

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 10/16/2023, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Information Technology in accordance with department bylaws:

DocuSigned by:
Ying Xie
C9BC3E0430D44CE...
Ying xie
Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair
October 18, 2023
Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

DocuSigned by:
Shaoen Wu
DD438D56A047463...
Shaoen wu
Name (printed or typed)
October 18, 2023
Signature/ Date

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

DocuSigned by:
Patrick Bobbie
42BA9C4928944CF...
Patrick Bobbie
Name (printed or typed)
October 19, 2023
Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

DocuSigned by:
Sumanth Yenduri
B04458D098CE4E8...
Sumanth Yenduri
Name (printed or typed)
October 18, 2023
Signature/ Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

DocuSigned by:
Ivan Pulinkala
02FA0CC7B24D4B3...
Ivan Pulinkala
Name (printed or typed)
November 15, 2023
Signature/ Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 3

A. DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW 3

B. DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY 3

C. OVERVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEWS 3

II. MULTIPLE-YEAR REVIEWS 5

A. PRE-TENURE REVIEW 5

B. TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW..... 5

 1. *Promotion for Non-Tenure Faculty* 5

 2. *Promotion and/or Tenure for Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty* 6

C. POST-TENURE REVIEW 6

 1. *Process for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)*..... 6

 2. *Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)*..... 7

III. FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW..... 7

A. ANNUAL REVIEWS PROCESS 7

 1. *Faculty Responsibility*..... 7

 2. *Evaluation by Department Chair*..... 7

B. WORKLOAD MODELS 8

 1. *The Workload Model*..... 8

 2. *The Workload Model and Faculty Performance Agreement* 9

 3. *General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks* 10

C. QUALITY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENT 10

 1. *Philosophy and Intent* 10

 2. *Teaching*..... 11

Teaching Evaluation Rating Scale..... 11

Student Review of Teaching Effectiveness 13

 3. *Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA)* 13

S/CA Rating 14

S/CA Effort and Quality Levels for Annual Review 15

 4. *Professional Service (PS)* 17

PS Evaluation Rating Scale 17

IV. REVISION OF DOCUMENT 18

A. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINE REVIEW..... 18

B. THE PROCESS FOR REVISIONS TO THE PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES 18

V. REFERENCES 19

VI. APPENDICES 19

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

I. Introduction

A. Department Overview

The Department of Information Technology is a unit within the College of Computing and Software Engineering at Kennesaw State University. The department seeks to be recognized as a collaborative and collegial group of scholars who value excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The department seeks to be recognized as active in campus leadership and successful in research and funding activities involving undergraduate and graduate students. The department offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates.

All faculty members are expected to be leaders in teaching excellence and to develop into becoming leaders in teaching excellence; all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to be active in scholarship and creative activities of their discipline; and all are to be active in professional service. All faculty are expected to contribute to student success and pursue professional development in one or more of the three performance areas: Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activities, and/or Professional Service.

Kennesaw State University is a fast-growing research university that is developing in quality, depth, and breadth of program offerings and faculty accomplishments. As the relative importance of scholarship has grown over the years, the level of expectation will continue to mature with an increasing emphasis on the quality of scholarship.

B. Department Philosophy

The IT Department supports scholarship and professionalism across the whole range of Information Technology and appropriate related interdisciplinary areas.

The IT Department provides support to all faculty members in developing their own paths of scholarship and professional growth. Faculty members in the IT Department are strongly encouraged to create individual plans for their scholarly and professional development and to review these plans with the Department Chair regularly.

The IT Department supports all faculty in the development of deep and persistent scholarly and professional relationships both inside of KSU and with relevant outside organizations. As stated in the KSU Faculty Handbook, faculty members have the freedom to choose a wide range of organizations for research purposes, especially given the breadth of computing and information technology today, which is still a relatively young discipline. Professional development activities and professional service must align with the strategic goals of the Department and College.

C. Overview of Faculty Performance Reviews

As per the University and College guidelines and the Faculty Handbook, all faculty undergo performance reviews in three areas: *Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity*, and *Professional Service*. Teaching faculty performance is evaluated via two basic and interrelated processes: annual

reviews and multi-year reviews. An annual review evaluates the faculty member's performance over one year but within the context of multi-year reviews. The multi-year reviews, including pre-tenure/third-year review, promotion and/or tenure review, and post-tenure review, involving multiple reviewers, are a more comprehensive examination of a faculty member's contribution to the Department, College, and University. During annual reviews, faculty performance is evaluated on the five-point Likert scale defined in Table 1.

Table 1. Five-Point Scale Rubric and Description

Score	Category	Description	Comments
5	Exemplary	Faculty member far exceeded the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	
4	Exceeds Expectations	Faculty member exceeded the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	
3	Meets Expectations	Faculty member met the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	
2	Needs Improvement	Faculty member's efforts and performance fell below department and/or college expectations in the performance area and did not meet the department expectations even at a minimal level. Extensive improvements are needed.	This rating in any area necessitates a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) for tenured and tenure-track faculty
1	Does Not Meet Expectations	Faculty member neglected their responsibilities in the performance area.	This rating in any area necessitates a PRP for tenured and tenure-track faculty

Because department promotion and tenure (P & T) guidelines are discipline-specific and are approved by the 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 made.

The philosophy, expectations, and workload models in this document apply to departmental expectations for pre-Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Reviews.

II. Multiple-Year Reviews

A. Pre-Tenure Review

Pre-tenure review assesses the progress of the candidate toward tenure and promotion. The review process is described in KSU Faculty [Handbook 3.12B.1](#).

B. Tenure and/or Promotion Review

Faculty members planning to seek promotion and/or tenure should consider these criteria in the Information Technology Department at Kennesaw State University.

Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are insufficient to qualify for tenure or promotion. Any promotion of tenure-track or tenured faculty requires the record of receiving external grant(s): as the PI or as a Co-PI. An exception can be granted if other significant research achievements are made with the approval of the Department Chair and the Dean.

The faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure is expected to perform at the beginning level of the next highest rank. The faculty will be evaluated according to the expectations below with the guidelines outlined in Table 1.

1. Promotion for Non-Tenure Faculty

a) Promotion of Lecturer-line Faculty

The lecturer-line faculty are expected to demonstrate noteworthy in Teaching and at least satisfactory in Professional Service (KSU Handbook 3.2 and 3.10).

1) Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- Achieved *at least* “Exceeds Expectations” in Teaching.
- Achieved *at least* “Meets Expectations” in Professional Service.

2) Promotion of Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

- Achieved at least “Exceeds Expectations” in Teaching.
- Achieved at least “Meets Expectations” in Professional Service
- Demonstrated a strong record of contribution to creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices, or a positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings. (KSU Handbook 3.10.1)

b) Promotion of Clinical Faculty

The clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate noteworthy in Teaching and another area, and at least satisfactory in the third area (KSU Handbook 3.2 and 3.7).

1) Promotion of Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor

- Achieved *at least* “Exceeds Expectations” in Teaching.
- Achieved *at least* “Exceeds Expectations” in Scholarship and Creative Activities, or Professional Service.
- Achieved at least *at least* “Meets Expectations” in the third area if applicable.

2) Promotion of Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

- Achieved *at least* “Exceeds Expectations” in Teaching.
- Achieved *at least* “Exceeds Expectations” in Scholarship and Creative Activities or

Professional Service.

- Achieved *at least “Meets Expectations”* in the third area if applicable.
- Demonstrate a strong record of contribution to and leadership in clinical specialty areas. These contributions are in on-campus and off-campus work in clinical, educational, industry, and/or professional settings. Clinical professors are typically characterized as leaders, mentors, and experts, and these accomplishments merit regional, national or international attention and recognition. (KSU Handbook 3.7 B).

2. Promotion and/or Tenure for Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

The tenure-line faculty are expected to demonstrate noteworthy in Teaching and Scholarship and Creative Activities, and at least satisfactory in Professional Service (KSU Handbook 3.2 and 3.5A/B)

a) Promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor AND Award of Tenure

- 1) Achieved *at least “Exceeds Expectations”* in Teaching **AND** Scholarship and Creative Activities.
- 2) Achieved *at least “Meets Expectations”* in Professional Service.

b) Award of Tenure

- 1) Achieved *at least “Exceeds Expectations”* in Teaching **AND** Scholarship and Creative Activities.
- 2) Achieved *at least “Meets Expectations”* in Professional Service.

c) Promotion of Associate Professor to Professor AND/OR Award of Tenure

- 1) Achieved *at least “Exceeds Expectations”* in Teaching **AND** Scholarship and Creative Activities.
- 2) Achieved *at least “Meets Expectations”* in Professional Service.
- 3) Demonstrate leadership competencies in at least one of the three areas.

C. Post-Tenure Review

The Department of Information Technology places importance on the requirement that all faculty members who have received tenure in the Department continue to be active and productive members of the faculty throughout their careers.

All tenured faculty members must undergo post-tenure review in accordance with the procedures outlined in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.B.4. The same section lists eligibility for expedited post-tenure review and monetary PTR rewards.

All employees who are defined as administrative faculty in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 1.1 are not subject to the post-tenure review process described in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.B.4 for tenure-track teaching faculty. Such individuals will undergo Administrative Post-Tenure Review in accordance with the procedures outlined in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.B.5.

1. Process for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

The process of post-tenure review, which is undergone by all KSU tenured faculty at five-year intervals, is described in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.B.4. Expedited Post-Tenure Review and Monetary PTR Rewards are also described in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.B.4.

2. Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

In the event of a post-tenure review that Does Not Meet Expectations (1) or Needs Improvement (2) a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) must be created in accordance with the procedures outlined in KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.B.4.II & III. The PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the post-tenure review.

III. Faculty Annual Review

Faculty must address the quality and significance of their contributions in the Annual Review Document (ARD) and Faculty Performance Agreement(s) (FPA). The burden of demonstration is on the faculty member, with the determination of the contribution level made by the Department Chair and the Dean. Expectations for faculty work differ due to variations in faculty rank, workload models, and FPA agreements.

A. Annual Reviews Process

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

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

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

1. Faculty Responsibility

Faculty members are responsible for justifying their performance ratings, which are assessed on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 for 'Does Not Meet Expectations' to 5 for 'Exemplary' in their annual reviews. This includes providing specific criteria for each score level under the negotiated workload model and demonstrating how their work contributes to the mission and vision of the University, College, and Department.

2. Evaluation by Department Chair

Department Chair will evaluate faculty members in each of the three performance categories--*teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service*—based on the five-point Likert scale (see Table 1). In addition, the Department Chair will evaluate faculty's efforts to promote student success in *at least one* of the three areas.

The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their ranks, tenure/promotion status, and career stage as noted in the 5-point scale. (BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)

The overall evaluation will weigh the rating in each area by the workload percentage in that area. The overall evaluation will then be rounded to the nearest whole number; however, the overall evaluation cannot exceed a rating of 3 if there is a rating of 1 in any area per the CCSE guidelines.

If a tenured faculty member receives a rating below 3 in any category during an annual review, a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) must be developed in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 3.12.A.5 of the KSU Faculty Handbook.

If a tenured faculty member receives a rating below 3 in any category (not necessarily the same category) on two consecutive annual reviews, the faculty member will be subject to a corrective post-tenure review in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 3.12.A of the KSU Faculty Handbook.

B. Workload Models

KSU Faculty Handbook (Section 2.2) provides a common model and vocabulary to describe the varied work faculty members undertake and an agreed framework for discussions of that work. The work of a faculty member involves many different facets, including the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service. The model establishes core standards and expectations to be established through the shared governance process:

- A typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year.
- All faculty must allocate at least 10% of their time to Professional Service activities essential to the institution per their rank and discipline.
- The IT Department establishes, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught, and equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research) should be formally negotiated and incorporated into the faculty assessment process. The Department Chair has flexibility in establishing class sizes to meet student demand with consultation from the Department Faculty Council (DFC) and teaching faculty. Department Chair will ensure Faculty equity in class sizes. All efforts will be made to have the total student number in a year close to the average class size times the number of course load.
- A typical workload for a tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 60%, 30%, and 10% in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and professional service respectively.
- The IT department establishes, in writing, teaching load equivalencies for scheduled laboratory courses where 1 lab contact hour is counted as 0.5 credit of a workload hour.
- The workload model does not dictate, or favor, any mix of activities. That mix is for individual faculty members and the Department Chair to agree upon (with Dean's approval) based on institutional needs and KSU's shared governance negotiated through the FPA.

1. The Workload Model

Based on KSU Faculty Handbook, the IT department establishes flexible guidelines as to expectations of faculty members in the following three faculty performance areas:

- Teaching
- Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA)
- Professional Service (PS)

2. The Workload Model and Faculty Performance Agreement

Each individual faculty member shall divide his/her professional efforts among the three faculty performance areas noted. That division of effort will be reflected in a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) between the individual faculty member and the University (see Faculty Handbook Section 3.12). Negotiation of individual FPAs allows for diversity among individual faculty members. Colleges and departments, in consultation with faculty stakeholders, determine which FPA combinations best suit their college and departmental objectives. FPAs may change from year to year and even from semester to semester as needs and opportunities change. Consistent with the university's culture of shared governance, the details of an individual FPA are worked out in consultation between the chair and the faculty member and are subject to final approval by the Dean. Faculty for whom a different model would be more appropriate will collaborate with their Chair in the selection of that model. A faculty member's strengths, interests, and past three years' annual reviews will serve as the primary guide to the selection of a workload model. If the faculty member and the Chair cannot reach agreement on the FPA, the Dean will make the final determination.

Some examples of possible FPA workload combinations appear below. The norm for workload effort expected in the area of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively. The examples reflect various percentages of effort in the three faculty performance areas. The examples given are merely illustrative. Individual FPAs can vary, as agreed by the faculty member and Chair, and as approved by the Dean.

Table 2 shows typical examples of IT Department Workload Models Expectations. The actual FPA percentages for each faculty member will be negotiated with the Department Chair as part of the annual review and are subject to final approval by the Dean (Faculty Handbook, Sections 2-3.14). Please refer to Section V below for yearly faculty expectations, paying particular attention to Table 6 S/CA Effort and Quality Levels for annual review percentages.

Table 2. IT Faculty Annual Workload Model Expectations
(Total percentage must be 100%)

Workload model & Specialization	Rank and Tenure	Teaching	Scholarship & Creative Activity	Service
Limited Term (5-5)	N/A	100%	0%	0%
Teaching Intensive (4-5)	Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Clinical Faculty	90%	0%	10%
Teaching Focused (4-4) *	Clinical Faculty/Tenured	80%	10%	10%
Balanced Teaching (3-4)	Tenured	70%	20%	10%
Balanced Load (3-3) **	Tenure track/Tenured	60%	30%	10%
Research Intensive	Tenure track/Tenured	20%-50%	40-70%	10%

- 1) Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty are expected to participate in grant funding activities when S/CA >10%.
 - 2) Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty must have a minimum of 10% S/CA and Service.
 - 3) Any variation of the above workload model (e.g., external grant funding may require increasing S/CA effort) is subject to negotiation between Faculty and Department Chair, with the approval of the Dean.
 - 4) Workloads with less than 60% teaching and more than 30% S/CA are possible if sufficient justification (typically externally funded projects) enables buy-out from teaching to focus upon S/CA. This must get approval from the Department Chair and Dean.
- *Typical working load for non-tenure track clinical faculty with professional rank.
- **Baseline Norm expectations for tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty.

3. General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks

The IT department employs tenured, tenure-track faculty, lecturers, limited-term, and part-time faculty. The IT department has multiple workload models available, differing in the significance of contributions in each area of Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activities, and Service.

Through the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) process, faculty may also negotiate variations on these models, requiring the approval of both the Department Chair and Dean. The computing accrediting body (ABET) requires that all permanent faculty have time for scholarship and professional development needed to remain current in the field.

Expectations vary based on the workload models and FPA agreements. Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions to the ARD and FPA. The overall outcome of the performance will be assessed on a five-point scale: (see Table 1). Details on each level's criteria for three performance areas can be found in the sections below.

In relation to the contribution level in each area, the burden of demonstration is on the faculty member, with the determination of the contribution level made by the Department Chair and the Dean. Faculty seeking a promotion are advised that their argument is strengthened if they are already performing at the expectations of the next rank.

C. Quality and Significance of Faculty Accomplishment

1. Philosophy and Intent

The department's philosophy on evaluating the significance of scholarly accomplishments is evolving towards more defined levels of expectation for different ranks and workload models. The anticipated outcome of this approach is to enable faculty to 1) better gauge and balance their commitments across the three general areas of responsibility: Teaching; Scholarship and Creative Activities (S/CA); and Professional Service (PS), while 2) simultaneously encouraging teaching excellence, sustained and excellent scholarship, and effective service activities. All S/CA and PS should be aligned with the IT or CCSE strategic goals.

In the Teaching, S/CA, and PS areas, faculty expectations will be at least at the rating of 3 (Meet Expectation). The evaluation levels list the **minimum** evaluation levels for each area.

The following explains the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service. Each area gives a detailed explanation of how faculty is assessed for each rating in each area.

2. Teaching

Consistent with KSU's guidelines, IT faculty members are expected to be excellent teachers who regularly mentor and advise students and create engaging and welcoming classroom environments that enhance student learning opportunities. Highly effective teaching and learning are central departmental priorities.

Teaching Evaluation Rating Scale

a. Meets Expectations in Teaching (rating of 3 on a five-point scale):

The constantly changing IT field requires dynamic efforts to maintain currency in the field. This level of contribution is characterized by a commitment to teaching and learning, inside and outside the classroom, which sustains instructional excellence and promotes high levels of student achievement. In addition to the basic expectations in the KSU Faculty Handbook Section 2.4 and CCSE P&T Guidelines, the IT department faculty are expected to: (Table 3)

Table 3. Basic Expectations for Teaching

- 1) Completes assigned classes in regular Fall and Spring semesters achieving satisfactory performance as evidenced in part by student evaluations, by FCARs, and other means without having repeatedly unsatisfactory performance in the preceding 3-year period.
- 2) Creates or updates syllabi at the beginning of each term, while adhering to department, college, and university standards, including those necessary for ABET accreditation, such as approved course assessment reports and assessment participation.
- 3) Holds required office hours and is generally available to students. Interacts with students in a timely, respectful, and professional manner, and treats each student as a valued adult learner.
- 4) Maintains or updates course website (course instructor) and/or course master shells (course coordinator) to meet university review requirements.
- 5) Adopts appropriate teaching and pedagogical methods and teaches effectively with distance learning technology.
- 6) Continuous improvement activities: Utilizing course evaluation mechanisms and instruments consistent with the departmental and university teaching effectiveness policy, with written analysis and responsive adjustments to evaluation data.
- 7) All faculty members are required to define a set of courses within the department programs that they are available and committed to teaching.

b. Exceeds Expectations in Teaching (rating of 4 on five-point scale)

Faculty member demonstrates three (3) or more different achievements from Table 4. Some items can be counted multiple times (*) based on the effort and justification of the faculty and the determination from the Department Chair.

c. Exemplary in Teaching (rating of 5 on five-point scale)

Faculty member demonstrates five (5) or more different achievements from at least two (2) different categories in Table 4. Some items can be counted multiple times (marked with *) based on the effort and justification of the faculty and the determination from the Department Chair.

Table 4. Exceeds Expectation/Exemplary in Teaching

<p>1) Evaluation, recognition, and awards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Achieve consistent excellent performance as evidenced, in part by student evaluations, by FCARs, and other means. b. Be nominated or win a teaching award or fellowship at various institution levels. c. Be recognized by both students and colleagues as a very good teacher, as evidenced by university-level programs like “Thank-a-Teacher” (CETL) and “Made-the-Difference” (Career Planning and Development), Class observation report (department), direct email, social media network recommendation (LinkedIn), and other public sources. <p>2) Teaching activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Teach large class sections that significantly exceed the normal class size set by the department with above-average teaching evaluations and without extra teaching support or overloading payment. b. * Teach a short course abroad or participate in a study abroad program. c. * Participate in new teaching initiatives or pilot programs. <p>3) Mentoring activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. * Chair a thesis or dissertation committee. b. * Serve a thesis or dissertation committee. c. * Mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students on a research project, directed studies, service-learning project, capstone project, honor program project, industry project, or other special projects. d. * Mentoring high school interns on directed studies and special topics. <p>4) Development activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. * Lead the new development or redesign of a concentration, certificate, track, or program. b. * Develop a new course or significantly modify an existing course. c. * Develop new, or significantly update, Open Educational Resources such as Open Textbooks, Ancillary/Supplementary Resources, and Audiovisual Materials (e.g., ALG grant). – refer to https://alg.manifoldapp.org/projects/t-p-guidelines. d. Lead the development, implementation, and evaluation of an innovative teaching method or a new pedagogy paradigm. <p>5) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring new colleagues in teaching and student advising/mentoring.</p> <p>6) Other teaching and mentoring-related activities agreed upon by the faculty member and the Department Chair.</p>
--

d. Needs Improvement in Teaching (rating of 2 on five-point scale)

Does not meet one of the items from Table 3 (above).

e. Does Not Meet Expectations in Teaching (rating of 1 on five-point scale)

Does not meet two of item# 1-3 or not meet any three from Table 3 (above).

Student Review of Teaching Effectiveness

All IT classes will be evaluated using one or more mechanisms:

- Using KSU approved student survey instrument.
- Using the teaching effectiveness metrics and process developed for courses to comply with program assessments such as ABET and university program review.
- Using peer evaluation of classes.

IT faculty are expected to consider and reflect on the feedback provided by these mechanisms in their annual review document.

A faculty member may utilize additional instruments of their own design for continuous improvement. If intended for use as part of the faculty annual review, the process must include the following features:

- All evaluation instruments must be anonymous: the student cannot be determined from the information and presentation of the evaluation instrument.
- All evaluations must be handled outside of the oversight of the faculty member being evaluated. This ensures that the faculty member cannot pressure or intimidate student responses (even unintended). The faculty member must not be present during the evaluation or have control over the evaluation instrument containing student responses.
- The evaluation instruments must be delivered to the Department Chair in a “chain of custody” that excludes the faculty member.

3. Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA)

All tenure-track IT faculty members are expected to participate in research and creative activity, the level of expectation varying with the faculty member’s workload model and FPA.

IT faculty members have traditionally valued a wide variety of scholarly activities. The key to the appropriate valuation of a scholarship product is the peer-review process and the production of a clearly defined and reviewable product. Research and creative activity products should:

- Be critically reviewed by professional peers.
- Be disseminated internally and beyond the University.

Research rises to the level of scholarship when it becomes disseminated and professionally reviewed. The scholarship includes, but is not limited to:

- Discovery or applied research activities disseminated in reviewed scientific and professionally based journals, monographs, book chapters, online reviewed publications, etc.
- Industrial research leads to patents, presentations, or publications in referred journals.
- Publication and dissemination of research in technical reports written for governmental agencies if the report is peer-reviewed by other professionals in the field.
- Publication of peer-reviewed textbooks, textbook chapters, academic conference proceedings, journals, and review articles.
- Publication of software on major peer-reviewed commercial stores.

- Presentations at professional conferences, consortia, seminars, etc. including any presentations produced from student mentorships.
- Externally funded projects and grants. Consideration will be given to the degree of competitiveness of the program, the funding organization (international, national, regional, state, local or industrial), the value of the grant, and the individuals' contribution to the project.

Evaluation of a faculty member's research effectiveness will be based upon the evidence that the individual faculty member has systematic inquiry activities associated with individual or collaborative scientific research, and should:

- encompass notable levels of discipline expertise,
- be innovative or logically contribute to the discipline or professional knowledge base
- be replicable or elaborated.
- be documented and peer reviewed.

S/CA Rating

The guidelines listed in this section only apply to faculty with research workloads.

Table 6 lists the S/CA efforts and two quality levels: tier 1 and tier 2. Examples of tier 1 and tier 2 S/CA products can be found in Appendix A and B, respectively. The points in Table 6 are used to evaluate if the research outcome of the faculty meets the assigned research workload, while Table 5 defines the criteria for achieving *Exceeding Expectations* and *Exemplary* ratings.

a. Meets Expectations in S/CA (rating of 3 on a five-point scale)

- Faculty's S/CA points from Table 6. meet the S/CA percentage specified in his/her workload model.
- The S/CA efforts can be any combination of products as listed in Table 6.
- Faculty with more than 10% S/CA in their annual workload model are expected to demonstrate evidence of applying, receiving, or executing external grants and/or contracts. (See Table 6)

b. Exceeds Expectations in S/CA: Meets Expectations in S/CA also required. (rating of 4 on a five-point scale) (See Table 5)

c. Exemplary in S/CA: Meets Expectations in S/CA also required. (rating of 5 on a five-point scale rubric) (See Table 5)

Table 5. Exceeds Expectations/Exemplary in S/CA

S/CA of workload model	Exceeds Expectations	Exemplary
10%	At least one S/CA product from Meeting Expectations category in Table 6 as the lead author	At least one S/CA product from Exceeding Expectations category in Table 6
20%	At least one S/CA product from Exceeding Expectations category in Table 6	At least two S/CA products from Exceeding Expectations category in Table 6

30%	At least one S/CA product from the Exceeding Expectations category in table 6 as the lead author/Co-PI of an active external grant OR multiple products as the second lead author.	At least one S/CA product from the Exceeding Expectations category in table 6 as the lead author/PI of an active external grant OR more than one product as the second lead author/Co-PI of active external grant.
>30%	Two S/CA products from the Exceeding Expectations category in Table 6 as the lead author, and one of these products is expected to be on an active external grant as co-PI.	Two S/CA products from the Exceeding Expectations category in Table 6 as the lead author, and one of these products is expected to be on an active external grant as PI or more than one active external grant as Co-PI.

d. Needs improvement in S/CA (rating of 2 on a five-point scale)

Completed \geq 50% and $<$ 100% of assigned S/CA workload.

e. Not Meeting Expectations in S/CA (rating of 1 on a five-point scale)

Completed $<$ 50% of assigned S/CA workload.

S/CA Effort and Quality Levels for Annual Review

Table 6. S/CA Effort and Quality Levels for Annual Review

Quality	S/CA type	Points
Meeting Expectations	Conference Paper, Poster, Panel, Abstract, etc. (accepted, peer reviewed) Any conference that is peer reviewed with paper acceptance rate $>$ 40%	Conference Poster, Abstract, Panel – 5% - Lead author, 3% - 2 nd - 4 th author, 1% - 5 th + author Conference Paper – 10% – 15% - Lead author, 7% - 12% - 2 nd - 4 th author, 4% - 9% - 5 th + author
	Journal (peer reviewed)	10% (submitted) – Lead author, 7% (submitted) – 2 nd - 4 th author, 4% (submitted) – 5 th + author 15% (accepted) – Lead author, 12%(accepted) – 2 nd - 4 th author, 9% (accepted) – 5 th + author See Tier 2 list in Appendix B
	Book Chapter (submitted)	10% - 15% (submitted) – Lead author, 8% - 12% (submitted) - 2 nd - 4 th author, 6% - 10% (submitted) - 5 th + author
	Grant/contract	PI: Internal submitted, 8% Internal awarded $<$ \$50K, 12%

		<p>External submitted < \$50K, 10%</p> <p>External submitted >= \$50K, 15%</p> <p>Co-PI:</p> <p>Internal submitted, 5%</p> <p>Internal awarded <\$50K, 7%</p> <p>External submitted < \$50K, 8%</p> <p>External submitted >= \$50K, 13%</p>
Exceeding Expectations	<p>Prestigious Conference (accepted, peer reviewed)</p> <p>Any conference that is peer reviewed with acceptance rate <= 40%</p>	<p>20% - Lead author,</p> <p>15% - 2nd - 4th author,</p> <p>10% - 5th + author.</p> <p>See Tier 1 list from Appendix A.</p>
	Journal (accepted, peer reviewed)	<p>20%-25% - Lead author</p> <p>15%-20% - 2nd to 4th</p> <p>10%-15% - 5th +author</p> <p>See Tier 1 list from Appendix A.</p>
	Book/ book chapter (accepted, peer reviewed)	<p>20% -25% (book chapter) – Lead author</p> <p>15% -20% (book chapter) – 2nd to 4th author,</p> <p>10%-15% (book chapter) - 5th + author</p> <p>30% (book) – Lead author</p> <p>25% (book) – 2nd+ author</p> <p>20% (book) - 3rd+ author</p>
	Grant/contract (awarded)	<p>PI:</p> <p>Internal >=\$50K - 15%</p> <p>External < \$100K - 25%</p> <p>External >= \$100K - 35%</p> <p>Co-PI:</p> <p>Internal >=\$50K - 10%</p> <p>External < \$100K - 18%</p> <p>External >= \$100K - 28%</p> <p>Senior Personnel:</p> <p>External - 5-10%</p>
	Commercial grade product/application development	Published/Completed: 20%
	Patent	Submitted: 15%
		Awarded: 20%

1. For activities not listed in the table, S/CA venues not listed in Appendices A and B, and special situations, faculty members are expected to discuss with the Department Chair to determine the effort level and significance. For example, the faculty may provide additional information besides conference acceptance rates.
2. If journal/book/book chapter/grants include more than one annual review period, faculty will receive credit for both submission and acceptance.
3. For an S/CA product that has a point range, the faculty should provide evidence to justify the requested point.

4. For funded Grants/Contracts, PI/co-PIs/equivalent designers receive the same S/CA credit which is the total awarded grant/contract amount. Multiyear grants/contracts are counted equally over the entire duration of grants/contracts. For a multiyear grant/contract, the total awarded amount/contract is divided equally by the number of years; and the division product is counted as the annual S/CA credit.
5. For publications (book chapter or books, conference, and journal publications) with more than one author, all authors get credit with % as specified above. 2nd+: second and subsequent authors.
6. Faculty who works on a S/CA product with students are considered as lead authors.
7. Lead author is the person who made the most contribution to a publication such as first author or corresponding author.
8. The entire S/CA credit for a given year must not constitute “submitted” product’s effort only.

4. **Professional Service (PS)**

All faculty members are expected to participate in service activities, with the level of expectation varying from the faculty member’s workload model and FPA. Service activities can be to the department, college, university, or discipline. Faculty members need to describe their contribution to the service activity in detail – not just a list.

PS Evaluation Rating Scale

Service activities are recognized as important contributions, particularly those that support the work and functioning of the department. Specific department service activities are highly valued. Some department leadership roles have teaching reassignment and service activity needs to be factored into workload through, e.g., committee meeting frequency. Service activities need to be aligned with strategic goals and are categorized as follows:

a. Meets Expectations in Service: (rating of 3 on a five-point scale)

Table 7. Meet Expectations in Professional Service

- 1) Participate in discussions regarding curriculum.
- 2) Participate in department and college meetings and discussions.
- 3) Attend graduation events. Two per academic year.
- 4) Serve on committees in the Department, College, University, or discipline (i.e., reviewing papers, serving on editorial boards, national professional organizations, and program committees in professional conferences).
- 5) Participate in at least two activities to support the academic department/college/ student events.

b. Exceeds Expectations in Service: Meets Expectations in Service also required (rating of 4 on a five-point scale)

Faculty member demonstrates 3 from the list in Table 8. Each service can be counted multiple times and needs justification in ARD.

c. Exemplary in Service: Meets Expectations in Service also required (rating of 5 on a five-point scale)

Faculty members demonstrate 5 or more from the list in Table 8. Each service can be counted multiple times and needs justification in ARD.

Table 8. Exceeds Expectation / Exemplary in Service

- 1) Serve the institution.**
- a) Lead a Department, College, Or University Committee with quality deliverables.
 - b) Sponsor KSU student organizations.
 - c) Contribute to special Department/College/University initiatives or task forces beyond Meeting Expectations contributions.
 - d) Contribute to leadership roles at the Department/College/University level beyond Meeting Expectations contributions.
 - e) Serve as a chair of an ad-hoc committee for the Department, College, Or University.
 - f) Reach out to schools or community colleges.
 - g) Make significant contributions to writing institutional self-study reports, accreditation reports, governance documents or other notable institutional documents.
- 2) Serve to the communities/discipline.**
- a) Serve as a leader of civic and community organizations with activity related to IT discipline (e.g., Technology Association of Georgia).
 - b) Frequently perform consulting or training services for business groups within his/her discipline on and off campus, or similar activities.
 - c) Serve as an Invited Speaker, Chair, Co-Chair, Program-Chair, Local Chair role in prestigious National/International Conferences.)
 - d) Serve on the organizing committee of a regional, national, or international conference.
 - e) Serve on national/international grant/proposal reviewing panels.
 - f) Take a leadership role in external program accreditation. (Tenured faculty only¹) – includes writing external accreditation reports and leading department efforts for accreditation.
 - g) Serve on editorial boards, or as editor of proceedings or journals.
 - h) Serve on leadership to national organizations that elevates the University's national recognition in a positive way. (Tenured faculty only¹)
 - i) Serve as external reviewer for faculty promotion/tenure portfolios.
- 3) Other service activities agreed upon by the faculty member and the Department Chair.**

d. Needs Improvement in Service (rating of 2 on a five-point scale)

Does not meet one of the items in Table 7.

e. Not Meeting Expectations in Service (rating of 1 on a five-point scale)

Does not meet three of five items in Table 7.

IV. Revision of Document

A. Promotion and Tenure Guideline Review

This document will be reviewed every three years in the Fall by the IT Department Faculty Council. The Tier 1 and Tier 2 S/CA product lists will be reviewed annually in the fall semester by the IT Department Faculty Council.

B. The process for revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

1. Identify the need for revisions: The first step is to determine why revisions are

necessary. This may be due to changes in the academic field, changes in institutional policies, or feedback from faculty members.

2. Invite Department Faculty Council (DFC) to oversee the revision process.
3. Review existing guidelines: The committee should review the existing Promotion and Tenure Guidelines to identify areas that need to be revised. This review should include feedback from faculty members who have gone through the promotion and tenure process.
4. Develop proposed revisions: Based on the review of existing guidelines and feedback from faculty members, the committee should develop proposed revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
5. Seek feedback: The proposed revisions should be shared with faculty members and other relevant groups for feedback. This feedback should be considered when finalizing the revisions.
6. Approve revisions: The revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines should be approved by the IT DFC, Promotion & Tenure Committee, Department Chair, College Dean, and Provost.
7. Communication changes: Once the revised guidelines have been approved, they should be communicated to all faculty members.

V. References

- KSU Faculty Handbook
- CCSE P&T Guidelines

VI. Appendices

A. Appendix A: IT Department S/CA Tier 1 List

<https://kennesawedu.sharepoint.com/:x/s/CCSE/IT/ESbNhZki9PBDobJ3yl5m2HABtMj3UYU4gs6DyDHcPBWu3Q?e=9BN4fJ> Tier 1 List

B. Appendix B: IT Department S/CA Tier 2 List

<https://kennesawedu.sharepoint.com/:x/s/CCSE/IT/ESbNhZki9PBDobJ3yl5m2HABtMj3UYU4gs6DyDHcPBWu3Q?e=9BN4fJ> Tier 2 Lis

Final Editors: Shirley Tian, Ming Yang, Chi Zhang, Maria Valero, Jack Zheng, and Shaoen Wu
Proofread by Judith Brodell

Revision History:
2023 May/August/October
2020 August
2017 November
2016 October