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General Expectations for Faculty Review

Kennesaw State University has established guidelines at multiple levels of review (department, college, and university) to assess the individual contributions of faculty members with respect to the central mission of the institution, the college, and the department. Kennesaw State University's promotion and tenure guidelines place a priority on the quality, significance, and impact of the products in each of the performance areas: Teaching (T), Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA), and Professional Service (PS). Where tenure and promotion are concerned, all faculty must demonstrate satisfactory performance in each of the areas defined in this document and in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. While teaching and program administration is the central mission of Leadership and Integrative Studies, in accordance with University-wide guidelines, scholarship and creative activity is an essential component in promotion and tenure decisions for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Lecturers, due to their higher teaching loads, are not required to pursue Scholarship and Creative Activity.

Primacy of the Faculty Performance Agreement in Assessment of Faculty Performance

Each full-time faculty member in the department works with the Department Chair in developing the faculty member's Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). The FPA is a formal agreement approved and signed by the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean. The FPA outlines the faculty member's unique situational context and identifies the faculty member's workload model and goals for all areas of faculty performance. The FPA defines expectations for a three-year period but should be renegotiated annually under the conditions described below.

The purpose of the FPA is to ensure (1) each faculty member has a clear understanding of their expected roles and duties, (2) the roles and duties assigned to the faculty member contribute to the mission of the department and college, and (3) each faculty member is provided adequate time and resources to succeed in designated expectations, roles, and duties. After the faculty member drafts the FPA, it is the Department Chair's responsibility to determine if the FPA meets departmental needs and provides an appropriate foundation for the faculty member's career.
progression. Similarly, it is the Chair's responsibility to ensure that the FPA is reasonable and not overly ambitious in nature. When necessary, the Chair should work with the faculty member to revise the FPA.

Once an FPA has been developed, approved, and signed, it becomes the basis for the Department Chair's annual review evaluations. The FPA may be renegotiated if the faculty member's situational context changes (perhaps because of an unexpected change in teaching load or a change in the direction of a faculty member's efforts). The faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean must approve the revised FPA, which will replace the previous FPA.

The Annual Review Process

Faculty members must document specific accomplishments and the quality and significance of those accomplishments in their Annual Review Document (ARD). In the annual review process, the Chair will evaluate each faculty member's performance as *Exceeding Expectations*, *Meeting Expectations*, or *Not Meeting Expectations*. The designation *Meeting Expectations* implies that the individual is performing satisfactorily, while *Exceeding Expectations* is reserved for exceptional performance that clearly goes well beyond the satisfactory performance in a given area. See “Expectations by Rank in the Areas of Teaching” on page 13 for a description of the criteria for *Meeting Expectations* in each area of review at each faculty rank.

While not a specific area of performance review, collegiality is important to the functioning of the department. All faculty are expected to foster respectful relationships with students, colleagues, and members of the larger KSU community.

Evaluation of Performance for Promotion and Tenure (KSU Handbook, p.71)

The KSU Faculty Handbook provides University-wide guidelines for levels of review (department, college and university) of faculty performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service. In accord with the Faculty Handbook, faculty within the Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies must indicate quality, significance, and impact of their work in each performance area in order to be promoted and tenured. Likewise, in order to be promoted to senior lecturer, lecturers must provide evidence of increased quality, significance, and impact in the areas of Teaching and Professional Service.

Teaching

The Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies expects every faculty member to be actively engaged in the teaching, supervision, and mentoring of students. In addition, faculty must develop, articulate, and implement a philosophy of teaching. This teaching philosophy should
introduce the teaching section of the portfolio narrative. Meeting classes regularly and maintaining accessibility to students through regular office hours are basic obligations of faculty members and necessary for a satisfactory review. The KSU Faculty Handbook requires documentation of teaching effectiveness through at least two measures.

In the Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies, criteria for documenting effectiveness in teaching must include a summary of student feedback (survey and comments) from the University's mandated student evaluation and a numerical trend analysis indicating areas of ongoing improvement.

Guidelines for using SRTs (KSU Faculty Handbook, Sec. 2.5)
Individual faculty members may use SRT data to improve their own classes. The data may also be used during the annual review process or for purposes of promotion and tenure. When data are used for evaluating teaching performance, several important guidelines should be followed. First, it is important to note that SRTs constitute only one measure of teaching effectiveness, so SRTs should never be used as the sole criterion for evaluation. Data from objectively scored items (Likert items) should be compiled in the form of frequency tables that include both counts and percentages for each Likert category (i.e., strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no response). Response rates should also be provided for each course section. Data should not be reported as an average (mean) because it is not appropriate to interpret mean values for Likert scale data.

Further documentation of teaching effectiveness may include but is not limited to any of the following:
- Other student, peer, and supervisory evaluations of teaching and any quantitative or qualitative instrument that may be required by the department or used voluntarily by the faculty member;
- Measures of the achievement of student learning outcomes; demonstrations of student mastery of key skills and concepts;
- Syllabi, assignment descriptions, assessments, and other instructional materials clearly delineating the faculty member's ability to fulfill the learning outcomes for courses; development, description, and assessment of innovative teaching techniques;
- Curricular development, including determining appropriate learning objectives, required skills, and instructional outcomes for new or updated courses;
- Adoption and appropriate use of instructional technology to enhance teaching and learning;
- Evidence of effective advising, mentoring, and supervision of students; documentation of academic rigor, such as class GPAs and/or description of specific assignments or assessments that require critical thinking or advanced skills; teaching awards and nominations;
- Evidence of handling diverse and challenging teaching assignments;
- Mentoring other faculty to enhance their teaching effectiveness;
- Evidence of community-engaged teaching or curricular and co-curricular instruction that is intentionally designed to meet learning goals while simultaneously fostering reciprocal relationships with a community partner. Community-engaged teaching is assessable and requires
structured reflection by learners.

Documenting teaching effectiveness should focus on both the quality and significance of a faculty member’s teaching. Achievement of student learning outcomes should receive prominent attention in the faculty member’s discussion and documentation. Supporting evidence of student learning outcomes can be derived from quantitative and/or qualitative assessment measures. In the performance evaluation process, faculty members may augment student evaluation data with their own interpretation of the results.

Materials presented as evidence of teaching effectiveness will be most informative if they demonstrate growth and improvement over time. Course revisions and pedagogical change in response to collected data demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement and innovation in the classroom. Faculty members are expected to seek professional development opportunities to continuously improve their teaching effectiveness, for instance, through workshops or mentoring from senior faculty members.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

As an interdisciplinary department, Leadership and Integrative Studies recognizes the value of quality collaborative, interdisciplinary scholarship, as well as SCA conducted by the individual in their discipline, teaching, or administrative area. Because of the focus of Leadership and Integrative Studies on teaching, scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) is valued equally to scholarship of discovery, integration and application. Regardless of scholarship focus, a faculty member’s scholarly record should include dissemination of material through peer-reviewed venues and publications, and this peer-reviewed status should be clearly indicated in the portfolio or vita.

SCA that did not undergo peer review should also be identified as such in the portfolio or vita. The review process recognizes the time and intellectual energy invested in scholarship that is submitted to scholarly venues but is not initially accepted. In addition to publication and presentation, other scholarly activities include writing reviews of scholarly books or textbooks, serving as a discussant where review and critique of others’ scholarship is required, and grant writing.

Regardless of workload model, peer reviewed presentations and products that do not undergo peer review are not sufficient to ensure tenure and promotion. All tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to pursue and be successful in disseminating peer-reviewed publications of their scholarship and creative activity. The following is a list of the types of scholarship employed by department faculty and examples of typical scholarly products.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) has been emphasized by both Hutchings and Shulman and the University System of Georgia as systematic inquiry pertaining to instructional conditions and student learning. Both indicate, too, that such inquiry is not scholarship until it is evaluated through peer-review and then disseminated to the professional community. Outputs include but are not limited to peer-
reviewed articles, monographs, book chapters, on-line publications, technical reports; professionally reviewed presentations at conferences, consortia, and seminars; and externally reviewed textbooks, laboratory manuals, and similar published materials.

**Scholarship of Discovery** involves the creation of new knowledge. Outputs from the scholarship of discovery include but are not limited to peer-reviewed articles, monographs, book chapters, on-line publications, technical reports, as well as professionally reviewed presentations at conferences, consortia, and seminars.

**Scholarship of Application/Scholarship of Integration** involves the application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge as well as the integration of knowledge from multiple sources. Outputs in these areas include but are not limited to publication in peer-reviewed professional journals, book reviews, and papers presented at regional, national and international meetings, as well as presentations at practitioner-oriented forums.

**Scholarship of Community Engagement** involves partnerships between faculty and community organizations or members and addresses public purposes. Faculty, students, community-based organizations, government agencies, policy makers, and/or other actors work together to identify areas of inquiry, design studies and/or creative activities, implement and evaluate activities that contribute to shared learning and capacity building, disseminate findings, and make recommendations or develop initiatives for change. The findings of community-engaged scholarship can be published in academic venues like peer-reviewed journals and university press books. However, this kind of scholarship often produces other kind of products, including but not limited to published reports, exhibits and multimedia forms of presentation, installations, clinical and other service procedures, programs and events, court briefings and legislation. Like other kinds of scholarship, the scholarship of community engagement must involve inquiry, advance knowledge, and be open to review and critique by relevant scholars and community and professional peers.

**Creative Activity:** The Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies values scholarship and creative activity in all disciplines. Therefore, faculty members are encouraged to be actively involved in creative or scholarly endeavors that are peer-reviewed and publicly disseminated and that contribute to the advancement of their professional reputation within the disciplines.

**Criteria for Quality and Significance of Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)**

Because of the broad array of disciplines represented in the Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies, criteria for the quality and significance of SCA may vary. Evaluation of work from such a range of disciplines should also take into account differences in the time required by each for establishing a research program, collecting data, and analyzing it. In general, evaluation of a faculty member’s research effectiveness will be based upon evidence of systematic inquiry that a) encompasses notable levels of discipline expertise, b) is innovative or logically contributes to the discipline or professional knowledge base, c) is replicable or capable of being elaborated, d) is documented, peer-reviewed, and disseminated.
A consistently high quality of scholarly work is more important than the quantity of the work done.

Faculty members’ narratives for review should make a case for the quality and significance of their scholarship as grounded in their disciplines. Indicators may include the following:

- evidence of impact, contribution to a body of knowledge or the advancement of instruction
- invited presentations
- publication or presentation in highly selective venues (where information on acceptance rates is publicly available, this should be provided in the portfolio)
- citations of work in other publications
- adoption of teaching models or techniques by other faculty
- requests for research protocols from others seeking to replicate the author’s study
- reviews or discussions of the faculty member’s scholarship in other publications
- receipt of grants or funding support
- scholarship awards or nominations

Excellence in community-engaged scholarship requires that the research be of high quality, make significant contributions to building knowledge, and be recognized by a relevant community of peers, as with other forms of scholarship. A variety of evidence for the quality of community-engaged scholarship can be included, including the products listed above. Impact can also be demonstrated through the broad distribution of community-engaged scholarship products and evidence of outcomes in terms of changes in policy and practice, legislative action, enhanced community capacity, and contributions to public discourse. Evaluators of quality and impact should be drawn from a relevant and qualified community of experts, which can include scholars, professionals, community members, and civic leaders (Warren, et al., 2014).

The most valued forms of scholarship and creative work emerge from a peer-reviewed/adjudicated process. Other forms of dissemination are also valued, for example, invited presentations, scholarship presented to practitioner-oriented groups, or expert opinion published in the popular or professional press. While materials that do not undergo peer review might be considered scholarly work, they will not be considered scholarship until a final product has been produced that has been peer-reviewed. Such scholarly materials may include but are not limited to ideas/best practices disseminated through listservs, material posted on a faculty member’s own blog or website, items posted on a public blog or website, items self-published electronically or in print, and other materials that are disseminated without undergoing the scrutiny of one’s peers.

Even peer-reviewed dissemination venues vary in quality and significance. For example, a publication in a prestigious journal will be more valued than a publication in a less prestigious journal. The faculty member is responsible for providing relevant evidence on the quality and significance of contributions. Similarly, presentation venues also vary in quality and significance. Presentations at state, regional, national or international conferences where acceptance is determined by a substantive peer review of the quality and significance of the proposed presentation and the
impact of the work on student learning will be more valued than presentations at any conference where such substantive review for acceptance is not done and where acceptance may be determined primarily by the matching of the proposed presentation with the theme and focus of the conference.

Expectations for quality and significance increase with rank and experience. Furthermore, the expectations for publication and presentation for Scholarship (SCA) Emphasis faculty are such that the work published and presented should be of greater significance and impact.

**External Letters (required fall 2018)**

Faculty going up for review in 2018 and beyond are required to have external letters included in their portfolio. The university guidelines for this process are as follows:

a. The person submitting a portfolio (herein after referred to as the “candidate”) and the department chair/school director (herein after referred to as “chair”) develop a list of potential letter writers, twice the minimum number of the total required, with the candidate supplying at least half the names on the list.

b. The chair and the candidate will discuss potential letter writers and in collaboration will develop a mutually acceptable, hierarchized list. The majority of letters must come from individuals who are neither co-authors nor dissertation committee members. If the candidate and the chair cannot reach agreement on the list of potential letter writers, the dean will make the final determination of the list.

c. Individuals who pose a conflict of interest (such as friends, relatives, KSU co-workers) will be removed from the list.

d. For promotion to Full, the candidate chooses 2 names out of the final 3 letter writers; the chair chooses 1.

e. For promotion to Associate the candidate chooses 2 out of the final 3 letter writers; the chair chooses 1.

f. The candidate may veto two names on the chair’s initial list with no reasons or explanations required.

g. Neither the chair nor the candidate may solicit a letter concerning Scholarship / Creative Activity from outside of the mutually agreed upon list.

h. The candidate may choose to solicit a maximum of 5 additional letters of support in any area of Teaching, and/or Service and/or Scholarship from outside the mutually composed list. When soliciting such letters, the candidate will include that the writer is asked not to make a tenure/promotion recommendation as such. No individual may write more than one (1) letter of support for a single
candidate’s portfolio.

i. The department chair contacts the potential letter writers by email or phone requesting their assistance.

j. If the letter writer accepts, the chair will send the letter writer the standard KSU “Letter to External Reviewers,” the KSU faculty member’s CV, department guidelines for promotion and tenure, and reprints and/or professional portfolios or other documentation as appropriate by discipline. It is unnecessary to have all materials evaluated. The candidate should select the work to be shared with the letter writer. Materials should be shared electronically with the letter writer to the degree possible.

k. If the letter writer declines, the chair will choose another letter writer in the order of the list.

l. Once packets are sent to external letter writers, no additional information regarding the candidate’s research/creative activity will be sent to the external letter writer.

m. The letter writers will send their letter to the department chair who will insert the letter into Binder 1 in a section clearly marked “External Letters.”

n. If requests are sent to more potential letter writers than are required, and if more than the required numbers are received, all letters will be included in the portfolio.

o. If fewer than the number of letters requested by the chair are received, the chair will so note in the portfolio and the review will proceed.

**Professional Service**

The KSU Faculty Handbook states that "all faculty members are expected to devote at least 10% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution" (Section 3.3). Multiple service responsibilities are essential to the life of the Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies, University College, and Kennesaw State University. Professional service is broadly defined as contributing to the internal affairs and governance of the department, the college, the institution, and one’s professional discipline. Service within the greater community that links the faculty member's professional expertise to a project, initiative, or organization is also a part of professional service. As noted in the workload models that follow, in Leadership and Integrative Studies, all faculty are expected to devote a minimum of 10% of their workload to professional service activities. The scope of service activities for each faculty member should be negotiated with the Department Chair.

As a department that emphasizes student contact and integration of campus services, the Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies is
committed to valuing professional service and evaluating it by its quality, significance, and impact rather than mere quantity. Faculty must make clear in their narratives their individual contributions to committee work or group efforts and the significance of these contributions, in particular, highlighting tangible results that have significant impact. Assuming leadership roles on departmental, college, or university-level committees is an important consideration in tenure and promotion decisions. Assumption of leadership roles is expected to increase with rank and experience.

Documentation of scholarly service activities, as explained in Section 3.3 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, will be used to appropriately evaluate faculty contribution in the area of professional service. Indicators may include the following:

- Performing service inside or outside the department, as defined by the faculty member's situational context;
- Participation or leadership in departmental, college or university committees;
- Service work that exceeds what is necessary for the everyday operation of the department, including serving as an advisor to a student organization or planning one-time or annual campus events;
- Participation in curricular and co-curricular policy development at any level of the university;
- Formal program assessment;
- Conducting practitioner-oriented workshops at state, regional or national professional meetings; and;
- Assuming leadership roles within professional organizations related to the faculty member's discipline;
- Non-curricular engaged service, or more specifically, any on- or off-campus community engagement that is not predominately related to teaching or research but clearly complements a faculty member's academic expertise. Service within the greater community should link his or her professional expertise to a project, initiative or organization. According to the Office of Community Engagement, engaged service "help[s] foster mutually beneficial relationships that serve the community while providing opportunities to further develop socially responsible, civically engaged and educated citizens."

Basic faculty responsibilities--such as attending department meetings, participating in commencement ceremonies, attending essential department functions and meeting prospective faculty and staff applicants--are not included in professional service achievements. They are basic obligations required of every member of the department.

Documents providing evidence substantiating professional service will need to be supplied in a faculty member's portfolio. This may take the form of thank you letters that specify details of the faculty member's contributions, copies of various products that resulted from the service work (pictures, the cover page of a report, etc.), official documents that verify one's service (programs from conferences sponsored by professional societies that document involvement, official publications from professional societies that list role, printouts of appropriate web pages that list one's involvement), and other such materials.

Professional service may also include the work of individuals who perform significant ongoing administrative duties, including the Department
Chair, Assistant Department Chair, program directors/coordinators and, occasionally, faculty undertaking comparable endeavors (course coordination, curriculum development, etc.). Professional service in the form of program administration and leadership is distinctive for each faculty member based on the specific position(s) held. The service duties performed by an administrator may include activities such as the following:

- day-to-day operational management of the administrative unit
- budgeting and budget reporting
- strategic and operational planning
- scheduling courses and events for the unit
- supervision of faculty and staff
- staffing functions, including screening, hiring and training employees of the unit
- conducting performance reviews of faculty and staff
- marketing degree programs and unit activities
- other work assignments that are directed toward the successful operation of the administrative unit, department or curricular initiative for which they are responsible.

Annual Reviews

Faculty performance within the University College is evaluated annually according to KSU guidelines (KSU Handbook section 3 p. 63). Each department/school within University College has established an annual review process consistent with the University guidelines. Faculty members are reviewed over the basic categories of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service. All teaching faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching and noteworthy achievement in at least one other area (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5, 8.3.6, and 8.3.7). All faculty members must have at least 10% of their time allotted to Professional Service activities.

Faculty members must document specific accomplishments, and the quality and significance of those accomplishments, in their Annual Review Document (ARD). In the annual review process the department chair will evaluate each faculty member’s performance according to the faculty members’ FPA, and using the terms designated in the respective department/school P&T guidelines with the FPA receiving primary consideration.

General Expectations for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure by Rank (KSU Handbook, p.71)

The KSU Faculty Handbook provides university-wide guidelines for levels of review (department, college and university) of faculty performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service. In accord with the Faculty Handbook, faculty within the Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies must provide evidence of quality, significance, and impact of their work in each performance
area in order to be promoted and tenured. Likewise, in order to be promoted to senior lecturer, lecturers must provide evidence of increased quality, significance and impact in the areas of Teaching and Professional Service.

**Lecturers**

According to KSU Faculty Handbook guidelines, “It is understood that lecturers will generally be on the Teaching Intensive Model. Lecturers do not have specified expectations in scholarship but may be expected to participate in student advisement and to serve on committees. Lecturers may serve in other roles (e.g., course coordinators) as needed. Promotion and rehiring decisions will be made considering the faculty member’s success in achieving requirements of their model during the evaluation period (see details in department guidelines).”

The Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies follow the KSU Faculty Handbook concerning lecturers and senior lecturers: “In most cases faculty hired as lecturers or senior lecturers have as their primary responsibility teaching, supervising, and mentoring and are therefore expected to be highly effective in these areas. Unless otherwise set forth in a Faculty Performance Agreement, there are no expectations for scholarship and their service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g. attendance at relevant department meetings and participation on appropriate department committees). In many cases their responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load of these individuals offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty load at KSU. Because of this, lecturers and senior lecturers are expected to demonstrate exceptional teaching ability in order to qualify for reappointment at KSU. In some cases the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and unique. In such cases the responsibilities should be delineated in the Faculty Performance Agreement.”

The process for promotion will be similar to that used for promotion within the professorial ranks (see KSU Faculty Handbook). A portfolio, following the format required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures, following the same schedule of deadlines. No external letters are required, but they may be included at the candidate’s discretion. The portfolio for optional promotion to senior lecturer should demonstrate exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution, especially in the areas established in the faculty member’s FPA.
Tenure-Track Faculty

Expectations by Rank in the Areas of Teaching: Examples of accomplishments that meet and exceed expectations at each rank for the sample workload models are provided but not limited to the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professor Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Assistant Professor Exceeding Expectations AND Promotion to Associate Professor Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor Exceeding Expectations AND Promotion to Full Professor Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor Exceeding Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • completes teaching goals as outlined in fpa or provides adequate justification for why any goals were not met  
• provides well-articulated philosophy of teaching and learning  
• course evaluations that demonstrate a mastery of course content and a high level of competency and positive rapport with students  
• demonstrates reflective approach to assessing one’s own instruction and course materials  
• shows commitment to continually updating and improving course material and delivery and using high impact practices | • implements diverse and effective teaching methods from the literature, modeling best practices for teaching in the faculty member’s discipline.  
• demonstrates commitment to improvement through reflection, participation in professional development, conference attendance, and/or solicitation of feedback from peers and students  
• teaches in learning communities  
• participates actively in and/or leads departmental curriculum discussions and sharing of teaching resources  
• explores and implements technology to enhance teaching & learning  
• provides well-articulated philosophy of teaching and learning  
• course evaluations demonstrate a mastery of course content and a high level of competency in the classroom | • develops new courses or new delivery methods  
• contributes to pedagogical improvement by presenting instructional development sessions for other ksu faculty  
• collaborates effectively with colleagues across the college and/or university on instructional, curricular, and/or program matters  
• serves as mentor for colleagues, students and/or practicing professionals  
• mentors students in professional activities such as presentations and publishing  
• obtains qm certification for teaching or evaluating online courses  
• serves on or chairs individual student work or committees (e.g., portfolios, theses, directed studies, dissertation committees)  
• demonstrates consistent growth in effective teaching  
• contributes to pedagogical growth by presenting instructional development sessions beyond ksu  
• achieves graduate teaching status | • is recognized for teaching by department, college, university or the profession  
• has received fellowships related to teaching  
• possesses a sustained record of developing new courses or delivery methods  
• has been invited to present (at conferences, other universities, teaching and learning centers, etc.) pedagogical practices or curricular developments  
• works with graduate or undergraduate students on research projects  
• has a record of mentoring junior faculty |
**Expectations by Rank in the Areas of Scholarship and Creative Activity:** Examples of accomplishments that meet and exceed expectations at each rank for the sample workload models are provided but not limited to the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professor Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Assistant Professor Exceeding Expectations AND Promotion to Associate Professor Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor Exceeding Expectations AND Promotion to Full Professor Meeting Expectations</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor Exceeding Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- completes scholarship goals as outlined in FPA or provides adequate justification for why any goals were not met.</td>
<td>- a record of publications in less selective journals or other scholarly outlets</td>
<td>- a growing body of scholarship that represents the faculty member’s unique contribution to the field</td>
<td>- a body of scholarship indicating a unique contribution to the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- publication in the form of peer-reviewed journal article, book chapters, and other such peer-reviewed venues in the area of the faculty member’s discipline, SoTL, or other related area</td>
<td>- a record of presentations at regional or national peer-reviewed conferences</td>
<td>- a record of publications in more selective journals or other scholarly outlets</td>
<td>- a record of public display and/or dissemination of creative accomplishments in international venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- internal grant proposals</td>
<td>- public display and/or dissemination of creative accomplishments in state or regional venues (e.g., theater productions, works of art, etc.)</td>
<td>citations of work in other publications</td>
<td>invited publications and presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- research presentations given at state and regional conferences.</td>
<td>- collaborative research with colleagues within the department and across campus</td>
<td>public display and/or dissemination of creative accomplishments in national venues (e.g., theater productions, works of art, literature, etc.)</td>
<td>a record of presentations at international peer-reviewed conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public display and/or dissemination of creative accomplishments on campus and at local venues (e.g., theater productions, works of art, etc.)</td>
<td>written acknowledgement of work by others in the field</td>
<td>a record of presentations at national peer-reviewed conferences</td>
<td>increased citation of work by others in the field, indicating growth as a leading scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- collaborative research projects that engage the faculty member with colleagues within the department and across campus</td>
<td>application(s) for external funding</td>
<td>invited presentations or workshops</td>
<td>adoption of SoTL-based recommendations by the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nominations for or receipt of scholarship-related awards at KSU</td>
<td>written acknowledgement of work by others in the field</td>
<td>requests for research protocols from others seeking to replicate the author’s study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaborative research with colleagues at other institutions within in the state and across the U.S.</td>
<td>adoption by other faculty of SoTL-based teaching recommendations</td>
<td>receipt of grants/other funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>application(s) for external funding</td>
<td>nominations for or receipt of scholarship-related awards in the field at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nominations for or receipt of scholarship-related awards at KSU</td>
<td>collaborative research with colleagues at institutions across the U.S. and internationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Expectations by Rank in the Areas of Professional Service:** Examples of accomplishments that meet and exceed expectations at each rank for the sample workload models are provided but not limited to the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exceeding Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exceeding Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exceeding Expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- completes professional service goals as outlined in FPA or provides adequate justification for why any goals were not met.</td>
<td>- serves on committees at the department and college levels</td>
<td>- serves on university-wide committee(s); assume leadership roles on department and college committees</td>
<td>- possesses a sustained record of reviewing conference proposals beyond the state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- contribute to the efforts of committees at the department and college level</td>
<td>- serves in leadership capacity on departmental committees</td>
<td>- activity in university-wide service initiative(s)</td>
<td>- has established a sustained record of reviewing manuscripts for professional publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- participate in/volunteers at conferences and other activities of local, state, and national professional organizations</td>
<td>- reviews conference proposals at local, state, or regional levels</td>
<td>- reviews manuscripts for professional publications</td>
<td>- presents with students at professional conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use professional expertise in service to the KSU campus and the local community</td>
<td>- advises student organizations or projects</td>
<td>- reviews conference proposals at national or international level</td>
<td>- serves on an editorial board for a professional publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- assumes leadership roles in professional organizations at local or state level</td>
<td>- assumes leadership roles in professional organizations at local or state level</td>
<td>- uses professional expertise to the benefit of the community and/or the profession</td>
<td>- possesses a sustained record of providing effective leadership in professional organizations at state, regional, and national/international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has received award(s) for professional service from the college, university, professional organizations or the community</td>
<td>- has received award(s) for professional service from the department</td>
<td>- assumes leadership roles in professional organizations at the national or international level</td>
<td>- has received award(s) for professional service from the college, university, professional organizations or the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Workload Activities

The Department of Leadership and Integrative Studies has multiple workload options designed to allow individual faculty members to utilize their unique strengths and abilities to benefit Kennesaw State University. Each faculty member will divide their professional efforts among the performance areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service, as set forth in the faculty member’s Faculty Performance Agreement. The University’s flexible workload model allows diversity within the department and among individual faculty members. As expressed in the KSU Faculty Handbook, “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.”

As noted previously, based upon consultation between the faculty member and the Department Chair, with approval of the Dean, FPA agreements may change from year to year and even from semester to semester. For new hires and annual FPA updates, the Department Chair, in consultation with faculty stakeholders, and with the approval of the Dean, will determine which FPA combinations best suit departmental objectives. Illustrative examples of several workload FPA combinations likely to occur in the Leadership and Integrative Studies Department appear below. Other combinations are possible and can be individualized for faculty with specific, approved goals and objectives.

**Teaching Emphasis (for Lecturers only)**
- 9 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
- 90% Teaching effort**
- 0% SCA effort
- 10% PS effort

**Teaching-SCA Balance**
- 6 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
- 60% Teaching effort**
- 30% SCA effort
- 10% PS effort

**Teaching-Service Balance**
- 6 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
- 60% Teaching effort**
- 30% PS effort
- 10% SCA effort
SCA Emphasis
4 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
40% Teaching effort**
50% SCA effort
10% PS effort

Service Emphasis I* (Program Directors/Assistant Department Chair)
2 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
20% Teaching effort**
10% SCA effort
70% PS effort

Service Emphasis II* (Department Chairperson)
1 course load per academic year
10% Teaching effort**
10% SCA effort
80% PS effort

Table 1: Expected Activities by Workload Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>9 courses/yr (90%)</td>
<td>6 courses/yr (60%)</td>
<td>6 courses/yr (60%)</td>
<td>4 courses/yr (40%)</td>
<td>2 courses/yr (20%)</td>
<td>1 courses/yr (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SCA Effort</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Expected Activities in Scholarship and Creative Activity over 3 year period

*Note: *Peer-reviewed publication of scholarship or exhibition (for creative activity) is required for tenure or promotion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity over 3-year period as specified in FPA</th>
<th>Teaching/SCA Balance</th>
<th>Teaching/Serv. Balance</th>
<th>SCA Emphasis</th>
<th>Service Emphasis I*</th>
<th>Service Emphasis II*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or funded grants with documented significance and impact. <em>Note: In cases where an article or chapter has been accepted but not published, the candidate must provide evidence of imminent publication. If credit is given for a work “in press” in one annual review, it should not be given, as well, in the next annual review.</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentations and other scholarly products or activities.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These areas are used to define different levels of emphasis on service that include leadership and administration associated with certain types of positions and responsibilities (e.g. department chair, program director, etc.).

**Each 3-credit hour class represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year. Faculty teaching discipline-based courses that are time-intensive such as graduate courses, studio courses, lab courses, or field experiences will work out equivalencies with the department chair. Supervising a master’s thesis committee, undergraduate research, directed studies, and similar activities may also be formally recognized with equivalencies determined by department chair.
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