University College
Tenure & Promotion Guidelines

I. Distinguishing College Characteristics
University College was formed in 2004-2005 to provide academic home for exploratory students who have not yet determined their academic major and also to provide greater visibility and significance to a variety of programs, academic support services, and projects. Many of the programs that are located within University College have a long history of excellence at KSU. Others are relatively new. All of them are focused on promoting student engagement and student success in and out of the classroom. University College works closely with the other Academic Colleges, the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, the Institute for Global Initiatives, the Office of Academic Affairs and the Division of Student Success and Enrollment Services to provide academically excellent programs and services that will enhance the college experience for all students.

University College has two departments: the Department of First-Year Programs and the Department of University Studies. Each department houses key programs that are central to the mission and strategic plan of Kennesaw State University and that contribute markedly to the success of Kennesaw State University students. The programs housed in each department are described in the respective departmental T&P guidelines and on the respective web sites:

http://www.kennesaw.edu/fyp/ - First-Year Programs
http://www.kennesaw.edu/university_studies/ - University Studies

Because the mission of University College is to help students succeed across a broad spectrum of academic situations, faculty members in University College are expected to make excellence in teaching, advising, and mentoring a focal point of their academic efforts. Professional Service is expected of all University College faculty. Except for faculty hired as Lecturers, scholarship is also required and may be related to an individual’s discipline or may be related to an individual’s teaching or professional service. Because of the variety of academic and support programs, several faculty in University College will also have significant responsibilities in the area of Leadership and Administration. A range of workload distribution models and their associated expectations are described in this document. However the list is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive. The expectations for each individual faculty member will be delineated in a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) that is approved by the faculty member’s Department Chair and the Dean of University College.

II. Interpretation of University Tenure & Promotion Guidelines by Performance Area
Kennesaw State University has established guidelines at multiple levels of review (university, college, and department) 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 tenure and promotion guidelines place a priority on the quality, significance, and impact of the products in each of the
performance areas – Teaching, Supervision & Mentoring, Research & Creative Activities, Professional Service, and where applicable, Leadership & Administration.

Where promotion and tenure decisions are concerned, all faculty members must demonstrate satisfactory performance in each of the areas defined in this document and in accordance with university guidelines. While teaching and/or program administration is the central mission of University College, in accordance with University-wide guidelines, scholarship is now an essential component in tenure and promotion decisions for untenured, tenure-track faculty members. For tenured faculty members, promotion beyond current rank requires evidence of ongoing scholarship.

Work in any area of performance is considered scholarly if it involves a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured, evaluated, revised, reflected upon, and rethought.

For any particular piece of work to be considered scholarship it must be done in a scholarly manner as defined in the previous paragraph and should either involve assessment/evaluation of the impact on student learning and/or must be subjected to substantive peer review. It should then either be published and/or presented in an appropriate venue.

While peer-reviewed work is preferred, it is recognized that faculty may sometimes be engaged in scholarship for which there are limited venues for dissemination. In these cases, it is the responsibility of the faculty member, Chair of the department, and Dean of the college to describe the significance and impact of the scholarship in the faculty member's FPA.

Significance of The Faculty Performance Agreement in Assessment of Faculty Performance
Each full-time faculty member in each department works with the department chair in developing the faculty member’s Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). This agreement shall be consistent with the department, college, and university guidelines. The FPA is a formal agreement (approved and signed by the faculty member, the chair, and the dean) outlining the faculty member’s unique situational context and identifying the faculty member’s workload model and goals for all areas of faculty performance. The FPA defines expectations for a three-year period but may be renegotiated under the conditions described below. Any activity in a faculty member’s FPA approved as a valid work product in Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring (TSM), Research & Creative Activity (RCA), Professional Service (PS), or Leadership and Administration (LA) will be honored as such in annual reviews and tenure and promotion evaluations.

The purpose of the FPA is to ensure (1) that each faculty member has a clear understanding of his or her expected roles and duties, (2) that the roles and duties assigned to the faculty member contribute to the departmental and/or college team and the mission of the college and the department, and (3) that each faculty member will be
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. If necessary, the chair will 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 old FPA.

The Annual Review Process
Each department has established an annual review process consistent with the university guidelines. 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 using the terms designated in the respective departmental T&P guidelines.

Teaching, Supervision & Mentoring (TSM): University College 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 that is prepared for a tenure, promotion, or progress review.

Meeting classes regularly and maintaining accessibility to students through regular offices hours are basic obligations of faculty members and necessary for a satisfactory review. University guidelines require documentation of teaching effectiveness through at least two measures. Criteria for documenting effectiveness in TSM are specified in individual departmental guidelines.

Documenting teaching effectiveness should focus on both the quality and significance of a faculty member’s contributions. Numerical averages and student comments derived from the student evaluations are important inputs into assessing teaching effectiveness. 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.
Regarding the scholarly nature of teaching, Hutchings and Shulman (1) propose that teaching is scholarly “[w]hen it entails… practices of classroom assessment and evidence gathering, when it is informed not only by the latest ideas in the field but by current ideas about teaching the field, [and] when it invites peer collaboration and review.” For example, an instructor updates the content of a course after reading research articles in discipline-based journals and attending presentations at professional meetings. In addition, the instructor attends sessions at professional meetings focused on pedagogical issues, reads interdisciplinary articles on pedagogies, and participates in on-campus teaching workshops, which motivate the instructor to try new pedagogies in an effort to deliver course content more effectively and efficiently. The instructor also collects feedback from students using classroom assessment techniques advocated by Angelo and Cross (2) and modifies course content and pedagogies based on this feedback. Periodically, the instructor discusses these activities with a colleague for suggestions on further refining the course content and pedagogy.

Faculty members are expected to seek professional development opportunities to continuously improve their teaching effectiveness, for instance, through workshops or mentoring from senior instructors.

Research & Creative Activity (RCA): As an interdisciplinary college, University College recognizes the value of quality collaborative, interdisciplinary scholarship, as well as scholarship conducted by the individual in his or her discipline, teaching, service, or administrative area. University College has a unique focus on teaching, advising, mentoring and academic support. Therefore, the scholarship of teaching 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 or publications, and this peer-reviewed status should be clearly indicated in the portfolio or vita. Other parameters of scholarship are defined in the respective departmental T&P guidelines.

As discussed later in this document, examples (non-exhaustive) of workload models with illustrative distributions of activities among the areas of evaluation are displayed in Table 1. Expectations for scholarship productivity over a three-year period, according to workload model, are displayed in Table 2.

Appropriate progress in pursuit of a terminal degree is considered appropriate scholarship for a faculty member who lacks a terminal degree.

- Scholarship of Discovery (discipline-based scholarship) is the creation of new knowledge. Outputs from the scholarship of discovery include but are not limited to publications in peer-reviewed academic journals, research monographs, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books.

- Scholarship of Application/Scholarship of Integration involves the application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge as well as the integration of knowledge from multiple
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning enhances the instructional efforts of the institution, a discipline, or our interdisciplinary programs.

Hutchings and Shulman (1) further propose that “scholarly teaching” becomes “the scholarship of teaching” when it entails “the three additional central features of being public ("community property"), open to critique and evaluation, and in a form that others can build on…. A fourth attribute of a scholarship of teaching, implied by the other three, is that it involves question-asking, inquiry, and investigation, particularly around issues of student learning.” This form of scholarship is regularly referred to as the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). SoTL activities may vary in quality and impact. An instructor first beginning to conduct SoTL research may share findings and resources (e.g., changes in a course syllabus, examples of improved assignments) at a departmental meeting or at an on-campus workshop. SoTL research of higher quality and significance may be accepted for presentation at a national conference, published in a peer-reviewed journal, or included in an edited reference book.

SoTL is further elaborated on from the University System of Georgia perspective in a document available on the web (3). In that document SoTL is defined as the “systematic examination of issues about student learning and instructional conditions which promote the learning (i.e. building on previous scholarship and shared concerns), which is subjected to blind review by peers who represent the judgment of the profession, and, after review, is disseminated to the professional community”. The document also provides a number of “cases” that illustrate the principles outlined in the definition.

In synthesizing material from the university guidelines, the various documents referred to in the previous paragraphs, and also from discussions with a variety of individuals on campus, the following are the key principles in determining whether a particular piece of work is determined to be “Scholarship of Teaching & Learning” regardless of the venue selected for dissemination:

1. The work was done in a scholarly manner as defined above.

and

2. The work involves a systematic study of the impact on student learning

and/or

3. The work is subjected to a substantive peer review based on quality and significance
Furthermore, dissemination venues vary in quality and significance. For example, a publication in a prestigious SoTL journal will be more valued than a publication in a less prestigious SoTL journal. Similarly, a publication in a less prestigious (but peer reviewed) journal may be more valued than SoTL materials distributed on an electronic discussion list or the development of a “how to” manual for distribution to one’s colleagues.

Similarly, presentation venues also vary in quality and significance. Presentation 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 presentation 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.

Outputs in this area are specified in respective department guidelines.

➢ Because University College values research and creative activity in all disciplines, those faculty members whose discipline falls within the creative arts are encouraged to remain 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. Outputs in this area include but are not limited to:

- performance pieces
- visual works of art in all media
- video productions
- other creative endeavors listed within the College of the Arts guidelines for individual disciplines

➢ Criteria for Quality and Significance of Research and Creative Activity
Because of the broad array of disciplines represented in University College, criteria for quality and significance of RCA may vary accordingly. 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. A consistently high quality of scholarly work is more important than the quantity of the work done. Faculty members’ narratives should make a case for the quality and significance of their scholarship as grounded in their disciplines. Indicators may include:

- 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.

Expectations for quality and significance increase with rank and experience. Note that faculty choosing the Scholarship (RCA) Emphasis workload model are required to seek and obtain external funding for their work. Furthermore, the expectations for publication and presentation for Scholarship (RCA) Emphasis faculty are such that the work published and presented should be of greater significance and impact.

**Professional Service (PS):** The KSU Faculty Handbook states that “all faculty members are expected to participate in service activities essential to the life of the institution,” (p. 5.54). Multiple service responsibilities are essential to the life of University College, its departments and KSU. 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, 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.

University College 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 the KSU Faculty Handbook, will be used to appropriately evaluate faculty contribution in the area of professional service. Assessment of faculty performance in this area is defined within respective department guidelines.

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.

**Leadership & Administration (LA):**
This category of evaluation applies to individuals who perform significant ongoing administrative duties, including the department chair, program directors/coordinators and occasionally, faculty undertaking comparable endeavors. Leadership & Administrative activities are unique for each faculty member based on the specific position(s) held and/or functions performed. Therefore, activities and evaluation criteria in this area will be individually negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Chair, with approval of the Dean.

Evaluation of Administration & Leadership performance will involve the following:
- Evaluation of the department chair’s administrative capabilities will utilize input from subordinates and supervisors through the annual review process
- Evaluation of program directors and coordinators will be based on evidence of the achievement of objectives for the program, department or curricular initiative for which they are responsible.

**III. Distribution of Workload Activities**
University College 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 his/her professional efforts among the performance areas of Teaching, Supervision & Mentoring; Scholarship & Creative Activities; Professional Service; and, where appropriate, Leadership & Administration, as set forth in the faculty member’s Faculty Performance Agreement. The University’s flexible workload model allows diversity within each department, and among individual faculty members. 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 hiring and periodic FPA purposes, 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 University College appear in Table 1.
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### Table 1: Expected Activities By Workload Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, Supervision &amp;</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>4 courses/yr (40%)</td>
<td>4 courses/yr (40%)</td>
<td>2 courses/yr (20%)</td>
<td>1 courses/yr (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service***</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Service of Significance</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research/Scholarship Effort</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Admin</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These areas are used to define different levels of emphasis on 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 studio courses, lab courses, or field experiences will work out equivalencies with the department chair. Undergraduate research, directed studies, and similar activities will also be formally recognized with equivalencies determined.

*** Please note that all faculty, regardless of the workload model selected for their FPA, are expected to have a minimum of 10% effort in Professional Service
Table 2: Expected Activities in Research and Creative Activity (RCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity over 3-year period as specified in FPA</th>
<th>Teaching Emphasis (0%)</th>
<th>Teaching-RCA Balance (30%)</th>
<th>Teaching-Service Balance (10%)</th>
<th>RCA Emphasis* (50%)</th>
<th>Service Emphasis (10%)</th>
<th>Administrative/Leadership Emphasis I ** (10%)</th>
<th>Administrative/Leadership Emphasis II ** (10%)</th>
<th>Administrative/Leadership Emphasis III ** (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles, book chapters, major grants or other substantive work product with documented significance and impact***</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 ****</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other presentations, publications, and scholarly activities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funding required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Appropriate progress in pursuit of a terminal degree is considered appropriate scholarship for a faculty member who lacks a terminal degree.

* Those with a scholarship emphasis are expected to seek and obtain external funding for their work. Furthermore, the expectations for publication and presentation are such that the work published and presented should be of greater significance and impact.

** See footnote (*) to Table 1

***Criteria for quality and significance of scholarship and creative activity are listed in respective department guidelines. The expectations for quality and significance increase with rank and experience, as does the expectation for mentoring junior faculty and the assumption of leadership roles.

****Expectation in this category for the department of First Year Programs.