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I. Introduction / Distinguishing College Characteristics

University College is a unit of Kennesaw State University and was formed in 2004-2005. The College is home to students pursuing bachelor’s degree in Integrative Studies. University College also provides an academic home for first-year and other exploratory students who have not yet determined their academic major, as well as student-centered programs, academic support services, and projects. University College is institutionally recognized as a collaborative, collegial and diverse group of scholars who value excellence in teaching and mentorship, who are active in campus leadership and who are successful in research activities that may involve both undergraduate and graduate students.

Many of the programs located within University College have a history of excellence at KSU, while others are relatively new. Each program is focused on promoting student engagement and student success in and out of the classroom. University College works closely with other academic colleges, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Division of Global Affairs, the Division of Academic Affairs, and the Division of Student Affairs to provide excellent programs and services that enhance the college experience for all students.

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

- First-Year and Transition Studies - https://uc.kennesaw.edu/fyts/
- Leadership & Integrative Studies - https://uc.kennesaw.edu/lis/

In addition to its academic departments, University College is also the home to University College Advising Services (Advising Office for New, Exploratory, and Students in Transition) and a variety of community partner programs and academic support initiatives.

The work of a University faculty member at Kennesaw State University involves many different facets that include the three areas of: 1) Teaching; 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity; and 3) Professional Service. We believe individual faculty should develop goals that reflect their unique ways of contributing to the University and departmental goals. These goals are developed each year in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). Faculty accomplishments are reported and evaluated in the Annual Review Document (ARD). The annual review process supports the professional growth and success of each faculty member through negotiation of appropriate goals with the department chair (hereinafter referred to as “chair”) and feedback on the accomplishments from the chair. The annual review and tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (P & T and PTR) provide guidance with respect to the standards of performance expected by the University College in each of the areas.

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 and mentoring the 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 field, teaching, professional service, or community engagement. Because of the variety of academic and support programs, several faculty in University College will also have significant leadership and administrative service responsibilities. 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 FPA that is approved by the faculty member’s department chair and the dean of University College.

II. Alignment of the University College with the University and College Strategic Plan, Mission, and Faculty Performance Guidelines

The University College is committed to achieving the mission and strategic plans of Kennesaw State University. These guidelines are intended to support and elaborate on the guidelines for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review of Kennesaw State University and the University College, as applied to faculty within the college. Each faculty member should carefully consider all guidelines at the University, college, and departmental levels as they prepare for the annual review or tenure and promotion application.

The University College acknowledges and supports the resolution on the primacy of departmental promotion and tenure guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate (approved by the Faculty Senate, April 9, 2007) and the Faculty Handbook, which include the following:

1. Department/school P&T guidelines that have undergone approval at all levels (department/school, college, dean, and provost) are in essence an understanding between the faculty member and the University.

2. Reviews of P&T portfolios at each level (department P&T committee, department chair, dean, provost, and if need be, college P&T committee) shall be based upon the criteria spelled out in the department P&T guidelines, or in the case of joint appointments the criteria spelled out in the joint appointment agreement.

3. Letters for promotion or tenure review at each level (department P&T committee, department chair, dean, provost, and if need be, college P&T committee) shall make specific and detailed reference to the current department P&T guidelines in justifying the P&T decisions made by that committee or individual.

III. General Guidelines for Faculty Performance

The University College requires a baseline of service from all faculty members, as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook. This baseline of service includes the following:

- Attending required department, college and University meetings, seminars, and graduation;
- Working effectively with colleagues on appropriate ad hoc and chartered committees;
- Meeting with students and members of the community on issues related to the mission of the
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department and college; and
• Contributing ideas and effort to improve department offerings and functions.

Faculty performance in the University College is evaluated following the general guidelines established by the University. The key elements of these general guidelines include:
• Workload Models
• Faculty Performance Agreement
• Annual Review Document
• General Expectations for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure by Rank
• Guidelines for each area of review: Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service
• External Review Letters

Workload Models Overview

The workload of faculty members within University College will be designed to allow them to utilize their unique strengths and abilities to benefit Kennesaw State University, subject to the college’s and their department needs. Consequently, each faculty member’s workload may be unique. There are, however, typical university workload standards expected of full-time UC faculty. With the exception of Lecturers, who will be expected to focus almost exclusively on teaching, faculty members will divide their professional efforts among the performance areas of teaching (T); scholarship and creative activity (SCA); and professional service (PS), as set forth in the faculty member’s FPA.

The baseline workload effort expected in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the typical tenure-track and tenured teaching faculty are 60%, 30%, and 10% respectively. The minimum workload effort in the area of SCA expected for a tenure-track or tenured teaching faculty expecting to be tenured and/or promoted is 20%. The norm for workload effort expected in the area of service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 10%. Workload adjustments are made from these norms based on contextual factors, including external funding, departmental needs, etc. Faculty for whom a different model would be more appropriate will collaborate with their chair/director in the selection of that model. A faculty member’s strengths, interests, and past five years’ annual reviews will serve as their primary guide to the selection of that model. Faculty meeting or exceeding expectations on their existing workload model will not be required to change to a different workload model. If a chair/director and faculty member cannot agree on a workload, the department P&T committee will make a non-binding workload recommendation to the dean, and the dean will make the final determination (KSU faculty handbook section 2.2). While a rare exception, a tenure-track or tenured faculty member may shift from a 60-30-10 workload to a 70-20-10 workload while still meeting the minimum workload distribution expected for promotion. Such a shift is determined by the chair in consultation with the faculty member based on their performance. As a decrease in SCA effort could adversely impact a faculty member’s progression toward tenure, a SCA assignment less than 20% should only occur post-tenure and/or in cases when progress toward promotion to professor is not recommended based on preference or performance. Course assignments may be adjusted across semesters in consultation with the faculty member and chair. For example, a 60% teaching load is typically distributed as 3-3, but may be 4-2 or any combination totaling the assigned percentage workload as agreement upon by the aforementioned parties. If the faculty member and the chair cannot reach
agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

Following are the most common workload distributions approved for UC faculty. Additional illustrative examples of potential FPA workload models can be found in the individual department promotion & tenure guidelines. Other workload distribution combinations are possible and can be individualized for faculty with specific, approved goals that support both faculty and departmental/college objectives.

**Workload Examples** (In all cases, a faculty member’s workload should total 100%)

**Teaching Emphasis (Lecturers and Post-tenure; Not seeking promotion – 90/0/10)**
9 course load per academic year
90% Teaching effort
0% SCA effort
10% PS effort

**Teaching/Service Emphasis (Lecturers and Post-tenure; Not seeking promotion – 80/0/20)**
8 course load per academic year
80% Teaching effort
0% SCA effort
20% PS effort

**Teaching/Scholarship & Creative Activity/Professional Service Balance I (Standard - 60/30/10)**
6 course load per academic year
60% Teaching effort
30% SCA effort
10% PS effort

**Teaching/Scholarship & Creative Activity/Professional Service Balance II (60/20/20)**
6 course load per academic year
60% Teaching effort
20% SCA effort
20% PS effort

**Teaching/Scholarship & Creative Activity/Professional Service Balance III**
4-5 course load per academic year
40-50% Teaching effort
40-50% SCA effort
10% PS effort

**Service Emphasis (12-month faculty, tenure-track or tenured seeking promotion)**
0-20% Teaching
10-30% SCA effort
50-80% Professional Service

**Administrative Service Emphasis (Department Chairperson only; 12-month)**
0-10% Teaching effort
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0-10% SCA effort
100% PS effort

*Standard expectations for tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty.
**Minimum expectations for tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty. Additionally, faculty with this workload model must show evidence of significant leadership/productivity in service roles.
***Recognizing the significant and intended administrative function of the chair position, teaching and SCA are encouraged and valued, but not required for full professors serving in the role. Workload adjustments may be negotiated for a chairperson desiring to teach and pursue SCA. If a chair plans to apply for tenure and/or promotion, their portfolio will be evaluated for teaching and for scholarship and creativity activity, so this should be considered in developing the individual’s workload.

Workload Specifics

Teaching – Each three-credit hour course equates to 10% of workload effort.

Service – The number of committees or other professional service in which faculty are involved will vary and be delineated in the FPA. Each 10% equates to approximately 120 hours over the standard ten-month contract period. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to keep track of individual service contributions, time spent on service, and the quality and significance of service products and outcomes. See General Expectations for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure by Rank and Guidelines for each Area of Review: Professional Service for a more detailed explanation.

Scholarship & Creative Activity – Peer-reviewed publication of scholarship or exhibition (for creative activity) is required for promotion (tenure-track faculty) and tenure. Non-tenure track faculty are not expected to produce scholarship. Peer-reviewed and adjudicated products include published journal articles, books, book chapters, creative works, or funded grants. For promotion and tenure purposes, only published (not accepted or in press) products will be considered.

The following table denotes the number of products expected for the UC example workload models. Quantity alone is not the most important aspect of SCA, but rather the quality and significance of the products. See General Expectations for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure by Rank and Guidelines for each Area of Review: Scholarship and Creative Activity for a more detailed explanation.

Table 1: Expected Activities in Scholarship and Creative Activity over 5-year period for Tenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed, peer-adjudicated, and invited publications or creative products</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed presentations and other peer-reviewed scholarly products or activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** These are minimum SCA expectations for the college. Academic departments within the college may set higher SCA for faculty.

**The Faculty Performance Agreement**

Each full-time faculty member in each department/school works with the department chair or school’s director in developing the faculty member’s FPA. This agreement shall be consistent with the department/school, 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 identifies the faculty member’s workload model and goals for all areas of faculty performance. The FPA defines expectations for a one-year period and may be renegotiated under the conditions described below. Faculty will provide evidence of the quality and significance of their work for each review.

The purpose of the FPA is to ensure (1) that each faculty member has a clear understanding of their expected roles and duties, (2) that the roles and duties assigned to the faculty member contribute to the department/school, college, and the mission of the college and the department/school, and (3) that each faculty member will be provided adequate time and resources to succeed in negotiated expectations, roles, and duties.

After the faculty member drafts the FPA, it is the department chair’s responsibility to determine whether the FPA meets department/school 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. This negotiation provides an opportunity for the faculty member to educate the chair about their work and for mentoring and sponsorship by the chair.

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 Document

Faculty performance within the University College is evaluated annually according to KSU
guidelines (KSU Handbook section 3.12). 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 (KSU faculty handbook section 3.2; BOR Policy Manual
sections 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,
Sections 3.5-10)

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 University College must indicate quality,
significance, and impact of their work in each performance area in order to be tenured and
promoted. 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, “Unless otherwise set forth in the Faculty
Performance Agreement (FPA), there are no expectations for scholarship. 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).”

Departments within University College follow the KSU Faculty Handbook concerning lecturers and
senior lecturers:
“In most cases, lecturers’ and senior lecturers’ primary responsibility is teaching and therefore are
expected to be highly effective teachers. In most cases, their responsibilities will primarily be
devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load
of these individuals constitutes a full workload and offsets the absence of a full range of regular
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faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty workload at KSU. In rare cases, the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and differ from the typical lecturer or senior lecturer workload described above. In such cases, the responsibilities must be specified in the FPA."

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. 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
It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate that their accomplishments are of the caliber appropriate for the rank to which she/he is seeking promotion. Examples of accomplishments appropriate 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>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning</td>
<td>• Participates in department and school curricular improvement efforts</td>
<td>• Superior teaching effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course evaluations, teaching observations, and critical reflections that demonstrate a mastery of course content and a high level of competency</td>
<td>• Adapting instructional technology for the enhancement of teaching and learning</td>
<td>• Assume greater leadership roles in curricular development and reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building rapport with students and colleagues</td>
<td>• Mentoring and guiding less experienced faculty</td>
<td>• Increased experimentation with teaching techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-reflective approach to assessing one’s own instruction and course materials</td>
<td>• Increasing involvement in promoting their teaching effectiveness at conferences and workshops</td>
<td>• Provide leadership in program and curriculum development in the faculty member’s discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitment to continually updating and improving course</td>
<td>• Developing opportunities on and off campus for service</td>
<td>• Provide leadership in program and curriculum assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing one’s body of scholarship in the discipline or field</td>
<td>• A growing body of scholarship representing the faculty member’s contributions to the discipline or field</td>
<td>• A body of scholarship that includes a goal-directed, unique contribution to the discipline or field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publications in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books (including textbooks), instructional materials, and other such peer-reviewed venues in the faculty member’s discipline, SoTL, or other related area</td>
<td>• Publications in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books (including textbooks), instructional materials, and other such peer-reviewed in increasingly more selective venues in the faculty member’s discipline, SoTL, or other related area</td>
<td>• Publications in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books (including textbooks), instructional materials, and other such peer-reviewed in selective venues in the faculty member’s discipline, SoTL, or other related area and increased citation of one’s work by others in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grant proposals for both internal and external grants</td>
<td>• Grant proposals that seek external funding</td>
<td>• Grant proposals written in collaboration with junior faculty to seek external funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research presentations given at regional and national conferences; invited presentations on campus and at local events</td>
<td>• Research presentations given at national and international conferences; invited presentations at regional events</td>
<td>• Research presentations given at international conferences; invited presentations at national and international events (e.g., keynote speaker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectations by Rank in the Areas of Scholarship and Creative Activity
It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate that their accomplishments are commensurate with the rank to which s/he is seeking promotion. Examples of accomplishments appropriate at each rank for the sample workload models are provided but not limited to the items below. Although similar activities may be appropriate at each level, evidence of increased quality is expected at higher ranks.
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
University College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination of creative accomplishments on campus and at local venues (e.g., theater productions, works of art, etc.)</th>
<th>Dissemination of creative accomplishments at increasingly more select regional and national venues (e.g., theater productions, works of art, etc.)</th>
<th>Dissemination of creative accomplishments at select national and international venues (e.g., theater productions, works of art, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative research projects that engage the faculty member with colleagues within the department and across campus</td>
<td>• Collaborative research projects that engage the faculty member with colleagues at other institutions within the state and across the U.S.</td>
<td>• Solo or collaborative research projects that engage the faculty with colleagues at institutions across the U.S. and internationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expectations by Rank in the Areas of Professional Service**

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate that their accomplishments are of the caliber appropriate for the rank to which s/he is seeking promotion. Examples of accomplishments appropriate 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>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to the efforts of committees at the department and college level</td>
<td>• Contribute to the efforts of committees at the department, college, and University level; assume leadership roles on department and college committees</td>
<td>• Contribute to the efforts of committees at the department, college, and University level; assume leadership roles on college and University committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate in/volunteer at conferences and other activities of local, state, and national professional organizations</td>
<td>• Assume leadership roles in professional organizations at the local and state levels</td>
<td>• Assume leadership roles in professional organizations at the national and international level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use professional expertise in service to the KSU campus and the local community</td>
<td>• Use professional expertise in service to the state and regional communities</td>
<td>• Use professional expertise in service to the state and regional communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Tenure Review (PTR)**

The review of post-tenure portfolios will follow the process outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook.
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section 3.12. The review begins with the college P&T committee and assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member’s performance in the context of their individual roles and responsibilities. At each level of review the overall outcome will be categorized as either achieving or not achieving expectations in post-tenure review.

Guidelines for Each Area of Review for Faculty Performance

1. Teaching

As stated in the University guidelines, teaching and mentoring effectiveness is considered to be essential for continued faculty employment, tenure, and promotion in rank. University College expects every teaching faculty member to be actively engaged in teaching, which encompasses 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 other multi-year review.

In University College, teaching, supervision, and mentoring activities may include but are not limited to:

- Teaching effectively across a variety of instructional settings (classroom, instructional laboratory, seminar, directed study, tutorials, undergraduate research and scholarship, etc.)
- Using effective and engaging pedagogical methods, such as group activities, writing exercises, teaching with technology, etc.
- Developing new, improved or innovative instructional materials that continually improve teaching effectiveness and engagement.
- Mentoring students either by individual attention during office hours or extra tutoring sessions
- Advising for the degree program or professional school and career
- Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students in degree programs, particularly, in research and scholarship
- Developing, modifying, implementing, and evaluating curricula
- Developing grant proposals for external and internal awards

University guidelines require documentation of teaching effectiveness through at least two measures. Criteria for documenting effectiveness in teaching are specified in individual department/school guidelines and should focus on both the quality and significance of a faculty member’s contributions.

Documentation may include but is not limited to numerical averages and a summary of student comments derived from student written evaluations, evidence and description of innovative teaching techniques, peer reviews, and other independent evidence that shows how the faculty member a) effectively plans and organizes subject matter of courses assigned, b) utilizes effective teaching and instructional assessment methods to better understand and to further improve teaching effectiveness and student learning, c) functions effectively in an advisement capacity with students, d) serves as an effective mentor of students, and e) expands his or her knowledge/skills to improve effectiveness as an ongoing activity to further the instructional capabilities of the department/college. Each course is evaluated at the end of fall or spring semester, and the
evaluation is initiated by the faculty member according to University policy. The course evaluation data submitted should be representative, e.g. submission of evaluations from complete sections is preferable.

In the performance evaluation process, faculty members may augment student evaluation data with their own reflections on 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 (1999) propose that teaching is scholarly “when 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” p. 13). For example, an instructor updates the content of a course after reading research articles 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 (1993) and modifies course content and pedagogies based on this feedback. Periodically, the instructor discusses these activities with colleagues for suggestions on further refining the course content and pedagogy. Faculty members are expected to continuously improve their teaching effectiveness through seeking professional development and by implementing new methods and assessing their impact on students.

2. Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)

As an interdisciplinary college, University College recognizes the value of quality collaborative, interdisciplinary scholarship, as well as scholarship conducted by the individual in their discipline, teaching, service, or administrative area (Boyer, 1990). Scholarship of service is distinguished from routine service work by the significance and the products produced by the activity. In University College the scholarship of teaching is valued equally to the scholarship of discovery, integration and application, and community engagement (see descriptions below). Regardless of scholarship focus, a faculty member’s scholarly record should include dissemination of material through peer-reviewed or adjudicated venues or publications, and this peer-reviewed or adjudicated status should be clearly indicated in the portfolio or vita. Faculty with graduate faculty status will also have expanded scholarship expectations in keeping with the guidelines implied by the graduate faculty application process and the Faculty Handbook. Parameters of scholarship are defined in the respective department/school P&T guidelines.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) has been emphasized by both Hutchings and Shulman (1999) 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, online publications, technical reports; professionally reviewed presentations at conferences, consortia and seminars; and externally reviewed textbooks, laboratory manuals, and similar published materials.
Scholarship of Discovery (discipline-based scholarship) 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: University College 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. Outputs in this area are specified in respective department/school guidelines. They include but are not limited to performance pieces, visual works of art in all media, video productions, and other creative endeavors listed within the KSU P&T college and department guidelines for individual disciplines.

Criteria for Quality and Significance of Scholarship and Creative Activity

Because of the broad array of disciplines represented in University College, 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, just like 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.
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Expectations for quality and significance increase with rank and experience. Note that faculty under the Scholarship (SCA) emphasis workload model are encouraged to seek and obtain external funding for their work. 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.

3. Professional Service

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member’s academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks which benefit or support individuals and/or groups in the institution, the University System, professional associations, or external communities at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels. The scope of service activities for each faculty member should be negotiated with the department chair.

The KSU Faculty Handbook states that “all faculty members are expected to devote at least 10% of their time to professional service activities, which are essential to the life of the institution” (p. 32). For University College, a strong service function is recognized as a fundamental dimension of faculty activity and necessary to facilitate effective delivery of programs and student services within the University and college. In University College, faculty professional service activities may include but are not limited to the following:

- Leadership and/or active participation in University, college, or department level activities, committees, faculty governance bodies, task forces, etc.
- Leadership and/or significant achievements in activities among professional organizations at the international, national, regional, and state level (boards, standing committees, ad hoc committees, task forces, etc.).
- Leadership and/or consulting/advising among a broad base of relevant community, state, regional, or national organizations, agencies, schools, or businesses.
- Development and/or maintenance of departmental, college, or University documents such as the part-time faculty handbook, program brochures, departmental web pages, etc.
- Leadership of education abroad programs
- Leadership (faculty sponsor/advisor) in student-based professional clubs, honor societies, etc.
- Promotional and recruiting activities for department, college, and/or University.
- Editorships/reviewers board membership of professional journals or scholarly books/monographs.
- Professional review of journal articles, books, etc.
- Other service duties that are mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the department chair that are not assignable to other areas.

Professional Service may also include serving as an administrator (see KSU Faculty Handbook for definition of administrator). Individuals within University College may have service responsibilities that entail significant ongoing administrative duties, including the department chair, assistant department chair, program directors/ coordinators and occasionally, faculty undertaking comparable endeavors. 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

Professional service activities will be evaluated based upon the nature and extent to which the individual applies professional expertise in: a) the University community in support of teaching, service, and research functions, b) local, state, regional, national, or international professional organizations, and c) community and/or non-profit organizations, governmental groups, or private business/agencies whose missions align with this department, college and University.

Leadership and 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 of service will be individually negotiated between the faculty member and the department chair, with approval of the dean.

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, school, college or University-level committees is an important consideration in tenure and promotion decisions. Assumption of responsibility and leadership is expected to increase with rank and experience.

Assessment of faculty performance in this area is defined within respective department/school guidelines.

**External Letters**

Effective Fall 2018, the inclusion of external letters as part of the promotion and tenure process is required. External letters will not be required for post-tenure review (PTR) nor for non-tenure track faculty unless research and scholarship expectations are 50% or more of their workload expectations. For faculty eligible for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and tenure, three external letters will be required. For faculty eligible for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and/or tenure, three external letters will be required.

**Tenure and Promotion Review Process**

As outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook, the faculty review process for tenure and promotion follows these steps.
1. Department Committees
   a. There is a single department committee with a minimum of three voting members at appropriate rank for each portfolio (committees can borrow faculty from other departments if needed).
   b. Only Professors can vote on a candidate’s promotion to Professor. Both Associate Professors and Professors can vote on a candidate’s promotion to Associate Professor. Associate Professors are to recuse themselves from all discussions and voting on a candidate’s promotion to Professor.

2. Letters
   a. The person submitting a portfolio (herein after referred to as the “candidate”) and the department 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 colleagues) will be removed from the list.
   d. For promotion to full, the candidate chooses two names out of the final three letter writers; the chair chooses one.
   e. For promotion to Associate the candidate chooses two out of the final three letter writers; the chair chooses one.
   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 five 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 and notify the faculty member.
   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 upload the letter into electronic portfolio workflows.

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.

p. The candidate will not see the letters unless the candidate expressly requests a copy of the letters pursuant the Georgia Open Record Act (O.C.G.A §50-18-0 through 50-18-76).

q. At the end of the process, the department chair will remove the letters and keep them on file for seven (7) years following separation of the employee from the institution (USG Record Retention Guidelines for Employee Personnel Records #0472-04-01).

3. Department Chairs
   a. Department chairs regardless of rank may review the portfolio of any faculty member regardless of rank as they are evaluating portfolios based on their roles as administrators and not by professional rank.

4. College P&T Committees
   a. Only Professors can vote on a candidate’s promotion to professor. Both Associate Professors and Professors can vote on a candidate’s promotion to Associate professor. Associate Professors are to recuse themselves from all discussions and voting on a candidate’s promotion to Professor.
   b. College committees require a minimum of three voting members with staggered terms at the appropriate rank for each portfolio.
   c. The vote tally for and against recommending promotion and/or tenure is to be recorded on the coversheet (but not names of individuals casting those votes).
   d. If there are fewer than three voting members in a college at the appropriate ranks, then the College P&T committee will include as many representatives from another college as needed. The process for selecting members from another college will be determined by the Dean and Chair with notification to the faculty member.

5. Administrators
   a. All department chairs, deans, associate deans, VPs, AVPS etc. must follow the same procedure for soliciting and incorporating external letters into their portfolio as teaching faculty.

IV. Revisions to College P&T Guidelines

University College’s promotion and tenure (P&T) committee shall annually review the college guidelines and make recommendations to the dean regarding needed revisions. The dean shall convene an ad-hoc committee comprising the college P&T committee, and other members of the college faculty appropriate to the process of review and revision of the guidelines. Revisions to the guidelines shall be voted on by the faculty of the college in accordance with college bylaws.
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