BACKGROUND

The promotion and tenure policies of the University System of Georgia are contained in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents. Policies of Kennesaw State University contain additional elements that reflect the history, structure, and identity of the university and are found in the Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook. Policies of the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology at KSU contain additional elements that reflect the vision, mission and identity of the college. The process for promotion or tenure at Kennesaw State University culminates in the president's recommendation to the Board of Regents, which is the final authority on promotion and/or tenure decisions.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to set forth the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology's standards for awarding promotion and/or tenure to the college’s faculty members. It is based upon the policies and procedures of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures of the Kennesaw State University. It is intended as supplemental to such policies and procedures and does not supplant such policies, procedures or criteria therein listed.

Several working assumptions were identified during the course of the document’s preparation. A set of promotion and tenure standards and procedures for the college shall:

1. be compatible with standards and procedures operating at the University level;

2. clearly identify those qualities which are of value to the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, but which may be distinct from those of other academic units within the University;

3. focus on standards which can be implemented in a spirit of consistency and fairness;

4. reflect the collective understanding of the college faculty regarding their responsibilities as members of that faculty;

5. establish standards which ensure maintenance of the highest degree of excellence within the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology;

6. provide meaningful guidance and assistance to the dean, the department chair and the faculty as a whole in matters of faculty evaluation in the process of promotion and tenure;
7. be stated in a clear and unambiguous manner, thereby minimizing the dangers of confusion and misinterpretation.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE:

TIME IN RANK

The College of Engineering and Engineering Technology recognizes the provision in the KSU Faculty Handbook for the granting of credit toward promotion and tenure, but prefers that new hires pursue, at the outset, a five-year probationary period. The college acknowledges that the existing university’s guidelines also provide for the possibility of any faculty to request early review within the promotion and tenure process. The college recommends the latter course of action versus the seeking of credit by those new hires believing their background justifies compressing the traditional five year probationary period.

CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The College of Engineering and Engineering Technology recognizes the criteria for promotion and tenure as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook (3.5 General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review). Evidence for consideration of promotion and tenure should be referenced according to the three categories of evaluation identified under KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3, Basic Categories of Faculty Performance. The categories are as follows:

1. Teaching (a.k.a. Teaching, Advising & Mentoring)
2. Research and Creative Activity
3. Professional Service (a.k.a. Service)

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

For the period of time evaluated, faculty candidates for tenure and for promotion must demonstrate evidence of “noteworthy” achievement in the faculty performance categories of 1) Teaching and, 2) Research and Creative Activity. A minimum level of “satisfactory” must be evidenced in the faculty performance category of 3) Professional Service.

Faculty candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor hired prior to Fall 2016 must demonstrate evidence of “noteworthy” achievement in the faculty performance categories of 1) Teaching and 2) at least one of the following performance categories, Research and Creative Activity OR Professional Service. A minimum of “satisfactory” must be evidenced in all three categories.

The Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology uses five terms to define levels of achievement in the annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, pre- tenure, and post-tenure processes. The five levels are “exemplary”, “noteworthy”, “satisfactory”, “unsatisfactory”, and “unacceptable” and are defined by the Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which follow.
TEACHING, ADVISING & MENTORING

The following five-point rating scale is provided for guidance in the evaluation of effective teaching performance.

Unacceptable

0. This faculty member neglects his/her duties with such actions as frequently not meeting classes, failing to prepare adequately for classes, refusing to accept teaching assignments when requested by the department chair or does not accept the faculty role of advisor and mentor. He/she receives poor teaching evaluations and does not assess whether his/her students have met the course outcomes. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Unsatisfactory

1. This faculty member meets his/her classes, but conducts them without enthusiasm or imagination. He/she might not keep regular office hours nor otherwise make himself/herself available to students. He/she might be continuing to use the same material from year to year, thereby not keeping up with developments in the discipline. This faculty member does not use the results of the outcomes assessment process to improve their courses. This faculty member might not cooperate in the planning of courses with multiple sections. Because of such performance, he/she will might not be respected by colleagues and receives mediocre teaching evaluations. This faculty member might not accept the role as faculty advisor/mentor. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Satisfactory

2. This faculty member adequately fulfills duties in teaching and advising as required. He/she conducts classes, is available to students, is current in the discipline, uses a variety of teaching methods appropriate to the discipline being taught, and cooperates in departmental or college-wide teaching endeavors. This instructor is considered by his/her colleagues as a dependable member of the faculty and receives satisfactory teaching evaluations with Digital Measures scores usually higher than 2.5. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.
Noteworthy

3. This faculty member is imaginative and enthusiastic about teaching and advising, plans carefully, and carries through. His/her students find this instructor to be a stimulating classroom lecturer or leader of discussions. This teacher is very widely read in the discipline, explores new methods of teaching appropriate to the discipline being taught, continuously introduces into his/her courses the results of his/her own investigation. Both students and colleagues will recognize him as a very good teacher and receives Digital Measures scores normally 3.0 or higher. Continually tries to improve both the style and substance of the advising role by evaluating the effectiveness of his/her advising practices and willingly participating in advisor-training programs offered by the College for this purpose. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Exemplary

4. This faculty member is considered one of the best in the teaching and advising roles. He/she is highly imaginative, completely dependable, and in command of his/her discipline. This teacher generally receives excellent evaluations from both students and faculty. Digital Measures scores are in the 3.5+ range. Though he/she is demanding, this instructor is compassionate in his/her relationships with students and exerts every effort to be personally supportive. This professor may supervise students in research or independent study courses. He/she is recognized by faculty as a very good advisor. Students may request this faculty member as his/her advisor. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have exceeded the requirements of the agreement.
RESEARCH & CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The following five-point rating scale is provided for guidance in the evaluation of creative scholarly activity.

Unacceptable

0. This faculty member shows no interest in his/her discipline and does not read relevant material to keep current other than that required for class preparation. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Unsatisfactory

1. This faculty member reads in his/her discipline beyond textbooks and what is required for class preparation and attends professional events such as lectures, symposia, etc. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Satisfactory

2. This faculty member has demonstrated this year that he/she is successfully executing a plan for creative scholarly activity which includes professional development as detailed on their Faculty Performance Agreement. He/she published or has made significant progress towards the completion of a peer-reviewed publication or comparable intellectual contribution in their discipline or engineering education. For a consulting activity to be considered a comparable intellectual contribution, it must be scholarly and professional in nature. They hold membership in a discipline related professional organization and/or maintain/pursue professional licensure in their discipline. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Noteworthy

3. In any given year the hallmark of this faculty member's performance is organization and consistency in setting and achieving goals for creative scholarly activity and professional development as detailed on their Faculty Performance Agreement. He/she published or has made significant progress towards the completion of multiple peer-reviewed publications, an external proposal, or comparable intellectual contributions in their engineering discipline (i.e., not engineering education). For a consulting activity to be considered a comparable intellectual contribution, it must be scholarly and professional in nature. They hold membership in a discipline related professional organization and attend at least one professional meeting on a regular basis. They may have attended one or more state or regional workshops and/or maintain professional licensure in their discipline. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.
Exemplary

4. This year this person has exceeded the standards set forth in 3 above. This faculty member's publications and creative scholarly activity make him/her respected beyond the campus in his/her field. He/she has published in quality journals, presented at a national conference and/or submitted a grant proposal to a national funding agency. His/her scholarly or creative work has been judged as being excellent by his/her professional colleagues, i.e. awarded a fellowship, awarded a research grant, etc. Also, this person continues to demonstrate a higher level of independent functioning via a well-defined creative scholarly activity thrust or recognition in a specialized creative scholarly activity area. They maintain membership in one or more discipline related professional organizations and hold an office/position in at least one. They have attended two or more state, regional or national seminars or workshops and/or maintain professional licensure in their discipline. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have exceeded the requirements of the agreement.
ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES (cont.)

SERVICE

The following five-point rating scale is provided for guidance in the evaluation of professional service activities.

Unacceptable

0. This faculty member performs University and professional service activities reluctantly and with minimum effort, participates in no professional programs, holds no offices in professional organizations, and performs no consulting work or similar activities. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Unsatisfactory

1. This faculty member serves on committees to which he/she is appointed, but makes no special effort to assist students, or the Department, College, or University. He/she frequently fails to cooperate with colleagues serving on committees. The faculty member maintains memberships in one or more professional organizations, but is seldom involved in organizational meetings, seminars, consulting work, or similar activities. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Satisfactory

2. This faculty member fulfills all student support activities and committee assignments effectively. He/she assists willingly in the special service needs of the Department, College, and University; serves on committees effectively; and earns the appreciation of colleagues. This person occasionally presents a continuing education training program for persons in his/her discipline and occasionally presents a civic or community training program or gives a civic or community talk related to their discipline. The faculty member occasionally serves as a paper reviewer, chair, or discussant, and occasionally performs unpaid consulting work or similar activities. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Noteworthy

3. This faculty member is considered very effective at student support, committee work, outreach and continuing education programs. He/she is occasionally selected to serve on or to chair important committees. Through such activities, this person earns university-wide respect and recognition for their program. The faculty member is well known throughout regional/national organizations within his/her discipline. The faculty member demonstrates this level of achievement by involvement in one or more of the following activities: attends professional meetings of regional and/or national organizations and is frequently called upon to serve as a
paper reviewer, chair, or discussant, and may serve as an officer; frequently performs unpaid consulting or training services for business groups within his/her discipline on and off campus; or similar activities. This faculty member may serve as faculty advisor to a student group. He/she volunteers at some community events, i.e. judge for local science fair, speaker at career day, etc. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Exemplary

4. This faculty member is highly respected throughout the campus for his/her student, committee and community work. This faculty member has distinguished himself/herself for work with students, committees, and continuing education, having received service-oriented awards or served with distinction on prestigious campus-wide committees. The faculty member may be the faculty advisor of a student competition team or organizer of a student competition. He/she may have been nominated or received a service-oriented award or served with distinction on a prestigious campus-wide committees. The faculty member has distinguished himself/herself in at least one professional organization supporting his/her discipline. The faculty member demonstrates this level of achievement in one or more of the following activities; holds regional or national office, appears on national professional programs, hosts a national or international conference, serves on editorial boards and may occasionally serves as editor of proceedings or journals or similar activities. He/she may be called upon for important unpaid consulting or training assignments by business or industry groups. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have exceeded the requirements of the agreement.
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