

Computer Science Department

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation and P&T Guidelines

Previous version approved on 5/4/2023

Current version approved on 10/16/2023

Table of Contents

	<u>Page #</u>
1. Introduction	2
A. Department Overview	2
B. Philosophy and Intent	2
2. Categories of Faculty Performance	3
A. Teaching	3
1. Expected and Mandatory Teaching Activities	3
2. Significant Teaching Activities	4
3. Teaching, Course, and Student Assessment	4
4. Teaching Quality and Breadth	6
5. Student Success in Teaching Emphasis	6
B. Scholarship and Creative Activity	6
1. Scholarship and Creative Activity Categories	6
2. Examples of Scholarship Products	7
3. Student Success in SA/C Emphasis	8
C. Professional Service	9
1. Mandatory Service Activities	10
2. Regular Service Activities	10
3. Significant Service Activities	11
4. Student Success in Professional Service Emphasis	11
3. Overview of Workload Models	12
4. Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance	14
5. Expectations for Tenure, Post-Tenure, and Promotion	15
6. Faculty Review Process	18
7. Multi-Year Review Schedules	19
8. Revisions to P&T Guidelines	19
9. References	19
10. Approvals	20

1. Introduction

Below is a brief overview of the Department of Computer Science and the philosophy and intent of these guidelines. All guidelines must adhere to USG policy and KSU and college guidelines and policies. If any information contained in the college or department promotion and tenure guidelines contradicts the USG policy or the KSU Faculty Handbook, USG policy and the KSU guidelines and policy will supersede the college or department guidelines.

A. Department Overview

The Department of Computer Science (CS) is a unit of the College of Computing and Software Engineering (CCSE) at Kennesaw State University. The department seeks to be recognized as a collaborative and collegial group of CS scholars who value excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The department seeks to be recognized as active in campus leadership and suc

rewards the pursuit of excellence and quality in all three areas of accomplishment in which faculty members are evaluated (Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service). The structure values and recognizes leadership in teaching and quality education to students; encourages, supports, and rewards the accomplishment of scholarship products of national and international significance; and encourages and acknowledges service activities needed to enable the department, college, and university to thrive and grow.

The guidelines are intended to create a healthy environment and culture where each faculty member may pursue their professional goals and interact with colleagues in a respectful and professional manner, treating each faculty member as a valued colleague and abiding by a relevant professional code of conduct. The guidelines are also designed to foster an environment that nurtures each faculty member's professional growth in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service, and motivates each faculty member to participate as valued colleagues contributing to a positive and productive culture. This implies the creation of guidelines to motivate faculty toward accomplishing and excelling as is needed to achieve tenure, promotion, and growth.

2. Significant Teaching Activities:

Leadership and significant contributions in teaching include but are not limited to, the following activities.

- 1) Achieving consistent excellent performance as evidenced, in part, by student evaluations, by Faculty Course Assessment Reports (FCARs), and other means.
- 2) Being recognized by both students and colleagues as an effective teacher, as evident by awards and other acknowledgments.
- 3) Leading the development and implementation of new course(s), concentrations, or, program redesign.
- 4) Teaching a new course, in the area of specialization or interest of the faculty.
- 5) Developing new courses as needed to support degree programs and students' needs.
- 6) Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students on directed studies, honor projects, service learning, and special topics courses and/or projects. These activities contribute to achieving student success goals.
- 7) Participating in frequent or mid-term testing and grading, monitoring, and reporting student performance and progress toward graduation and retention goals. These activities contribute to achieving *student success* goals.
- 8) Mentoring high school interns.
- 9) Leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of a new pedagogy paradigm. These activities contribute to achieving *student success* goals.
- 10) Serving as the lead, other than program coordinator or director roles, in a program redesign or developing a new program or course sequence.
- 11) Leadership in mentoring a new colleague in teaching and classroom management.
- 12) Participating in the KSU Study Abroad program.
- 13) Managing and training TAs.

3. Teaching, Course, and Student Assessment:

Teaching and course activities, contributions, and effectiveness are assessed using measurable outcomes from teaching and course evaluations with an emphasis on teaching quality and depth for all courses taught during the period of review.

A. Course Evaluations

CS courses will be evaluated using mandatory and optional mechanisms. CS faculty members are expected to consider and reflect on the feedback provided by these mechanisms in their annual review document.

MANDATORY MECHANISMS

- 1) Use KSU's student survey instrument (i.e., Activity Insight, currently in use) and results for assessing teaching; giving the response rates are credible, reasonable, and feasible. The current KSU student survey instrument uses a rating scale that ranges from 1 to 4.

Credible Response Rates

For each individual course, surveys with at least a 25% response rate or at least 5 students responding will be considered to provide reasonable and feasible feedback, data, and statistics regarding teaching and course effectiveness. Surveys with response rates less than 25% with fewer

Significant Publication and Scholarship Contributions:

Assessment Rating:

Consistent excellent research assessment and ratings will have the following key components (described

Service activities and their associated weights are organized into three general categories: (1) Mandatory, (2) Regular, and (3) Significant. The list of service activities under the *mandatory* category is service activities required by every faculty member with a service requirement that constitutes 5% of the faculty members' overall workload. The remaining service workload (i.e., 5%) of the faculty member's overall workload will be selected from the *regular* and/or *significant* service categories. Not all regular and/or significant service activities are required. The associated load or percentage for each service activity is based on the significance, value, impact, and time of the particular service. Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions for each additional service item included in their service load.

1. Mandatory Service Activities:

Table 2.A Mandatory Service Activities: *(All service activities in this category are required for ALL faculty)*

Mandatory Service Activities	
1	Be engaged in issues regarding curriculum (i.e., informal discussions, providing feedback, etc.).
2	Attend and participate in department meetings and discussions.
3	Attend and participate in college meetings and discussions.
4	Attend a minimum of two university or college graduation ceremonies per academic year.

Part-91.800l6.800c21 -1.9008 T406 e7-1.90 -1.90nr e7-1.9 17-1.90osrwoe(part14.5(ment14.5,(om)1156(col14.5ol14.5(e)1.
5

3. Significant Service Activities:

Table 2.C Significant Service Activities: *(Additional service activities can be selected from this category)*

Significant Service Activities	
1	Serving as chair of a department or college committee.
2	Serving on an NSF (or equivalent) grant reviewing panel or serving on a review panel or committee.
3	Serving in a department leadership role that doesn't receive course releases or re-assigned time.
4	Serving as chair of a university-level committee.

5

learning, and other community-engaged activities, and who serve on various committees dedicated to student success are examples of assessable student success practices in professional service.

Assessment Ratings:

Consistent excellent service assessment and ratings will have the following key components (described in section 2.C above): *Mandatory Service Activities, Regular Service Activities, and Significant Service Activities*. All the components, as described in the foregoing, will be the basis for the annual evaluation of CS faculty members in **service**. The combined evaluation must take into consideration the proportion of the faculty member's workload model as indicated in the FPA (see the Overview of Workload Models in Section 3 below). The evaluation will be done according to the following ratings:

Exemplary (EY) Rating – (Level 5):

- € All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A)
- AND
- € 5 or more activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C, including at least 2 from Table 2.C.

Exceeds Expectations (EE) Rating (Level 4):

- € All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A)
- AND
- € 5 or more activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C.

Meets Expectations (ME) Rating (Level 3):

- € All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A)
- AND
- € 2 or more activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C.

Needs Improvement (NI) Rating (Level 2):

- € All the

ÈJHLGÍÍÌÐÌÌÏJKI AFÈÈÁÇÐÈÐÁÈ€D€ÁÈÉBÁÈÊÐÈÀÀÀÀÇÀÀBÈÁÇ

B. Promotion - *Interpretation and Adaptation of the University's General Criteria – by Rank*

Faculty members planning to seek promotion and/or tenure should keep in mind the criteria below for promotion in the CS department. The following describes the expectations of faculty at different ranks and workload models. Faculty need to note that at least 5 publications at a significant contribution level (Table 1B) and funded external research (Table 1C) is required for promotion. The CS department uses the following

C. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) [KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.5.C and 3.12]

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

In April 1996, the Board of the Board of Regents (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5.4 and USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.6) developed a policy statement requiring that all institutions conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members every five years.

In 2021, the Board of Regents modified its post-tenure review policy to include a five-point scale to evaluate each of the three areas during annual reviews, which, at KSU has also been adopted for post-tenure review; a performance improvement plan for faculty who score a 1 or a 2 during their post-tenure review; and a corrective post-tenure review leading to a performance improvement plan for faculty who score a 1 or a 2 in any performance area during two consecutive annual reviews (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5.4, BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7).

The primary purpose of post-tenure review is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of all tenured faculty members, thereby strengthening the quality and significance of faculty work. Post-tenure review serves to highlight constructive and positive opportunities for all tenured faculty to realize their full potential of contributions to Kennesaw State University and the University System of Georgia. It also serves to identify deficiencies in performance and provide a structure for addressing such concerns.

Post-tenure review is not a reconsideration of the faculty member's tenure status. Instead, it is a comprehensive five-year performance review that occurs after an individual is tenured. This post-tenure performance review is more comprehensive and concerns a longer time perspective (at least five years) than the annual performance reviews; post-tenure review feedback also comes from multiple peer and administrative perspectives, rather than from the perspective of one administrative head as is the case in annual reviews.

Post-tenure review provides both a retrospective and prospective examination of performance, considering that a faculty member probably will have different emphases and assignments at different points in his or her

20.9(in)1.1-eacpar74(Elis)813(72.24B.3(19)2 II 5(mbes12.9(lty w)pl)10.7(t facu)11 0 0 11.04 75.6001 460.43306 Tm1 scn.0413 Tw[(tha

In cases where the faculty member receives a score of 3 or higher, no formal faculty improvement plan is required. The results of the post-tenure review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development activity would focus on further enhancing the faculty member's performance.

If a faculty member receives a 4 or 5 on a traditional five-year post-tenure review, they will be entitled to a one-time monetary award. Faculty will then be eligible for the same award in five years (and no sooner than five years) at their next post-tenure review. Faculty members who undergo a corrective or elective post-tenure review, on the other hand, are not eligible for this one-time award.

Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review

A faculty member who receives a 1 or 2 in the context of a post-tenure review is one whose post-tenure review is deemed unsuccessful. In this case, a formal performance improvement plan (PIP) must be written. (See KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.)

6. Faculty Review Process

Administrative and teaching faculty performance is evaluated via two basic and interrelated processes: annual reviews and multi-year reviews. An annual review is an evaluation of the faculty member's performance over one year but within the context of multi-year reviews. The multi-year reviews, involving multiple reviewers, are a more comprehensive examination of a faculty member's contribution to the department, college, and University.

Annual Reviews

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

Format (ARD and FPA)

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

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

Evaluation of Categories

faculty performance evaluation, in compliance with these rubrics and ratings, are described in the

Approval Form for Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A copy of this form, completed, must be attached as





Carbon Copy Events	Status	Timestamp
Leslie Downs ldowns@kennesaw.edu Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)	COPIED	Sent: 11/15/2023 4:49:37 PM
Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:		
Not Offered via DocuSign		

Witness Events	Signature	Timestamp
----------------	-----------	-----------

Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp
---------------	-----------	-----------

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	11/10/2023 11:27:23 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:49:13 PM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:49:36 PM
Completed	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:49:37 PM

Payment Events	Status	Timestamps
----------------	--------	------------

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure

ELECTRONIC RECORD AND SIGNATURE DISCLOSURE

From time to time, Kennesaw State University (we, us or Company) may be required by law to provide to you certain written notices or disclosures. Described below are the terms and conditions for providing to you such notices and disclosures electronically through the DocuSign system. Please read the information below carefully and thoroughly, and if you can access this information electronically to your satisfaction and agree to this Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure (ERSD), please confirm your agreement by selecting the check-system.

Getting paper copies

At any time, you may request from us a paper copy of any record provided or made available electronically to you by us. You will have the ability to download and print documents we send to you through the DocuSign system during and immediately after the signing session and, if you elect to create a DocuSign account, you may access the documents for a limited period of time (usually 30 days) after such documents are first sent to you. After such time, if you wish for us to send you paper copies of any such documents from our office to you, you will be charged a \$1.00 per-page fee. You may request delivery of such paper copies from us by following the procedure described below.

Withdrawing your consent

If you decide to receive notices and disclosures from us electronically, you may at any time change your mind and tell us that thereafter you want to receive required notices and disclosures only in paper format. How you must inform us of your decision to receive future notices and disclosure in paper format and withdraw your consent to receive notices and disclosures electronically is described below.

Consequences of changing your mind

If you elect to receive required notices and disclosures only in paper format, it will slow the speed at which we can complete certain steps in transactions with you and delivering services to you because we will need first to send the required notices or disclosures to you in paper format, and then wait until we receive back from you your acknowledgment of your receipt of such paper notices or disclosures. Further, you will no longer be able to use the DocuSign system to receive required notices and consents electronically from us or to sign electronically documents from us.

All notices and disclosures will be sent to you electronically

Unless you tell us otherwise in accordance with the procedures described herein, we will provide electronically to you through the DocuSign system all required notices, disclosures, authorizations, acknowledgements, and other documents that are required to be provided or made available to you during the course of our relationship with you. To reduce the chance of you inadvertently not receiving any notice or disclosure, we prefer to provide all of the required notices and disclosures to you by the same method and to the same address that you have given us. Thus, you can receive all the disclosures and notices electronically or in paper format through the paper mail delivery system. If you do not agree with this process, please let us know as described below. Please also see the paragraph immediately above that describes the conseq

i. decline to sign a document from within your signing session, and on the subsequent page, select the check-box indicating you wish to withdraw your consent, or you may;