

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Faculty Expectations, Evaluation, and Review Guidelines

I. Introduction

The Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance section of the Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook states that:

Colleges and departments will establish tailored written guidelines . . . that specify evaluative criteria appropriate to their disciplines, describe the focus of their units within the larger mission and the core values of KSU, and delineate which activities will receive emphasis in annual performance reviews, in tenure and promotion decision, and in post-tenure performance evaluation of faculty (Section Five, page 2; <https://web.kennesaw.edu/academicaffairs/guidelines>).

The purpose of this document is to:

- Present the guidelines for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Serve as a bridge between University and departmental guidelines
- Provide continuity and consistency among departments in the College
- Assist everyone involved in the review process in interpreting University guidelines

II. Teaching Faculty—Expectations

The KSU Faculty Handbook clearly presents the general expectation for tenure-track faculty, i.e., instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, and non-tenure-track faculty, i.e., lecturers and senior lecturers.ⁱ

This section of the HSS Guidelines summarizes the general expectations and, in regard to teaching, supervising, and mentoring, adds a stipulation not in the university-wide guidelines (see below).

As stated in the KSU Faculty Handbook, Section Five, the categories of faculty evaluation are

- Teaching, supervising, and mentoring
- Research and creative activity
- Professional service
- Administration and leadership

Faculty members are to choose at least two of the categories as the foci of their work. Given the historic mission of the College and the involvement of the College in the general education

program at KSU, one of the categories must be teaching, supervising, and mentoring. Faculty members are to engage in scholarly activity in all of the chosen areas. In one area, at least, faculty members are expected to produce scholarship.ⁱⁱ

In summary, faculty members must select teaching, supervising, and mentoring and at least one additional area, be actively engaged in scholarly activity in all areas chosen, and produce scholarship in at least one of the areas.

In order to allow faculty in the College realistically to meet the expectations outlined above, beginning in the fall of 2007, the teaching load will be 3 – 3 for undergraduate and graduate faculty.ⁱⁱⁱ

The College of Humanities and Social Sciences guidelines acknowledge the eight distinctive, diverse academic departments and the interdisciplinary programs making up the College. Further, they acknowledge that departmental guidelines will address the distinctive expectations of faculty members in the departments and interdisciplinary programs.

Nevertheless, in all of the areas selected for evaluation, all faculty in the College are expected to:

- Maintain the up-to-date knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to fulfill their commitments and to incorporate them into their scholarly activities and scholarship
- Meet their responsibilities and carry out their assignments in a constructive, productive, and professional manner
- Cultivate excellence and demonstrate a commitment to developmental improvement, innovation, and progress
- Work in close consultation with their chairs and develop a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) in which they outline their goals and priorities for the period of time they note in the Agreement

Note: the Agreements must take into consideration the mission and guidelines of the College and departments, and the Agreements must be approved by the Dean of the College.

III. Teaching Faculty--Evaluation and Review

The evaluation process in the College of Humanities and Social Science has three parts. The first is the annual review.

The Faculty Handbook states that “. . . in all cases evaluation of faculty . . . will be based on evidence of the quality and significance of the individual faculty member’s scholarly

accomplishments” (Section Five, pages 4). Five areas are the focal points around which the quality and significance of accomplishments are measured

- Clarity and Relevance of Goals
- Mastery of Existing Knowledge
- Effectiveness of Communication
- Significance of Results
- Consistent Ethical Behavior

During each academic year, faculty members will have an annual review with their department chairs. Prior to the review, faculty members will prepare an Annual Review Document (ARD) in which they present evidence to demonstrate the progress they are making on the plans presented in their Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). Department chairs will provide written evaluations of the faculty. Along with the ARD, they are forwarded to the Dean’s office for review. After the review, both chairs and faculty members sign the documents and return them to the Dean’s office for signing. At all levels of review, within ten calendar days of the date the document is signed, faculty members may make a written response to the evaluation.

The Annual Review Document, the Faculty Performance Agreement, and all written responses from faculty members, are material for Tenure and Promotion—the second kind of evaluation in the College.

Section Five of the Faculty Handbook presents the tenure and promotion process for the faculty at Kennesaw State University. Beginning with department committees, continuing to the College level, and on to the University level, the Handbook outlines the details for each step.

The academic departments will have written guidelines that state specifically the expectations and evaluative criteria unique to the department. New, tenure-track faculty members will have a third-year review that will give them a clear picture of the progress they are making toward tenure. Letters of review state specifically the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty members under third-year review.

The third level of review is Post-Tenure Review. Board of Regents’ policy states that “Each institution shall conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members. Each faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review” (BOR Policy Manual, Section 803.07). The Faculty Handbook describes the post-tenure review process and what faculty members up for post-tenure review have to submit (Section Five, page 25).

IV. Teaching Faculty—Evaluation and Review Material

All material submitted for Promotion and Tenure Review must be in portfolios. The Faculty Handbook lists the contents the portfolio must contain (Section Five, page 27 – 28). In addition, however, portfolios for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences must contain, from the period of the review, all quantitative student evaluations and a clear, concise, and meaningful statistical analysis of the evaluations; complete qualitative evaluations from lower and upper division courses; and complete copies of all material submitted as examples of scholarship, e.g., entire articles and not just the first page of the article.

V. Department Chairs and Deans

Expectations and Evaluations. For the purpose of tenure and promotion, department chairs and deans follow all of the university, college, and department guidelines. For administrative evaluations, department chairs and deans are evaluated using the Assessment of Managerial Effectiveness form. The Dean receives the summaries. The VPAA reviews the Dean's evaluation. In addition, each department chair and all associate and assistant deans complete an Annual Review Document and submit it to the Dean. The Dean uses the results of the Assessment of Managerial Effectiveness survey and the annual reviews the department chairs and deans prepare as the basis for the annual review of each department chair, associate, and assistant dean.

ⁱ What follows below is for full-time, tenured and tenure track faculty. Lecturers and senior lecturers are employed specifically for teaching and have a teaching load of 5 – 4. As noted in the Faculty Handbook, for lecturers “. . . there are no expectations for scholarship and their service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g., attendance at relevant department meetings and participation on appropriate department committees)” (Section Five, page 25)

ⁱⁱ The Faculty Handbook defines scholarly activity as “. . . a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, revised and rethought.” It defines scholarship as “. . . tangible outcomes of the scholarly processes” (Section Five, page 8). See also Lendley C. Black, “White Paper on Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance,” Kennesaw State University, June 12, 2006

ⁱⁱⁱ For graduate faculty who teach fifty percent or more at the graduate level, the teaching load is 3 – 2