KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

Bagwell College of Education

Instructional Technology

Kennesaw State University

Department of Instructional Technology

Bagwell College of Education

Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review,
and Faculty Performance

Revised:
February 2008
February 5, 2015
Sept. 15, 2016

Approved by Faculty:
February 2008
February 5, 2015
Oct. 6, 2016

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to articulate the guidelines and expectations for the appraisal of faculty with respect to promotion and tenure (P&T) within the Department of Instructional Technology (ITEC). This document will be used by faculty and the Department Chair to guide annual faculty performance.

The document outlines the following:
- Alignment of the Department of Instructional Technology with the University and College Strategic Plans, Missions, Faculty Performance Guidelines, and Accrediting Entities
- Distinguishing characteristics of the ITEC Department
- General expectations for ITEC faculty performance
- An overview of the three performance categories to be addressed in P&T portfolios: Teaching, Mentoring, and Supervision of Students; Research and Creative Activity; and Professional Service
- A description of ITEC faculty workload
- General expectations of faculty roles, and responsibilities at each of the following ranks: Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor
- The Performance Planning & Evaluation Rubric for Promotion and Tenure
- Policy on revising and approving ITEC P&T guidelines

The ITEC Department follows all university guidelines for submission of faculty P&T portfolios. Faculty members preparing for promotion and tenure should consult the current KSU faculty handbook and the Faculty Affairs Policies and Procedures website for information on P&T training opportunities, forms, narrative examples, timelines, procedures, and format of portfolio submissions.

Alignment of the Department of Instructional Technology with the University and College Strategic Plans, Missions, Faculty Performance Guidelines, and Accrediting Entities

The Department of Instructional Technology is committed to achieving the Kennesaw State University and the Bagwell College of Education Mission and Outcomes. These guidelines adhere to *the Kennesaw State University (KSU) Faculty Handbook, Section 3,* and the *Bagwell College of Education Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.* These P&T guidelines are aligned with the college and university mission statements and strategic goals. The guidelines also consider requirements by national, regional, and state professional accrediting entities that have unique standards for courses and programs offered by the department.

Distinguishing Departmental Characteristics

The mission of the ITEC Department is to advance the effective use of technology to support teaching, learning, and leadership in P-12 schools through educator preparation, professional service, and research.

According to the departmental vision, ITEC will be internationally-recognized for innovative teaching and learning; relevant research to advance the use of instructional technologies in P-12 schools;

collaborative partnerships to strengthen technology integration in all educator preparation programs; and well-prepared graduates who transform schools into digital age learning environments that engage students and facilitate participation in our global community.

ITEC offers one endorsement/certificate and four graduate degree programs as follows:

- Online Teaching Endorsement and Certificate
- The Instructional Technology Certification Only Program
- The Instructional Technology Certification Conversion Program
- Masters (M.Ed.) in Instructional Technology
- Specialist (Ed.S.) in Instructional Technology (Certification Track)
- Specialist (Ed.S.) in Instructional Technology (Advanced Track)
- Doctoral (Ed.D.) in Instructional Technology

All endorsement and degree programs are offered fully-online, necessitating that ITEC faculty are skillful experts in designing and delivering online instruction to practicing educators. All four of our degree programs qualify Georgia certified teachers for a T-5, T-6, or T7 upgrade of their teaching certificate. Two degrees (M.Ed and Ed.S. Certification Track) lead to an initial service certification in Instructional Technology (S-5 or S-6) for Georgia teachers.

In addition to our degree programs, the ITEC Dept. contributes to preparing digital-age educators by coordinating and delivering undergraduate and graduate technology-related service courses to other Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) throughout the college and university. Our service role requires that our faculty to be knowledgeable of other programs and collaborate with EPP faculty.

Expectations of Faculty Performance

The Department of Instructional Technology has appropriate, discipline-specific guidelines informing colleagues and new faculty members of evidence required to demonstrate expectations in each category of faculty performance. These guidelines are consistent with the KSU policies on required review, promotion, and tenure considerations, and faculty performance. They also adhere to the mission, goals, and philosophy for the workload guidelines as approved by KSU, as well as Board of Regents Policies. Since ITEC Department offerings are primarily on the graduate levels, all ITEC tenure-track faculty are required to earn and maintain graduate faculty status as specified in the KSU Faculty Handbook annually. Therefore, the ITEC Department guidelines are highly influenced by the Graduate College's criteria to earn and maintain this status.

The basic categories of faculty performance at KSU are teaching, supervision, and mentoring, research and creative activity; and professional service. According the Faculty Handbook,

> Graduate Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a high level of scholarly activity and active professional involvement and are required to demonstrate teaching expertise at advanced and specialized levels appropriate for graduate programs, (4.1.2).

The Faculty Performance Agreement delineates the relative emphasis of an individual faculty member's activities in these three categories. In all cases evaluation of faculty performance will be based on

evidence of the quality and significance (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.4) of the individual faculty member's scholarly accomplishments in his or her respective areas of emphasis. [University section 3.3]

Scholarly activity is an umbrella term applied to faculty work in all performance areas: Teaching, service, and research and creative activity. *Scholarly* is an adjective used to describe the processes that faculty should use within each area. In this context, scholarly refers to a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, and revised and rethought. On the other hand, *scholarship* is a noun used to describe tangible outcomes of the scholarly processes. These tangible products provide evidence for faculty accomplishments in the category of Research and Creative Activity. They are disseminated in appropriate professional venues relating to the performance area. In the process of dissemination, the product becomes open to critique and evaluation. Scholarship may be in any of Boyer's categories of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, teaching, or engagement (service). [taken from BCOE section IV]

"Depending upon college and departmental guidelines, faculty members need not demonstrate noteworthy achievements in all three areas, but must be noteworthy in two and satisfactory in the third. All teaching faculty are expected to emphasize excellence in teaching and demonstrate noteworthy achievement in at least one other (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5, 8.3.6, and 8.3.7)." [Taken from KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.2]

Appropriate activities and noteworthy achievement in all three categories is defined by these *ITEC Departmental P&T Guidelines*. All levels of review in the tenure and promotion process honor these standards set forth here.

Basic Expectations and Responsibility
Basic expectations of Instructional Technology faculty relate to standard behavior, credentials, procedures, and norms that influence hiring, meeting processes, and daily interactions:
·   earned degree in instructional technology or closely-related field
·   experience working with K-12 schools
·   continues to serve K-12 schools in a scholarly manner
·   adheres to Instructional Technology department bylaws
·   adheres to Bagwell College of Education bylaws
·   adheres to department meeting norms
·   adheres to any departmental, classroom, and online teaching norms
·   devotes a required amount of time to professional service [KSU Faculty Handbook section 3. 2]
·   abides by all university policies as stated in current university handbook (including those related to sexual misconduct, financial responsibility, etc.)
·   abides by all Board of Regents policies
·   maintains a well-stated philosophy of teaching, learning and assessment of students supported by the scholarly literature
·   engages effectively in the annual faculty review process

·   engages in professional development that aligns with scholarly activity

·   exhibits reasonable responsiveness to professional communications

·   shares responsibilities among colleagues, as fairly as possible, in service to the department, college, and university

<p align="center">**Categories of Faculty Performance**</p>

Beyond basic expectations and responsibilities, Instructional Technology faculty are expected to perform in the three categories of teaching, supervising, and mentorship; scholarship and creative activity; and professional service in a manner that demonstrates quality and significance to the department, college, university, and profession.

Teaching, Supervising, And Mentoring

In the Instructional Technology Department, teaching, supervising, and mentoring of students are considered critical to the mission of the department. This section includes a brief description of each of the key elements as they apply to KSU, the BCOE, and ITEC, and highlights the general expectations that relate to promotion and tenure and the related department-specific FPA goals articulated by each faculty member on an annual basis. In all cases a faculty member should refer to the KSU Faculty Handbook for specific and detailed information regarding university-wide definitions, policies, and practices.

Teaching. As noted in the KSU Faculty Handbook teaching is an intentional act in which learning processes and outcomes of students are monitored, managed, and facilitated in a caring and flexible context supported by a relevant syllabus, designated readings and topics, and explicit evaluation criteria (KSU Faculty Handbook, section 2.4). A faculty member's philosophy of teaching, supervising, and mentoring of students is the explicit foundation upon which to articulate one's broad goals for effective teaching and promoting student learning and development within the context of one's discipline and the courses one teaches.

All faculty members' teaching is subject to various forms of evaluation. University student evaluations are a mandatory form of evaluation for each class taught within the last two weeks of each semester. Both selective and holistic review of this data is valued in the review process. Additional forms of evidence that attest to the quality and significance of one's teaching or further explain data outliers may include independent survey, dissemination of one's best teaching practice to targeted audiences, peer review of teaching or instructional products, and teaching-related grant or awards (KSU Faculty Handbook, Sec. 2.5). It is expected that each ITEC faculty member will demonstrate evidence of effective teaching for all review purposes. Effective teaching in the department includes completing all required assessment activities required for sustaining regional, state, and national accreditation of programs.

Supervising. In ITEC, supervision generally refers to overseeing field experiences and capstone projects. Supervising, as operationally defined in the KSU Faculty Handbook, relates to a faculty member's, at any

contract level, responsibility to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback to students who are engaged in academic experiences, intentionally structured for credit or pay, that generally take place outside the context of the classroom, and in which specific learning outcomes are explicitly stated and used to gauge the quality of student performance and professional behavior.

Mentoring. Mentoring is characterized as a faculty member's investment, through the use of time, energy, and expertise, in the academic or professional development of students, junior faculty, part-time faculty, or peers. Mentoring may involve advising, collaborating, or identifying opportunities for an individual to reach new academic or professional goals. All faculty members are expected to formally or informally mentor students. All formal mentoring activities should be included in the FPA.

Advising. While not explicitly included in the title, all faculty members are expected to participate in advisement of Instructional Technology students. Advisement of ITEC students may include any activity intended to support learners in successful program completion through individual or group communications, meetings, or advocacy on behalf of the student to organizational units such as, but not limited to, the Dean's office, Registrar's office, or Financial Aid.

Evaluation of Quality and Significance. Evaluation of the quality and significance of faculty accomplishments in the area of Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students should reflect a systematic, goal-oriented, and assessment-based perspective. Merely listing individual courses taught or selecting student comments does not address quality and significance (KSU Faculty Handbook, 3.3). In addition, see the *BCOE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* and *Evaluation of Quality and Significance in Research and Creative Activity* for other relevant issues to be considered in documenting and evaluating the quality and significance of faculty accomplishments.

Research and Creative Activity

Faculty members are expected to be productive in the area of research and creative activity. Research and creative activity is defined as "a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge, understanding, application, problem solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy in the communities served by the University" *(*KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.B*)*. In ITEC, the Scholarship of Teaching and the Scholarship of Service are subsumed in the category of Research and Creative Activity.

Scholarly researchers approach their research and creative activity in a systematic and intentional manner. They have a clear agenda and plan for their work in this area. Faculty who do scholarly work in this arena engage in programmatic research and creativity as opposed to random, haphazard forays into research and creative activity that have less chance of building a substantial body of work. Researchers transform their work into scholarship when the work is formally shared with others, exhibits the use of appropriate and rigorous methods, and is subject to informed critique and review, which would include the usual process of peer review and publication, showcasing, or presentation (3.4.A).

Evaluation of Quality and Significance. In supporting evaluation of quality and significance in Research and Creative Activity, faculty members should delineate a research and creative activity framework, agenda, or plan for all pre-tenure, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. Evaluation of all scholarly accomplishments will be based on five criteria of *quality* and *significance* as described in the KSU Faculty Handbook section 3.4 and as adapted from Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff's (1997) standards of scholarly work as described in *Scholarship Assessed*, a follow-up publication to Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Merely listing individual tasks and projects does not address quality and significance (KSU Faculty Handbook, 3.3.B). Given that the BCOE values scholarship in all areas of performance, the same standards of scholarly work must be applied to each area, and issues of quality and significance of accomplishments should be addressed in all areas in each Annual Review Documents (ARD).

Evaluations cannot be defined solely by the number of publications or other scholarly activities. The pace of research varies according to faculty's areas of interest with some research problems or methodologies requiring longer periods of time for significant data collection and analysis. In addition, research involving undergraduate or graduate mentorship takes longer to achieve results than similar activities that are produced by an individual faculty member's efforts who do not engage in student mentorship. Thus, a smaller number of higher quality works may be equal to or greater than a larger number of scholarly products. Documentation and evaluation of accomplishments in Research and Creative Activity for those reviews shall focus on the quality and significance of the work.

External Review Letters. Guidelines for external review letters addressing faculty accomplishments in Research and Creative Activity will follow university requirements (See current Faculty Handbook).

Primary Sources of Evidence. Generally, publications and presentations are primary sources of evidence for research and creative activity. The annual faculty review platform (e.g., Digital Measures) provides a variety of contribution types.

Publications may include but are not limited to:
· Books
· Book chapters
· Journal articles
· Invited publications
· Book reviews
· Academic technologies including patents, software, and technology-related products
· Grant proposals submitted to funding agencies for review and feedback
· Technical reports on results of research, teaching, or service to state, regional or national agencies including grant related agencies or accrediting agencies. (Technical reports alone are not sufficient evidence for meeting tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review expectations in the college.)

Presentations may include but are not limited to:
· Peer-reviewed presentations
· Keynote or invited presentations
· Invited lectures

Contributions to Collaborative Scholarship. ITEC values scholarship, which emerges from collaborative efforts across departments, colleges, and with our external partners in K-12 settings. Furthermore, collaboration in scholarly work with colleagues from other universities is valued. Faculty must identify the nature and extent of their contributions when describing the quality and significance of such collaborations. "Authorship is reserved for persons who make a substantial contribution to and who accept responsibility for a published work" (APA Publication Manual, 2010, p 18).

Professional Service

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member's academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks that benefit the University, the community, or the profession. Professional service includes service to the department, school, college, University, profession, and community. The service activity must be related to a person's status as a faculty member.

Department, College, and University Service. Faculty members will draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of scholarly service to the governance and professionally related activities of the department, college, or University. Service is a vital part of faculty governance and to the operation of the University. Evidence of the quality and significance of institutional service can support promotion and tenure. Governance and professionally related service creates an environment that supports scholarly excellence and the achievement of the University's mission.

Service to Community and Profession. Scholarly service to communities external to the University is highly valued and frequently enhances teaching, scholarship, and creative activity. Service to the community should be related to the faculty member's discipline or role at the University. Service to schools or school systems may include providing professional development programming, instructional technology recommendations, or other services requiring field-specific expertise. Appropriate professional organizations ITEC faculty may serve include, but are not limited to, GaETC, ISTE, CoSN, SITE, OLC, AECT, iNACOL, AACE or technology-related special interest groups in research-focused organizations such as GERA, EERA, and AERA. Service roles in these organizations should be scholarly in nature (see definition of scholarly above).

Evaluation of Quality and Significance. In all types of professional service, documentation and evaluation of scholarly service will focus on quality and significance rather than on a simple recitation of tasks and projects. Documentation of the products or outcomes of professional service should be provided by the faculty member and considered as evidence for the evaluation of his or her accomplishments. Documentation should be sufficient to outline a faculty member's agreed-upon responsibilities and to support an evaluation of effectiveness.

Department Promotion and Tenure Committee
There is a single department Promotion and Tenure Committee with a minimum of three voting members at appropriate rank for each portfolio (committees can borrow faculty from other departments if needed). Only Full professors can vote on a candidate's promotion to Full professor. Both Associates and Fulls 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 Full. Full professors are expected to serve on P&T committees as required. 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).

External Letters

The person submitting a portfolio (herein after referred to as the "candidate") and the department chair/school director (herein after referred to as "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.

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.

Individuals who pose a conflict of interest (such as friends, relatives, KSU co-workers) will be removed from the list. For promotion to Full, the candidate chooses two names out of the final three letter writers, the chair chooses one. For promotion to Associate the candidate chooses two out of the final three letter writers, the chair chooses one. The candidate may veto two names on the chair's initial list with no reasons or explanations required. Neither the chair nor the candidate may solicit a letter concerning Scholarship / Creative Activity from outside of the mutually agreed upon list.

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 letter of support for a single candidate's portfolio.

The department chair contacts the potential letter writers by email or phone requesting their assistance. 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.
If the letter writer declines, the chair will choose another letter writer in the order of the list.

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. The letter writers will send their letter to the department chair who will insert the letter into Binder 1 in a section clearly marked "External Letters." 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. 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.

Department Chairs
Department Chairs who are Associate Professors may review the portfolio of any faculty member regardless of rank.

College P&T Committees
Only Full professors can vote on a candidate's promotion to Full professor. Both Associates and Fulls 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 Full. College committees require a minimum of three voting members at the appropriate rank for each portfolio. 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). If there are fewer than three departments in a College, then the College P&T committee will include as many representatives from another College as needed.

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

Additional Comments
All faculty who are required to have "Research and Creative Activity" (e.g., all tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and clinical and research faculty as defined by their FPA/MOU) must submit external letters as described in this policy.

Faculty Workload

Tenure-Track Faculty
The workload configuration for tenure-track faculty in the ITEC Department consists of a 60%, 3-3 teaching load, indicating the teaching of three, 3-credit-hour courses during the Fall semester and three, 3-credit-hour courses during the Spring semester. The remaining time is equally distributed between service (20%) and research and creative activity (20%).

Faculty Workload for ITEC Tenure-track Faculty			
Model	Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students	Research and Creative Activity	Professional Service
60/20/20	60% (Three 3-credit-hour courses per semester)	20%	20%

This workload can be modified on a temporary basis in the following ways:
- The chair and a faculty member agree to reduce teaching load and increase the service load for critical departmental tasks, such as program coordination.
- Faculty members receive external or internal funding to reduce their teaching load and increase their focus on research or professional service to the college, university or profession by 20%.
- Faculty members receive a course release for graduating three doctoral students or serving on five doctoral committees resulting in a graduated candidate. These releases are to be taken in the Fall or Spring semesters as negotiated by the faculty member and the Department Chair, based on the service and teaching needs of the department. The course release is applied to research and creative activity.

The recommended guidelines for Research and Creative Activity are based on a 60/20/20 workload model. Any variation from this workload should be negotiated between faculty and Department Chair and documented in the faculty members' FPA/ARD. As noted in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* and the *BCOE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*, all teaching faculty are expected to demonstrate excellent performance in the courses they teach. If faculty members have workload modifications that increase their workload in areas of research and creative activity and/or professional service, they will be expected to (1) demonstrate how these activities extend beyond the 20% required in the basic workload model, and (2) provide quality and significance evidence for their activities. It is the faculty member's responsibility to communicate to the P&T committee what their workload has been.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (Lecturers and Clinical Faculty)

For Lecturers and Clinical Faculty, research, other scholarship, or project development is not an expected activity, but the faculty member may choose to participate independently or collaboratively in this area upon negotiation in the FPA.

The workload configuration for non-tenure-track faculty in the ITEC Department consists of an 80%, 4-4 teaching load, indicating the teaching of four 3-credit-hour courses during the Fall semester and four, 3-credit-hour courses during the Spring semester. The remaining time is allocated to service (20%) to the ITEC Dept.

This workload can be modified on a temporary basis when the chair and faculty agree to reduce the faculty member's teaching load and increase service to the department by 20%.

<p style="text-align:center">General Expectations of Faculty by Rank</p>

The following section is designed to help faculty members plan their professional activities and outline the general expectations of faculty at each rank. Promotion to the next rank demonstrates that faculty members have fully achieved all expectations of their current rank and have begun fulfilling the roles and responsibilities of the next rank.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Assistant Professor
Adapting to university expectations and establishing oneself in academia are the primary concerns of assistant professors. Assistant professors develop and refine their teaching, establish a scholarship focus, and establish a foundation for meaningful service to the department, college, and profession. "A typical pattern of effective and productive scholarly work for the assistant professor is one that begins modestly in the early years, perhaps with limited or local significance, and expands in depth, focus, significance, recognition, and productivity in later years." (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.6).They begin developing a body of work that has the potential for impacting her/his field through professional publications, presentations, and service. By the pre-tenure review, assistant professors must show clear evidence of growth and potential for continued development in all three categories of performance.

Associate Professor
Associate professors develop a scholarship agenda into a meaningful and coherent body of work. They establish a consistent record of scholarship and make significant contributions to the broader community (e.g., state, national/international). Associate professors refine their teaching; engage in scholarship of quality and significance; and approach work in a scholarly manner. Associate professors are maturing in their career with a clearly defined professional identity and increasingly meaningful service contributions. They fulfill all general expectations of and provide leadership for the department, college, and/or university.

Professor
Professors have developed a consistent and sustained record of achievement in teaching scholarship, and service. They have produced scholarship of quality and significance meaningful to their field of study. They may be invited to deliver keynote invitations; do professional presentations; and write chapters, articles, and books. The professor is productive within their specialty area and within the context expected of a senior-level faculty member. Professors serve as mentors for junior faculty and advise them as they plan their move through the ranks of academia. Peers and colleagues recognize and respect professors for their leadership contributions within the larger community (e.g., state, national/international).

Non Tenure-Track Faculty

Lecturer/Senior Lecturer

Lecturers have as their primary responsibility teaching, supervising, and mentoring and, therefore, are expected to be highly effective in these areas. Unless otherwise set forth in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA), 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). In most cases, their responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses.

<div align="center">

Post-tenure Reviews

</div>

The review of post-tenure portfolios for faculty and college-level administrators begins with the college review committee and then proceeds to the dean. The dean then makes a summary decision. If there is a request for a second review by either the candidate under review or the college review committee, the portfolio can proceed to a committee of current chairs of the department review committees in the college.

<div align="center">

Performance Planning & Evaluation Rubric for Promotion and Tenure

</div>

The following rubric will be used by reviewers to determine promotion and tenure. The rubric is also designed to help faculty members plan their professional activities leading to promotion and tenure. In making decisions about promotion and tenure, reviewers will examine the quality and significance of all submitted portfolio materials, including annual faculty performance agreements (FPAs), annual review documents (ARDs), university-required student course evaluations, and external letters, as specified by university and college policies.

While reviewers can use first-hand knowledge of faculty members' work and a review of individual artifacts, decisions related to quality and significance will be primarily based on justifications in the faculty member's portfolio narrative. Annual faculty performance agreements (FPAs), annual review documents (ARDs), university-required student course evaluations, and external letters, as specified by university and college policies will serve as supporting documents and evidence to verify assertions in the portfolio narrative.

Rubric for Department of Instructional Technology Describing Criteria for Promotion by Rank

Implied within this rubric is that faculty will sustain their work in **all** of these competencies as described below as they move through the ranks. Faculty members should always defend the quality and significance of their work across all categories. Some activities might be applicable to more than one category, but faculty members should choose one. The same activity should not be included in more than one category of a narrative.

	Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors	Performance Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professors	Performance Expectations for Promotion to Professor
Teaching, Mentoring and Supervision	**Develop excellent teaching, facilitation and advisement practices** Formulate a research-based philosophy of teaching, learning, and assessment and explore how this philosophy can guide effective instructional practice. Demonstrate excellent course facilitation skills in face-face-face or online classes. Work toward sustained or improved trajectory in teaching practices based on data from required university course evaluations and Annual Review Documents (ARDs). Use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate student learning. Develop procedures for analyzing and evaluating required university student evaluations and relevant information on student learning and revise course content, instructional strategies, and/or student assessment of learning, as needed. Complete certification/accreditation-related assessment activities required of course instructors. Complete all of the advisement responsibilities as outlined by the department.	**Establish self as an experienced, excellent teacher and adviser** Articulate a well-developed, research-based philosophy of teaching, learning, and assessment and explain how this philosophy guides current instructional practices. Demonstrate excellent teaching practices with evidence including but not necessarily limited to a comprehensive analysis of required KSU course evaluations and positive teaching performances on ARDs for the review period. Demonstrate sustained practices of data analysis, reflection, and instructional improvements in course content, instructional strategies, and/or student assessment of learning, as appropriate. Contribute meaningfully to curricular and instructional development, evaluation or reform in department through a c*ombination* of activities *such a*s: · *Revising course content, syllabi, and/or assessments to reflect evolving certification/accreditation requirements* · *Developing new courses in accordance with state and national accreditation standards.* · *Developing an online course according to Quality Matters (QM) review standards.* · *Providing sustained, high-quality support to part-time instructors.*	**Establish self as an exemplary, highly-accomplished teacher, adviser, and mentor.** Demonstrate an advanced, research-based philosophy of teaching, learning, and assessment practices that is exemplified in current instructional practices and provides students with best-practice models of effective instruction. Demonstrate exemplary teaching including a comprehensive analysis of required KSU course evaluations for the review period; meeting or exceeding ARD teaching performances for the review period; and other evidence *such a*s: · *Evidence of impact of teaching and mentoring on students' professional or academic growth.* · *Evidence of impact of teaching on colleagues' instructional practices.* · *Receiving recognition for teaching or course design such as high scores on QM reviews, nominations, or awards* · *Other activities that provide evidence of exemplary teaching or advising students.* Establish self as a leader in curricular and instructional development, evaluation or reform through activities *such as:* · *Designing innovative instructional practices.* · *Leading or making significant contributions to department, college, or EPP-level efforts related to course revisions, program revision, program development, evaluation, or accreditation activities.* · *Leading or making significant contributions to other activities that improve instructional programs at the department, college, or EPP-level.* Mentor junior faculty.

	Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors	Performance Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	Performance Expectations for Promotion to Professor
Service	**Establish a foundation for professional service in area of expertise** Serve and contribute meaningfully on department committees. Engage in shared governance, committee work, and decision-making processes at the college and/or university levels. Engage in state, regional, national, or international Instructional Technology professional organizations aligned to areas of expertise and interests. Establish goals and seek opportunities for professional service.	**Establish a record of applying professional knowledge to service activities in area of expertise** Assume leadership roles on department committees/initiatives. Serve on and contribute meaningfully to college and/or university committees/initiatives. Contribute to local, regional, state, or national/international professional organizations through a *combination* of activities *such as*: · *Reviewing grant proposals.* · *Reviewing articles or manuscripts for publication.* · *Reviewing conference proposals for state, regional, national, and/or international conferences or contributing to a conference program in other ways.* · *Contributing to other types of events or initiatives sponsored by an organization.* · *Participating in and contributing to a special interest group, committee, task force, professional learning community, or network sponsored by an organization.*	**Display a sustained, and increasingly significant record of applying professional knowledge to service activities in area of expertise** Assume departmental leadership roles appropriate for a tenured professor, building a sustained, significant service record of positive impact on departmental programs, decision-making, and/or shared governance. Assume leadership roles at the college or university level that yield positive impact on programs, decision-making, and/or shared governance. Provide leadership to the profession at local school, state, national and/or international levels through a *combination* of activities *such as*: · *Playing a significant role in helping a school or school district advance the effective use of technology to support P-12 student learning.* · *Assuming a leadership role, in an organization, conference, special interest group, committee, task force, professional learning community, or network* · *Serving on and contributing to a governing board or other high-level, decision-making body.* · *Leading new initiatives that improves or expands the professional learning options of an organization.* · *Participating in service activities that impact state, national or international level programs or policy related to P-12 education through government organizations or task forces.* · *Participating in a service activity that impact state, national or international level programs or policy related to accreditation or improvement of higher education's ability to produce digital-age educators.* · *Serving as a journal editor or on an editorial review board for a refereed journal related to the field of instructional technology.* · *Reading large-scale, significantly-funded national grant proposals* · *Receiving recognition for service activities, such as nominations and awards.*

	Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors	**Performance Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**	**Performance Expectations for Promotion to Professor**
Research and Creative Activity	**Establish a Foundation for Research and/or Creative Activity** Identify areas of interest for research and creative activity. Present at a local, state, regional, national, or international conference at least once per year. Pursue publication of scholarly work in local, state and regional professional publications (ex. conference proceedings, online repository, non-refereed journals, refereed journals etc.) in collaboration with others or as sole author.	**Establish Identity as a Scholar** Establish a clearly defined agenda for research and/or creative activity. Present at highly-respected, refereed, state, regional, national or international conferences (such as GaETC, ISTE, CoSN, SITE, OLC, AECT, iNACOL, AACE, AERA or SERA) on an average at least once a year showing patterns of broad dissemination reaching national and/or international audiences. Expand depth and breadth of research and creative activity through national and/or international publications* as evidenced by: (1) *Publishing or having in-press a co-authored or sole-authored article in a reputable, refereed journal* -and- (2) *At least one of the following:* · *Publishing an additional co-authored or sole-authored article in a reputable, refereed journal.* · *Publishing a co-authored or sole-authored article in a non-refereed journal with substantial readership* · *Publishing white papers, plans, or reports for government agencies, for-profit companies, not-for-profits, school districts, or other type of organization.* · *Publishing an academic technology, which is a tangible outcome of a scholarly pursuit, contributes to knowledge in the field, and is peer-reviewed and/or has a broad audience.* · *Editing a book from a reputable publisher* · *Publishing one monograph, chapter or case in a book from a reputable publisher as a sole author or in collaboration with colleagues* · *Publishing one book from a reputable publisher as a sole author or in collaboration with colleagues.*	**Gain Recognition as a Scholar** Continue to advance agenda for research and/or creative activity through *combination* of the activities such as: · *Continuing to publish highly-respected research and/or creative works.* · *Continuing to present at highly-respected, refereed state, regional, national or international conferences showing patterns of broad dissemination reaching national and/or international audiences.* · *Receiving invitations to speak, write, and/or edit publications on topics related to your area of expertise.* · *Receiving awards for your research and/or creative activities.* · *Obtaining grant funding to further research or creative activity.* Demonstrate impact of research and/or creative activities on P-12 schools, teacher preparation, and/or knowledge in the field of Instructional Technology.
		*Notes on publications: Contributions to collaborative work must be stated in the narrative or vita; the faculty member should be lead or sole author on at least one work; and at least one written work should be published by the time of review. The others can be in-press.	

Process Leading to and Expectations for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, their primary responsibilities are in the areas of **teaching, supervision, and mentoring**; therefore, they are expected to be highly effective in these areas. Lecturers must also establish a foundation of **departmental service** and senior lecturers must establish a sustained record of departmental service. Service activities may include, but are not limited to, advisement, course coordination, mentoring, and accreditation activities as directed by the Department Chair. While the service requirements for lecturers are primarily to the department, lecturers may also have service activities at the college, university, profession, or community as appointed by the Department Chair or when the lecturer's interest and schedule allow these activities.

Lecturers are eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer in their sixth year of employment by submitting a portfolio based on university guidelines. Recommendation for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer will be made based the following rubric.

Instructional Technology Department Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Review and Promotion Guidelines

Dimensions	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer
Dimension A *Educational Philosophy*	· Develops and articulates a research-based philosophy of teaching, learning, and assessment that informs effective instructional practices	· Refines and articulates a well-developed research-based philosophy of teaching, learning, and assessment that informs exemplary instructional practices.
Dimension B *Achieving Pedagogical Effectiveness through Self-Critique and* Other *Forms of Evaluation*	· Evidence of effective teaching ability in assigned teaching contexts (i.e., face to face, hybrid, online). · Evidence of self-reflection of: teaching to standards, effective lesson preparation and implementation using appropriate teaching methods to ensure learning of content and critical thinking. · Evidence of reflection on student evaluation responses, both quantitative and qualitative. · Evidence of adjusting practice based upon self-reflection, reflection on peer feedback, and analysis of qualitative and quantitative student evaluation. · Reflective self-critique leads to adjustments in course content, assessments, mentoring, and supervision (if applicable) to better serve candidate learning of content.	· Evidence of sustained highly effective teaching in assigned teaching contexts (i.e., face to face, hybrid, online). · Evidence of self-reflection showing clear consistent evidence of: teaching to standards, effective lesson preparation and implementation using appropriate teaching methods to ensure learning of content and critical thinking. · Clear consistent evidence of reflection on student evaluation responses, both quantitative and qualitative · Clear consistent evidence of adjusting practice based upon self-reflection, reflection on peer feedback, and analysis of qualitative and quantitative student evaluation. · Reflective self-critique shows a consistent history of making adjustments in course content, assessments, mentoring, and supervision (if applicable) to better serve candidate learning of content.

Dimension C *Professional Growth and Development*	· Evidence of linking teaching to current literature · Evidence of professional development (e.g., attendance at workshops, seminars, conferences, etc.) and evidence of application to classroom teaching and assessment	· Clear consistent evidence that current literature is used to improve teaching and revision of course content. · Clear consistent evidence of professional development and clear explicit connection to classroom teaching and assessment
Dimension D *Professional Collaboration*	· Evidence of collaborative activity with faculty to improve teaching, advising, and/or supervision.	· Clear consistent evidence of collaborative activity with faculty to improve teaching, advising, and/or supervision
Dimension E *Instructional and Curricular Leadership*	· Evidence of effective development and redevelopment of course syllabi. · Evidence of participating in departmental program assessment activities	· Evidence of effective development and redevelopment of course syllabi, course manuals, and collaborative/supportive course development, as applicable. · Clear consistent evidence of participating to program assessment activities that lead to improvement of curriculum and instruction.
Dimension F *Technology*	· Evidence of effectively using instructional technology tools and resources to facilitate student learning. · Evidence of expanding knowledge of technology use in the classroom in keeping with current advances in the field.	· Clear consistent evidence of highly effective usage of instructional technologies in all teaching contexts, in keeping with current advances in the field.
Dimension G *Service*	· Evidence of establishing a foundation for departmental professional service – Service activities may include advisement, course coordination, mentoring, accreditation activities, etc.	· Evidence of a sustained record of departmental professional service that advances the vision and mission of the department.

Procedure for Revising Departmental P&T Guidelines

The ITEC Department P&T Committee shall review the department guidelines annually. If the committee believes that revisions to the guidelines are necessary, they will request that the department chair form an ad hoc committee.

A faculty member in the department can also request that the department consider revising the guidelines. If the faculty agree with a majority vote, the department chair will form the ad hoc committee for the purposes of reviewing department guidelines and making recommendations for revision.

The ad hoc committee will be comprised of the ITEC P&T Committee, and at one other member of the department faculty. If no other faculty is willing to serve, the P&T Committee will serve as the ad hoc committee.

Once the ad hoc committee is formed, they will elect a chair and draft recommended changes. The changes will be given to the faculty for review and input.

After seeking input, the committee will put forth a final draft of the new P&T guidelines to the tenure-track faculty for a vote. If the changes involve guidelines for non-tenure track faculty, then non-tenure track faculty will be included in the vote. For changes to be adopted by the faculty and forwarded to other levels of approval by the department chair, college, and university, over fifty percent of the faculty members eligible to vote must agree.

Kennesaw State University
Academic Affairs

Approval Form for Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A copy of this form, completed, must be attached as a cover sheet to the department guidelines included in portfolios for Pre-Tenure, Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review.

I confirm that the attached guidelines, dated 10 / 06 / 2016, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Instructional Technology in accordance with department bylaws:

Jo Williamson _____ _Jo Williamson_ 10/07/16
Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair   Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Traci Redish _____ _Traci Redish_ 10/7/16
Name (printed or typed)   Signature/ Date

College P&T Committee Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Stacy Delacruz _____ _Stacy Delacruz_ 10/25/16
Name (printed or typed)   Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Arlinda J Eaton _____ _Arlinda J Eaton_ 10.31.16
Name (printed or typed)   Signature/ Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

_____   1/31/17