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# Introduction

The Department of Mathematics (the Department) is committed to achieving its own mission and strategic plan as well as the missions and strategic plans of the College of Science and Mathematics (the College*)*, and Kennesaw State University (the University). University guidelines concerning performance and evaluation are provided in *The KSU Faculty Handbook* (*The Handbook*) available on KSU’s Academic Affairs website. The guidelines in this document are intended to support and elaborate on University guidelines as applied to teaching and clinical faculty in the Department of Mathematics. Should there be a conflict between the guidelines in this document and the guidelines in *The Handbook*, the latter take precedence. The purpose of this document is to provide department-specific guidelines that will be used as the primary basis for annual performance reviews, promotion and tenure decisions, and post-tenure reviews. In establishing goals and preparing for any review or promotion, faculty should consult both *The Handbook* and this document. At all levels of review the rationale and justification for decisions shall be stated in writing to the candidate with specific and detailed reference to the guidelines in this document, any extant College guidelines, and *The KSU Faculty Handbook.*

Since the last issue of these guidelines were approved, there have been two major changes to the processes of tenure and promotion. (1) Tenure will only be granted to faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, thus, a successful petition for tenure from an Assistant Professor must be accompanied by a successful petition for promotion, and (2) letters from off-campus experts are now required for every petition for promotion in professorial rank.

# Types of Faculty

This document applies primarily to teaching and clinical faculty with professorial rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor), or lecturer rank (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer), who are tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track with renewable contracts. (Below, these are referred to as “teaching faculty.”) A few sections and remarks below, notably Sections III.D and IV.E, apply to designated administrative faculty. These guidelines do not apply to limited term faculty who are hired to teach over a specified number of semesters. Expectations for limited term faculty are typically related entirely to teaching classes and are detailed on a case-by-case basis in contracts negotiated with the Chair of the Department (the Chair).

# Performance Areas

The three areas of performance for teaching faculty are: 1) Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring (teaching); 2) Research and Creative Activity (scholarship or research); and 3) Professional Service (service).

Teaching is the central mission of the Department of Mathematics. From its service load teaching general education mathematics courses, to its support of science and engineering majors, to its commitment to mathematics majors, mathematics education majors, elementary education majors, and graduate students in mathematics education and in analytics and data sciences, the Department plays an essential role in the education of a huge swath of the student body. As part of its teaching mission, the Department is committed to helping early-career faculty develop effective methods for teaching, supervising, and mentoring students.

Scholarship goes hand-in-glove with teaching and as such, is also central to the mission of the Department of Mathematics. The Department is committed to helping early-career faculty develop agendas for scholarly activity that will progress and mature over time and that will support their eventual application for promotion and tenure. The Department is likewise committed to helping veteran faculty members pursue their own plans for scholarship by encouraging a diverse set of research agendas.

Service to the Department, the College, the University, the community, and the broader professional community is considered part of every tenured and tenure-track faculty member's basic obligation. Though there is a minimum expectation of service for all tenured and tenure-track faculty, service carries less weight than teaching or scholarship in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The character of the Department of Mathematics is influenced strongly by the fact that it houses two subgroups of faculty with different missions: the mathematics faculty, and the mathematics education faculty. While the two subgroups work in different ways with different goals, they enjoy certain similarities. It is vital to the health of the Department that the members of each subgroup understand both the commonalities and the differences between the two.

The mathematics faculty teaches most general education courses as well as most of the upper division and graduate level mathematics courses. This faculty teaches students from programs across the University. Though some mathematics faculty may produce research related to the teaching of collegiate mathematics, the traditional research from this group is in pure and applied mathematics. The audience for their research papers and presentations is typically composed of other mathematicians, either as researchers, or as teachers of college and university level mathematics courses.

The mathematics education faculty teaches courses that prepare teachers of school (K-12) mathematics. In addition, they work closely with, and remain responsive to, the needs of local schools and state and national initiatives. They are often called upon to provide professional development opportunities for practicing teachers as service to local and state communities. Research for mathematics education faculty concerns the teaching and learning of mathematics at all levels of education. In their research, mathematics education faculty work with and for two main audiences: mathematics education colleagues (at KSU and at other institutions of higher learning) and K‐12 teachers. Papers and presentations by mathematics education faculty may appear in research journals and conferences or practitioner journals and conferences. Mathematics education faculty may seek grants for projects that (1) enhance pre‐ and in‐service teachers’ mathematics content knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge or, (2) that focus on the teaching and learning of mathematics at any level of education. Audiences for the scholarly work of mathematics education faculty may also include mathematicians, curriculum developers, and policymakers.

Teaching faculty are subject to different types of reviews throughout the career. Expectations for different types of review vary. When hired as Assistant Professors, teaching faculty undergo a pre-tenure review that leads to the application for tenure, which is granted only to faculty at the rank of Associate Professor. In other words, an Assistant Professor must be promoted with or before a successful application for tenure. Lecturers undergo no milestone reviews with the possible exception of a voluntary application for promotion to Senior Lecturer. A faculty member at the rank of Senior Lecturer undergoes no further multi-year review. All tenured faculty, however, are required to undergo post-tenure reviews at intervals specified in *The Handbook*. Among tenured faculty, many, but not all, choose to follow a path towards promotion to Professor. The activities of faculty in these different cohorts will differ noticeably. These differences are addressed below.

We refer to pre-tenure review, post-tenure review, the review of an application for tenure, and the review of an application for promotion as *milestone reviews*. A milestone review requires the assembly of a portfolio and narrative that explain and document the faculty member’s activities over the course of several years. In composing a portfolio for any milestone review, the faculty member should establish the *quality and significance* of the work carried out in each performance area*.* Reciting or enumerating tasks, courses, projects, and accomplishments is insufficient. Any milestone review is conducted, at least in part, by committee and may be conducted entirely by colleagues with little or no understanding of mathematics or mathematics education. Even within the Department, colleagues conducting a milestone review may have nothing more than a passing acquaintance with the applicant’s field or its situation in the larger field of mathematics or mathematics education. **When assembling materials for a milestone review, it is incumbent on the applicant, and the applicant alone, to make a strong case that can be understood easily by any colleague in the Department or College.**

We provide examples of both the type of activities, and quality and significance indicators of activities that fall into each of the performance areas. In preparing a portfolio for a milestone review, faculty can and should employ such indicators in crafting an argument for the relevance of the work presented for review. These lists are not meant to be exhaustive, but to provide examples that faculty can use to guide their preparation of portfolios for review.

Applicants seeking tenure or promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor or Professor are expected to engage in mathematics or mathematics education research and to produce tangible, disseminated, peer-reviewed results of that discipline-based research. Section III.B deals with Research and Creativity activity and in that section, *scholarly work* and *scholarship* are distinguished and defined.

At various stages in the career, faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they approach teaching, research, and/or service in a *scholarly manner*, that is, a manner that is reflective, and that employs a continuous process of improvement that is intentional, systematic, measured, analyzed, and implemented.

## Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

The successful demonstration of effectiveness in teaching and mentoring students is essential for all faculty, both for continued employment, and in applications for tenure or promotion in rank. All teaching faculty are expected to approach their teaching, supervision, and mentoring in a scholarly manner.

Teaching activities may include but are not limited to:

* + High quality teaching across a variety of instructional settings (classroom, online courses, seminars, directed study, study abroad, etc.) that reflects an implementation of effective pedagogical strategies that address students’ learning needs
  + Field‐based supervision of mathematics education students in our programs
  + Curricular development, including modification, implementation, and evaluation (e.g., within existing courses, new courses, programs, etc.)
  + Student advisement for degree programs
  + Mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students in research

When preparing portfolios for milestone reviews, faculty are required to include all electronically available student course evaluations/comments (Student Feedback reports) for all courses taught during the period of review. Along with these evaluations, faculty should include a report on modifications or improvements crafted and/or implemented in response to student comments. Faculty may also include course evaluations/comments from outside the review period as additional supporting documentation for teaching effectiveness.

The students who complete course evaluations are a self-selected subset of the students who enroll in a course, thus the electronic surveys administered by the University are insufficient for demonstrating *quality and significance* in teaching. In any review, faculty must support the argument for quality and significance of their teaching with additional evidence. Examples of such evidence include

* + Peer observation or evaluation of course materials and teaching strategies by an experienced faculty member;
  + Supplemental evaluation instruments administered by the faculty (e.g., student questionnaire, pre‐ or post‐content assessment results, etc.);
  + Assessment of student learning based on course learning outcomes;
  + Sample syllabi, course materials, teaching artifacts, assignments, assessments, and projects;
  + A statement of teaching philosophy;
  + Student acknowledgements (former students and alumni);
  + Awards/recognition for teaching.

## Research and Creative Activity

The Department of Mathematics values a variety of discipline‐based scholarly activities that can include idea generation, gathering and analyzing data, theoretical and computational calculations and/or modeling, and the dissemination of results at professional meetings. These processes comprise *scholarly activity*. When scholarly activity leads to creative, intellectual work that is professionally reviewed by peers in the discipline and disseminated, that work is designated *scholarship*. Scholarly activity and scholarship may involve research based on the faculty member’s training and expertise (“discipline-based research”), teaching-and-learning-based research, or other appropriate efforts as defined in the Faculty Performance Agreement.

The Department recognizes that faculty working on different sorts of projects will have different rates of production. For example, research done in collaboration with students may take more time to bear fruit. Methodologies for collecting and analyzing data may involve a significant time commitment. Certain areas of mathematics are more highly developed, thus more difficult to advance in. Nonetheless, any faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion is expected to establish an active research agenda appropriate to an R3 institution. As in teaching, the *quality and significance* of research must be supported by evidence in any application for promotion or tenure. Examples of such evidence follow.

#### Scholarship

* + Research papers published in peer‐reviewed professional journals (including practitioner journals).
    - Applicants should speak to the breadth of readership of the journal, and should include citation metrics.
    - **F**or multi‐author publications in which the candidate is not the corresponding author, the applicant must describe his or her specific contributions to the publication. Documentation of the quality and significance of the applicant’s contributions can include a letter from co‐author(s).
* Reviewed grant or contract proposals for projects in mathematics or mathematics education
  + Include award letters as applicable.
  + Applicants should speak to the degree of competitiveness of the funding agency/program (i.e. the number or percent of proposals received and funded by the funding agency/program).
  + Documentation of the significance of the faculty member’s work may include letters from co‐PIs attesting to the applicant’s contribution to the preparation of the proposal and his or her role in the proposed project.
  + For unfunded proposals, applicants should include all reviewer comments, the proposal score (if given by funding agency), and a copy of the grant application, including cover page with signatures.
* Books or book chapters externally reviewed by editor(s) or by an expert in the field
* Peer‐reviewed conference proceedings
* Externally reviewed online materials or software,
  + Review by an editor or by an expert in the field can substantiate significance of the work.
  + Documentation of the number of adoptions or downloads relative to comparable textbooks or materials.

#### Scholarly Activity

* Preparing and submitting results of research to peer‐reviewed professional journals (including practitioner journals) or peer‐reviewed conference proceedings.
  + - Applicants should speak to the breadth of readership of journal, including the number of citations by others in the field.
    - **F**or multi‐author publications in which the candidate is not the corresponding author, the applicant must describe his or her specific contributions to the publication. Documentation of the quality and significance of the applicant’s contributions can include a letter from co‐author(s).
* Especially for faculty engaging in mathematics education research: formulating and identifying research questions, engaging in research methodology, collecting and analyzing data.
* Dissemination of results of research at professional conferences (including practitioner conferences), consortia, or seminars.
  + Document whether the presentation was by invitation.
  + Note the scope of conference (regional, national, or international attendance).
  + Indicate the acceptance rate, if available.
* Preparing and submitting grant or contract proposals for projects in mathematics or mathematics education
  + Include grant or contract proposals.
  + Supply evidence of related proposals that were funded.
  + Indicate the degree of competitiveness of the funding agency/program (i.e. the number or percent of proposals received and funded by the funding agency/program).
  + The faculty member may include a letter from co‐PIs that document the significance of the faculty member’s contribution to preparation of the proposal and his or her role in the project.
* Developing online materials or composing software
* Devising a new algorithm to solve a problem
* Awards/Recognition for research

In addition to any external letters that the University may require and solicit, faculty members applying for tenure or promotion in rank may include in their portfolios external letters evaluating their research and scholarship products. The most effective evaluation letters are from distinguished individuals in the candidate’s field who are in a position to provide an authoritative assessment of the *quality* of the candidate’s research and to comment on its *significance* in the discipline. When external evaluation letters are supplied as a result of the faculty member’s initiative, the faculty member must detail the nature of the relationship with the reviewer.

## Professional Service

Professional service is the application of a faculty member’s mathematical, academic, and professional skills and knowledge to support individuals, groups, programs, and functions within the Department, the College, and the University; state education entities; the local, regional, national, and international communities; and professional organizations. All tenured and tenure-track faculty must perform a certain amount of service as service facilitates the efficient and successful delivery of programs and student services within and outside of the University.

Professional service activities for faculty in the Department of Mathematics may include:

* + Leadership or active participation in University, College, or Department activities, committees, faculty governance bodies, student‐groups;
  + Mentoring junior colleagues;
  + Leadership or significant achievements in activities involving professional organizations at the state, regional, national, and international level (such as organizing a regional, national, or international conference or serving as an officer of a state, national, or international professional association);
  + Leadership or consulting/advising among relevant community, state, regional, or national organizations, agencies, or schools;
  + Outreach to schools, including presentations, teacher workshops, judging or monitoring at math bowls;
  + Serving as coordinator for programs, courses, or groups of courses;
  + Professional review of journal articles, books, grants, etc;
  + Attaining internal or external funding for programs that provide scholarship funds/resources for students in STEM disciplines (NSF‐STEM, NSF‐STEP, NSF‐REU, etc.).

As in all the performance areas, service will be evaluated for its *quality and significance,* which must be supported by evidence. Sources of evidence that faculty can use to argue the impact of their service may include:

* The effect of the service on students (or a student population) in the Department, the College, University, or the profession;
  + Product(s) developed during the time of service (the applicant should indicated the specific contribution to the product);
  + Policy/procedural changes that result from the service role (note the nature and scope of the change);
  + Recognition by others of the faculty member’s contribution or leadership in the service activity;
  + Awards/Recognition for service.

Service activities may be considered scholarly when they result in tangible, disseminated, and peer-reviewed results (scholarship). Scholarship of service alone is not sufficient to meet, nor can it substitute for the research and creative activity required for promotion or tenure. Scholarship of service is distinguished from routine service work by the significance and scope of the leadership exhibited and the products produced by the activity. Examples include:

* Authoring a significant institutional document for the Department, College or University.
* Making significant contributions to writing institutional self-study reports, governance documents or other notable institutional documents.
* Preparation of accreditation reports.

## Administration and Leadership

Administration and Leadership is a fourth area of evaluation that applies only to administrative faculty. Administration and leadership activities may include:

* Day‐to‐day operational management of the Department;
* Budgeting and budget reporting;
* Strategic and operational planning;
* Scheduling courses and events for the Department;
* Staffing functions, including screening, hiring, and training employees of the Department;
* Conducting performance reviews of faculty and staff.

Sources of evidence that faculty can use to measure and demonstrate the quality and significance of administration and leadership may include:

* Faculty reviews of administrative performance;
* Accreditation, growth, and sustainability of programs;
* External recognition of a program;
* Letters of support from peer(s) or supervisor addressing effectiveness in managing and advancing the necessary fiscal, physical, interpersonal, and intellectual environments.

# Workload Models

The workload templates we recognize in the Department of Mathematics are designed to give faculty members a starting point when considering how to structure the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) each year.

The FPA is an annual agreement between the Chair and each faculty member that details how the faculty member will allocate his or her time over the course of the ten months that comprise Spring and Fall Semesters. Both the FPA and the Annual Review Document (ARD) are composed with respect to calendar year. The FPA is the basis upon which the faculty member is evaluated for the annual review. The ARD is the document that summarizes the review.

Workload models take into consideration needs of the Department, College, and University, as well as the professional goals of faculty. They also reflect the rule, stated in *The Handbook*, that all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to dedicate a certain amount of their time to professional service. Untenured tenure-track faculty should be extremely cautious about making excessive service commitments beyond the minimum required.

Note that a 3 credit undergraduate course is typically considered 10% of a faculty member’s workload so 100% teaching would mean 15 credit hours of teaching each term. Finer points about how teaching counts towards workload are detailed below.

**Table 1. Summary of Workload Models for Mathematics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lecturer** | **% of Effort** |
| **TEACHING** | **90‐100** |
| **RESEARCH** | **0** |
| **SERVICE** | **0-10** |
|  |  |
| **Teaching Emphasis** |  |
| **TEACHING** | **80‐90** |
| **RESEARCH** | **0-10** |
| **SERVICE** | **10‐20** |
|  |  |
| **Teaching-Research Balanced** |  |
| **TEACHING** | **50‐60** |
| **RESEARCH** | **30‐40** |
| **SERVICE** | **10‐15** |
|  |  |
| **Research Emphasis** |  |
| **TEACHING** | **30‐40** |
| **RESEARCH** | **50‐60** |
| **SERVICE** | **10-15** |
|  |  |
| **Administrative Emphasis** |  |
| **TEACHING** | **0‐20** |
| **RESEARCH** | **0‐30** |
| **Admin/SERVICE** | **50‐100** |
|  |  |
| **Clinical Faculty** |  |
| **TEACHING** | **0-50** |
| **RESEARCH** | **0** |
| **Admin/SERVICE** | **50-100** |

## Lecturer Model

This model is for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. It is not available to tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Lecturers are expected to be highly effective in their primary area of responsibility, which is teaching. Excellence in teaching plays the most important role in reappointment and promotion decisions for lecturers. Though they are not expected to engage in scholarship, lecturers may dedicate up to 10% of their time to service activities. Any such commitment will be the result of consultation with the Department Chair and will be detailed in the FPA.

## Teaching Emphasis Model

This model combines a teaching focus with a secondary emphasis in the area of research or service. Tenured faculty not seeking promotionmay follow this workload model.

Faculty with an FPA detailing a Teaching Emphasis Model are expected to excel in teaching. The remainder of faculty effort will be divided between professional service activities and research activities. The proportion of the effort placed in each area will be determined by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member, based on Department, College, and University needs. Exact proportions are always specified in the FPA. Faculty in this category are expected to engage in scholarly activity as appropriate to their FPA. They may engage in the scholarship of discipline specific research or the scholarship of teaching and learning.

## Teaching‐Research Balanced Model

This model is followed by most tenured and tenure-track faculty. It combines a teaching focus with a secondary emphasis in research and creative activity. The goal of faculty working under the model is maintaining or establishing an active research program.

Faculty members who work under this model are required to show scholarship in discipline‐specific research or scholarship of teaching and learning. The proportion of the effort directed towards each area is determined by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member, based on Department, College and University needs, and specified in the FPA.

## Research Emphasis Model

Faculty requesting this model must demonstrate the exceptional quality and significance of their scholarship. Strongly persuasive criteria should be used to support a request for this workload model. Faculty on this model are encouraged to involve students in their research. Faculty who work under this model, and expect to continue working under this model, are required to demonstrate continued, significant progress in scholarship annually. It is expected that a faculty member on this model will show a greater level of scholarship (i.e., greater quantity of scholarship or products of more significance) than those on other models.

## Administration Emphasis Model

The Administrative Model applies to designated administrative faculty. Selection of this model must be done with the support and written approval of the faculty member’s supervisor, as well as the Dean of the College. The performance criteria for these faculty members will be the aggregate performance of the unit or program(s) supervised by the faculty. Faculty members engaged in this model are required to be active in multiple levels of service and to establish strong and effective leadership practices.

## Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are non-tenured, non-tenure-track faculty with professorial rank. (See *The Handbook* for more information.) They undergo annual review and may apply for promotion. Since their primary responsibilities are in the area of professional service and teaching, they must demonstrate their leadership in professional service and excellence in teaching in their annual reviews.

## All Models

As each model has some degree of flexibility, each faculty member will develop a specific formulation for the FPA in consultation with the Chair, and subject to the approval of the Dean. As the activities of a faculty member may change over the course of the career, so may the workload model. Indeed, FPAs may be re-negotiated with the Chair at any time in light of changing needs of the faculty member, the Department, the College, or the University.

# Annual Reviews

Faculty performance, which is reviewed annually, is always measured against the FPA. Regardless of the faculty member’s workload model, the annual review, which is captured in the ARD, should address each performance area that the faculty member is responsible for, according to the last FPA. The FPA is the most important document in a faculty member’s annual assessment so it is critical that it be carefully composed. *The Handbook* specifies what the FPA must contain. Cases in which a faculty member and the Department Chair cannot agree on the terms of an FPA are resolved by the Dean.

The ARD is the document that the faculty member prepares to report on fulfillment or progress towards fulfillment on the plan outlined in the previous year’s FPA. *The Handbook* discusses the roles of the FPA and the ARD in annual review. In the ARD, the faculty member addresses the activities and accomplishments in each performance area for the review period, with specific reference to the planned/expected responsibilities and scholarship expectations detailed in the previous year’s FPA. The quality and significance of reported activities and accomplishments are also addressed in the ARD. The Department Chair will study the ARD and provide a detailed, thoughtful review of the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses in his or her progress toward upcoming milestone reviews. While annual reviews provide important markers in a faculty member’s progress towards future promotions, making progress towards the next rank is not sufficient for promotion to the next rank.

The ARD is evaluated independently by the Department Chair and the Dean of the College. If a faculty member has performed the activities and met, or come sufficiently close to meeting, the goals outlined in the FPA, then the faculty member will receive a satisfactory evaluation. If a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory performance evaluation, the faculty member must provide a formal faculty development plan in the FPA for the next review period. The plan should detail an agenda for addressing deficiencies by

1. Defining the specific goal(s) or outcome(s) that is (are) to be achieved;
2. Outlining the specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goal(s) or outcome(s);
3. Identifying appropriate sources of faculty development, whether on campus or at other campuses or locations;
4. Setting appropriate times within the next review period by which the specific activities and goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and
5. Indicating appropriate criteria by which progress will be monitored.

Face‐to‐face meetings and discussion between the faculty member and Chair are required to ensure thorough exploration of all options, clear communications, and mutual understanding in the Chair’s evaluation of the ARD. In the event that the faculty member and Chair cannot reach agreement on the evaluation of the ARD, the Dean will make the final determination. For tenured faculty, receipt of two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews may result in modification of a faculty member’s workload model. This modification may include an adjustment in the proportion of time spent in each performance area or movement to a different workload model.

# Milestone Reviews

There are four types of milestone review for teaching faculty: pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. For most teaching faculty, the review for tenure is also a review for promotion to Associate Professor. If a faculty member is hired as an Associate Professor without tenure, the application for tenure may or may not be accompanied by an application for promotion in rank. As noted in Section III above, milestone reviews require the composition of a portfolio that will be reviewed by various individuals and committees from inside and outside the Department.

Any portfolio submitted for a milestone review should follow the format outlined in *The Handbook*. Portfolios that do not follow these guidelines are subject to a negative decision without review. The burden is on the candidate to provide evidence of his or her qualifications. **It is the task of the reviewers to evaluate the evidence provided. Reviewers neither search for the evidence itself, nor do they consider evidence--- positive or negative--- outside the candidate’s portfolio.**

## Pre‐tenure review

Pre‐tenure review takes place in the third year of a tenure‐track faculty member’s employment in the professorial rank. Since it occurs at the beginning of the third year, it reviews only two years of professional activities. Its purpose is to provide feedback as to a faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses in progress toward promotion and tenure. As such, the pre‐tenure review is itself a developmental exercise. Pre-tenure review, which is mandatory for tenure-track faculty, takes place before a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion or tenure. As such, a positive pre-tenure review does not constitute, nor does it guarantee, a positive promotion or tenure decision. The evaluation letters provided by the Department Review Committee, the Chair, and the Dean of the College become part of the candidate’s portfolio for later review. Poor preparation of the pre‐tenure review packet is viewed in an extremely unfavorable light., as it precludes the faculty member from receiving valuable, constructive feedback towards successful progress to promotion and tenure.

## Promotion and Tenure

The purpose of the promotion and tenure process is to secure a committed, dedicated faculty for the Department, the College, and the University. Guidelines are neither a contract, nor a checklist, for promotion and tenure.

#### Promotion

Faculty members seeking promotion should meet the expectations delineated in the tables in Section VIII below. To be considered for promotion in the professorial ranks, a faculty member must have produced and disseminated peer‐reviewed journal publications. A publication record is not necessary for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Promotion in rank is based upon performance and established criteria, and not the faculty member’s time in service.

The Department of Mathematics expects that tenure‐track and tenured faculty seeking promotion in rank will demonstrate effectiveness and leadership in the areas of teaching and service, and will have an active and productive research program in their area of expertise. Specific expectations by rank for each of the performance areas are provided in Tables 2, 3, and 4 below. Faculty considering application for tenure or promotion are strongly encouraged to consult this document and *The KSU Faculty Handbook*.

#### Tenure

The Department of Mathematics is the first level of tenure review for all faculty members of the Mathematics Department. The decision as to whether or not to award tenure to a faculty member is essentially a decision as to whether or not the University is willing to make a long‐term commitment to that faculty member. Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure. In an application for promotion and tenure, tenure presents the higher threshold. In particular, tenure may only be granted to those faculty members who either submit a successful petition for promotion to Associate Professor or who have already achieved the rank of Associate Professor. Successful candidates for tenure have achievements that demonstrate the quality and significance indicators delineated under Associate Professor in the tables in Section VIII. They demonstrate potential for long‐term effectiveness at the University. The decision to recommend tenure is based on how well the faculty member has performed in carrying out an agenda of scholarly activity in the three areas of professional activity. Faculty members applying for tenure are expected to produce discipline-based scholarship.

## Post‐tenure Review

Post-tenure review is a comprehensive five-year performance review which is required for all tenured teaching faculty. Carried out by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, its primary purpose is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members. The outcome of the review is either: 1) Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance, or 2) Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance. *The Handbook* describes the timeline for post-tenure review as well as the University policies on the two possible outcomes of a post-tenure review. In summary, three or more positive annual reviews are necessary but not sufficient for a faculty member to be achieving post-tenure expectations. The criteria for achieving expectations in post-tenure review are: (1) continued satisfactory performance in teaching, (2) continued satisfactory performance in scholarly activity and service, all as measured relative to the workload described in the faculty member’s FPAs for the years under review.

# Revisions to the Departmental Guidelines

The Department Review Committee and the Department Faculty Council shall periodically review the Department Guidelines and make recommendations to the Department Chair regarding needed revisions. The Department Chair or the Dean of the College may also request a review of or revisions to the Department Guidelines. When revisions are to be made, the Department Chair shall convene an ad hoc committee comprised of the Department Review Committee, and other members of the Department faculty appropriate to the process of review and revision of the guidelines. Revisions to the guidelines shall be voted on by all full‐time permanent faculty of the Department. Revisions must be approved by the Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Provost.

# Tables Summarizing Performance Expectations for Teaching Faculty

The fundamental rule of faculty evaluation and performance expectations is that on a year-to-year basis, teaching faculty should perform in accordance with their FPAs. When preparing for a milestone review, a faculty member and the Department Chair should agree to a workload model, and to an associated series of FPAs that, when fulfilled, will result in a body of work that will position the faculty member for a positive review.

For **promotion**, faculty members must be **performing at the beginning level of the next rank**. For **tenure**, faculty must be promoted to Associate Professor, and must meet the expectations for that rank in each area of evaluation. Note that Tables 2 and 4 refer to all teaching faculty at all stages of the career. Table 3 refers specifically to faculty seeking promotion.

### Table 2. Expectations for Faculty in the Department of Mathematics in the Area of TEACHING

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assistant Professors and Lecturers** | **Associate Professors, Professors, and Senior Lecturers** | **Clinical Faculty** |
| Any Assistant Professor or Lecturer should:   * Approach his/her teaching in a scholarly manner as defined in Section III * Have a well‐stated philosophy of teaching and learning and demonstrate how this philosophy has informed the development and selection of classroom pedagogies and activities; * Advise and mentor undergraduate or graduate students. * Update teaching material and keep current in his/her field in order to improve the quality of teaching. | In addition to continuing the expectations of the Assistant Professor, an Associate Professor, Professor or Senior Lecturer should:   * Demonstrate competence and effectiveness as a teacher using the quality and significance indicators in Section II.A. * Demonstrate that he/she is an effective advisor and mentor for undergraduate or graduate students. | Clinical Faculty with teaching expectations, are expected to be highly effective teachers, commensurate with their professorial rank. |

### Table 3. Expectations for Faculty Performance in RESEARCH, For Faculty Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure

This table should be read in light of the following statement from *The Handbook*, “When a faculty member’s experience, accomplishments, and career development evolve to the point where expectations applicable to the beginning level of the next highest rank are being met, the faculty member can make a strong case for promotion.” The entry here under Assistant Professor thus applies to a faculty member who looks forward to submitting to pre-tenure review at that rank. Once past this first milestone review, the faculty member should use the entry under Associate Professor as a guide. Though there are faculty at the rank of Professor who do not engage in research, an Associate Professor who aspires to be promoted to Professor should use the expectations under Professor to determine whether he or she is positioned to make a strong case for promotion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assistant Professor** | **Associate Professor** | **Professor** |
| A tenure track Assistant Professor should:   * Approach his/her research in a scholarly manner as defined in Section III * Develop a clearly defined research program in his/her area of expertise; * Have evidence of sustainability of his/her research program; * Disseminate scholarly work off campus; * Disseminate scholarly work in peer‐reviewed journals. * Investigate the prudence and feasibility of securing external funding to support their scholarly activity, as required by the nature of their research. | In addition to continuing the expectations of the Assistant Professor, an Associate Professor who plans to seek promotion or tenure should:   * Demonstrate that he/she is a competent and effective researcher using the quality and significance indicators in Section III. B; * Maintain an established and clearly defined research program in his/her area of competence; * Disseminate scholarly work in venues outside of campus; * Have an established record of peer‐reviewed publications and demonstrate that they are the intellectual driving force behind some of the reported scholarship; * Increase efforts towards obtaining external support to maintain their research program, as required by the nature of their research, if this is prudent and feasible in the context of a long-term research agenda. | In addition to continuing the expectations of the Associate Professor, a Professor should:   * Have evidence that his or her research program has contributed in a meaningful way to the body of knowledge in the area of expertise * Should have national recognition as evidenced by a record of peer‐reviewed publications. * Success in obtaining external support to maintain their research program, should an effort to obtain external funding fit well in the long-term research agenda. |

### Table 4. Expectations for Faculty in the Area of SERVICE

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assistant Professor** | **Associate Professor** | **Professor** | **Clinical Faculty** |
| An assistant professor should:   * Contribute meaningful but limited professional service to the department. * Faculty who have not been involved significantly in Department, College or University level service, should be able to demonstrate significant involvement in service to the discipline. | In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, an associate professor should:   * Have taken on a leadership role in Department, College, University service or taken a leadership role in professional service within their discipline. | A professor is expected to serve on promotion and tenure committees, as necessary to the Department, and otherwise to continue performing at the level achieved at the time of promotion from associate to professor.  This will result in a well‐established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, and significance of professional service activities. | Clinical faculty are expected to perform excellent service, per their FPAs. |