I. Introduction

A. Department Overview

The Department of Information Technology is a unit within Kennesaw State University established effective January 2015. The department resides at the Marietta campus. The Department of Information Technology seeks to be recognized as a collaborative and collegial group of scholars who value excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The department seeks to be recognized as active in campus leadership and successful in research activities and funding activities and involving both undergraduate and graduate students. The department offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates.

All faculty members are expected to be leaders in teaching excellence or quickly developing to become leaders in teaching; all professorial ranks are expected to be active in the scholarship of their discipline; and all are to be active in professional service.

Kennesaw State University is a fast-growing Comprehensive University that is developing in quality, depth, and breadth of program offerings and faculty scholarship accomplishments. As the relative importance of scholarship has grown over the years, the level of expectation will continue to mature with an increasing emphasis on quality of scholarship rather than quantity.

B. Department Philosophy

The IT Department supports scholarship and professionalism across the whole range of Information Technology and appropriate related interdisciplinary areas. For example, information security, IT education, and healthcare IT are included in this range as are the five traditional pillars of IT: Programming; Networking; Human Computer Interaction (HCI); Databases; and Web Systems.

The IT Department supports scholarship and professionalism at all levels of scope and significance. For example, one might start a research and development stem at a local conference, e.g., the KSU CETL Research on Learning and Teaching Summit. After feedback from the local level, expand the scope of the stem to the regional CCSC SE Conference on the way up to the national SIGITE/RIIT Conference, and other similar venues.

The IT Department supports all faculty in the creation of their own paths of scholarship and professionalism. For some it might be publications in prestigious journals or presentations at the best conferences; for others it might be creating a new healthcare app; for others still it might be creating an IT solution to a business problem, such as, creating a business continuity plan for a State agency, for others still it might be creating an innovative approach to teaching database or information security or HCI. IT faculty are encouraged to develop deep thinking and writing in their own scholarly and professional development plans, to review them often with the administration, and seek administrative support for such activities.

The IT Department supports all faculty in the development of deep and persistent scholarly and professional relationships both inside KSU and also with appropriate outside organizations. For example, many IT and computing faculty have such a relationship with ABET; some others have relationships with professional organizations and conferences, such as ACM. Following the KSU Faculty Handbook, the choice of the organization should wide-ranging as a) this falls under the
faculty member’s academic freedom in research, and b) computing and IT are very wide ranging today. c) IT is the youngest computing discipline and has not established yet its own research agenda and portfolio. Faculty are supported (as appropriate) for professional development activities.

All Faculty are expected to

1) interact with colleagues in a respectful and professional manner, treating each department member as a valued colleague,

2) abide by relevant professional codes of conduct.

II. Overview of Workload Models

Excerpted from the 2015 KSU Faculty Handbook Section 2.2

KSU provides a common model and vocabulary to describe the varied work faculty members do as well as an agreed framework for discussions of that work. The model establishes some core standards and expectations to be established through the shared governance process:

1) A typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year.

2) All faculty must participate in professional service activities essential to the life of the institution per their rank.

3) The IT department establishes, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught.

4) The IT department establishes, in writing, teaching load equivalencies for scheduled laboratory courses where 1 lab contact hour is counted as .5 credit of a workload hour.

5) The model does not dictate, or even favor, any particular mix of activities. That mix is for individual faculty members and their chairs to agree upon (with their dean’s approval) based on institutional needs and KSU’s shared governance process.

6) Furthermore, tenure-track faculty must produce scholarship in at least one of their performance area(s) of emphasis.

A. The Workload Model and Shared Governance:

Based on KSU faculty handbook, the IT department establishes flexible guidelines as to expectations of faculty members in the following three faculty performance areas:

1) Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring (TSM)

2) Research and Creative Activity (RCA)

3) Professional Service (PS)

B. The Workload Model and Faculty Performance Agreement (See also KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.2 - Overview of Faculty Responsibilities.)

Each individual faculty member shall divide his/her professional efforts among the three faculty performance areas noted. That division of effort will be reflected in a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) between the individual faculty member and the university (see Faculty Handbook Section 3.7). Negotiation of individual FPAs allows for diversity across colleges and departments and, within departments, among individual faculty members. Colleges and departments, in consultation with faculty stakeholders, determine which FPA combinations best suit their college and departmental objectives. FPAs may change from year
to year and even from semester to semester as needs and opportunities change. Consistent with the university’s culture of shared governance, the details of an individual FPA are worked out in consultation between the chair and the faculty member and are subject to final approval by the dean. If the faculty member and the chair cannot reach agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

C. General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks
The IT department employs tenured, tenure-track faculty, lecturers, limited term, and part time faculty. The IT department has multiple workload models available, differing in the significance of contributions in each area of Teaching, Service and Scholarship by rank. These workload models allow faculty careers to unfold naturally and holistically over the course of an academic lifetime, with changing focus of time and energy:

1) Traditional scholarship and research at either modest or intense levels
2) Teaching-centric focus
3) Service-centric focus
4) Balanced workload

Through the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) process, faculty may also negotiate variations on these models, requiring the approval of both the Department Chair and Dean. Table 1. Department Workload Models & Rank-Based Expectations outlines expectations by workload model and rank. The computing accrediting body (ABET) requires that ALL permanent faculty have time for scholarship and professional development needed to remain current in the field.

Expectations vary by rank, workload model, and FPA agreements. Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions in the ARD and FPA and Tenure and Promotion binders and narratives. The workload model expectations (Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory and Noteworthy) do not directly translate to Annual Review Document (ARD) evaluation levels:

1) Exceeds Expectations for the workload model (in all categories)
2) Meets and exceeds the expectations for the workload model
3) Meets expectations for the workload model (in all categories)
4) Minimally meets expectations for the workload model (average for all categories)
5) Does not meet expectations for the workload model (average for all categories)

The IT department requires that all faculty members be excellent instructors. All department faculty members are required to meet ALL of the expectations for the Satisfactory Expectations category under teaching. A faculty member cannot earn a higher standing if they are not meeting the baseline requirements of the Satisfactory Expectations for teaching, regardless of their contributions at the Substantive or Significant levels.

The IT department requires that all faculty members be contributing members of the department community, creating a productive and collegial department environment. All department faculty members are required to meet ALL of the expectations for the Satisfactory Expectations category under service. A faculty member cannot earn a higher standing if they are not meeting the baseline requirements of the Satisfactory Expectations for service, regardless of their contributions at the Substantive or Significant levels.
In relation to the contribution level in each area, the burden of demonstration is on the faculty member, with the determination of contribution level made by the department chair. Faculty going up for promotion are advised that they must be working at the next level.

III. Evaluation of the Quality and Significance of Faculty Accomplishments

A. Philosophy and Intent

The department’s philosophy on evaluating the significance of scholarly accomplishments is evolving toward more defined levels of expectation for different ranks and workload models. One anticipated outcome of this approach is to enable faculty to better gauge and balance their commitments across the three general areas of responsibility: Teaching, Supervising and Mentoring of Students (TSM); Research and Creative Activities (RCA); and Professional Service (PS), while simultaneously encouraging teaching excellence, sustained and excellent scholarship, and effective service activities among all the faculty members. All scholarship should be aligned with the IT or CCSE strategic goals.

In the RCA, TSM and PS areas faculty expectations will be at the Satisfactory or Noteworthy level. The evaluation levels list the MINIMUM evaluation levels for each area. In order to be promoted or tenured, or to receive higher annual reviews, faculty should accomplish Noteworthy levels of achievement as listed in this document for all three areas of TSM, RCA, and PS.

B. Evaluation Levels for each Area

The department recognizes three levels of “significance” for RCA and three levels for TSM and PS. These are defined specifically for each area (TSM, RCA, and PS) in the appropriate section.

**Unsatisfactory:** faculty members do not meet minimum satisfactory expectations.

**Satisfactory:** all faculty must meet satisfactory expectations in each area. In addition, valued and recognized contributions of note and importance.

**Noteworthy:** The highest level of contribution, having demonstrable importance at the high level, peer recognized as significant. This category may also include premier journal publications and the highest levels of external funding.
The following Table 1 describes the Faculty Work-load Models, and Rank-based expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Model &amp; Nominal Teaching Load</th>
<th>Tenure, Rank &amp; Specialization</th>
<th>Teaching Expectations</th>
<th>Service Expectations</th>
<th>Research &amp; Creative Activity Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer* 4-5</td>
<td>Teaching: Lecturer or Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Satisfactory 90% of effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 0-10% of effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 0-10% of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Intensive 4-4</td>
<td>Teaching: Tenured only</td>
<td>Satisfactory 80% of Effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 10-15% of Effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 5-10% of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Workload 3-3</td>
<td>Balanced Scholarship: Tenure track &amp; Tenured</td>
<td>Satisfactory 60% of Effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 10% of effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory Two products per year. 30% of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships-Intensive 2-3</td>
<td>Scholarship: Tenured only</td>
<td>Satisfactory 50% of Effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 25-30% of effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory One product per year. 10-15% of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-Leadership 2-2</td>
<td>Scholarship: Tenure track or tenured</td>
<td>Satisfactory 40% of Effort</td>
<td>Satisfactory 10% of effort</td>
<td>Noteworthy One significant product &amp; submit one external grant proposal per year 40% of the effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Limited Term 5-5</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Satisfactory 100% of effort</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noteworthy One significant product each year plus one external funding award 50% of the effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The Scholarship-Intensive and Research-Leadership workload models require Graduate Faculty Status and are competitively assigned on a year-to-year basis for a term of one year. To apply for this workload model, faculty must have published in “Significant” scholarship venues in the last 12 months, and be in good standing in all other department and university expectations. Faculty on these workload models may re-apply for subsequent years with continued publication of “noteworthy” products.

The number of faculty on the Scholarship-Intensive and Research-Leadership workload models is resource-constrained, and will vary. If the number of faculty applying for this workload model exceeds
the capacity of the department to support, the chair will accept competitive applications and supporting materials with DFC input.

*Non-tenure track faculty

C. **Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students (TSM)**

Consistent with KSU’s guidelines, IT faculty members are expected to be excellent teachers who regularly mentor and advise students and create engaging and welcoming classroom environments that enhance student learning opportunities. Highly effective teaching and learning are central departmental priorities.

1. **TSM Evaluation Rating Scale**

   a. **Satisfactory Expectations: ALL expectations at this level are required for ALL faculty**

   The constantly changing IT field requires dynamic efforts to maintain currency in the field. This level of contribution is characterized by a commitment to teaching and learning, inside and outside the classroom, which sustains instructional excellence and promotes high levels of student achievement. Basic expectations include:

   1) Creates and updates syllabi at the beginning of each term, while adhering to department, college, and university standards, including those necessary for ABET accreditation, such as approved course assessment reports and assessment participation.

   2) Is current in the discipline and pedagogical methods. Continually develops and revises lecture materials, tests, and assignment; designs and updates online sites/presentations and online course management sites; adopts different teaching methods that are appropriate to the courses, and teaches effectively with distance technology if applicable.

   3) Continuous improvement activities: Utilizing course evaluation mechanisms and instruments consistent with the departmental and university teaching effectiveness policy, with written analysis and responsive adjustments to evaluation data.

   4) Holds consistent office hours and is generally available to students. Interacts with students in a timely, respectful and professional manner, treats each student as a valued adult learner.

   5) Receives student evaluations that are consistently at the average range.

   6) All faculty members are required to define a set of courses within the department programs that they are available and committed to teaching [see “Teaching Breadth” section].

   7) Is current in the discipline, continuously introducing into his/her courses the results of his/her own investigation.

   8) Develops new courses as needed for the department

   Graduate faculty may also contribute by mentoring master’s thesis as the committee chair.
b. **Noteworthy Contributions: Satisfactory Teaching Expectations also required.**

Leadership and significant contributions in teaching include, but not limited to, the following:

1) Consistent excellent performance as evidenced by student evaluations.
2) Is recognized by both students and colleagues as a very good teacher.
3) Leads the development and implementation of new or improved: a) course sequences (such as IT 4323 and IT 4333), or, b) concentrations, or, c) program redesign.
4) Chairing thesis and dissertation committees.
5) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring new colleagues.
6) Mentors undergraduate and/or graduate students on research projects, directed studies, and special projects.

c. **Unsatisfactory**

An unsatisfactory rating occurs when a faculty member does not achieve satisfactory rating.

2. **Teaching Breadth**

IT Faculty are expected to provide flexibility in course assignments needed to support our degree programs and meet the needs of our students. IT Faculty are expected to identify the courses that they prefer to support as follows:

1) Faculty will review the teaching-breadth list annually as part of the FPA process.
2) This teaching-breadth list becomes one input into the scheduling process; faculty will be able to indicate their priority choices from the list of courses being offered by programs, and review and provide feedback on the draft schedules.
3) Faculty are expected to teach a course he/she does not often teach but identified on their teaching-breadth at least every 2-3 years.
4) Faculty input and the list of preferred courses and semester priorities, may be overridden by curriculum needs in a given semester.

a. **Faculty with Graduate Status:**

All IT faculty with graduate status are required to identify a list of minimum six primary teaching courses (the list should include at least 1 required graduate course and 1 or 2 undergraduate courses).

b. **All other Faculty:**

All other faculty are required to identify a list of primary teaching courses, consisting of at least 6 courses consisting of 2 lower-division, and 4 upper-division courses, 3 of which must be required courses.

3. **Student Review of Teaching Effectiveness**

All IT classes will be evaluated using two mechanisms:

1) Using the department student survey instrument through the electronic student evaluation of teaching effectiveness survey. This instrument is administered
electronically, with full student anonymity, and with a "chain of custody" that excludes the faculty member being evaluated.

2) Using the teaching effectiveness metrics and process developed for courses to comply with ABET and university program review. (FCAR)

IT faculty are expected to consider and reflect on the feedback provided by these mechanisms on their annual review document. IT Faculty MUST include the electronic student evaluations with their ARD.

A faculty member may utilize additional instruments of their own design for continuous improvement. If intended for use as part of the faculty annual review, the process must include the following features:

1) All evaluation instruments must be anonymous: the student cannot be determined from the information and presentation of the evaluation instrument.

2) All evaluations must be handled outside of the oversight of the faculty member being evaluated. This is to ensure that the faculty member cannot pressure or intimidate student responses (even unintended). The faculty member must not be present during the evaluation, or have control over the evaluation instrument containing student responses.

3) The evaluation instruments must be delivered to the department chair in a “chain of custody” that excludes the faculty member.

D. Research and Creative Activity (RCA) (Categories of Faculty Performance, cont.)

All tenured and tenure-track IT faculty members are expected to participate in research and creative activity, the level of expectation varying with the faculty member’s workload model and FPA.

IT faculty members have traditionally valued a wide variety of scholarly activities that include peer-reviewed publications, textbook-writing, and grant writing that is submitted and reviewed by appropriate agencies. Key to appropriate valuation of scholarship product is the peer-review process and the production of a clearly-defined and reviewable product. Research and creative activity products should:

- Be critically reviewed by professional peers in a Peer Review as described below.
- Be disseminated internally and beyond the university.

1. Quality and Significance

In support of the philosophical goal of creating an environment facilitating faculty to a) pursue external funding for their scholarship; b) disseminate their scholarship in the highest computing publication venues; and c) contribute to service and a positive department culture, a generalized ranking of scholarship quality levels is established in Table 2.

External Funding: The department seeks to encourage and support external funding efforts by recognizing and valuing the preparation and submission of proposals.

Technology Commercialization (e.g., patents or app development): The department seeks to encourage and support the creation of software or technology products for commercial or industry use.
Publication in top journals in computing (such as ACM and IEEE journals) is a lengthy and extremely competitive process. The research itself may easily span 2 years or more of work, and the journal submission, revision, and acceptance process may itself exceed 2 years.

The following Table 2 describes examples of the various levels of Satisfactory and Noteworthy Research and Creative Activities. Many of these activities occur over multiple years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reviewable Product</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Contributions, (not every one of the following is required each year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/College Colloquium (as appropriate) –</td>
<td>Presentation posted internally</td>
<td>Internal Peer Review: Department Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this may be combined with the next contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference attendance and presentation of peer-reviewed</td>
<td>External reviewable product</td>
<td>External Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed and reviewed internal and external grant application,</td>
<td>Grant Application</td>
<td>KSU grants office: Awarded grants see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regardless of whether funded or not. (Frivolous applications are not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognized, may not make it past Grant’s Office.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate publications in magazines, where the review is</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>External Editor or editorial board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>editorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Internal and local funding</td>
<td>Grant Award letter</td>
<td>Internal Peer Review: Grant Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most computing conference and thesis products and</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>External Peer Review: Program committee &amp; reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journals will fall into this category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive External Grants</td>
<td>Grant Award letter</td>
<td>External Peer Review: Grant agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps, web-based application products, or application programs accepted into</td>
<td>App or application program</td>
<td>External Review: App Store/Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noteworthy Contributions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook publications, Encyclopedia articles, book chapters, or edited books</td>
<td>Textbook; Encyclopedia</td>
<td>External Review: Publisher &amp; reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member must explain and demonstrate why their journals and</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>External peer review: Journal reviewers, of national and international venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conferences are of “noteworthy” quality. These must be publication venues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of national and international significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive external funding</td>
<td>Grant Award letter</td>
<td>External Peer Review: Grant agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **RCA Evaluation Rating Scale**

Scholarly and research products include publications, internal and external grant applications and externally funded proposals. They are organized into two general categories:

a. **Satisfactory Expectations:**

Contributions with peer review, and dissemination at local, regional or national levels. The contributions should align with the IT department strategic plan. Peer-reviewed contributions that are disseminated internally and beyond KSU include grant applications, externally funded project proposals, journal articles and conference papers.

b. **Noteworthy Expectations:**

Highest level of peer review with international dissemination. For grant applications and externally funded project proposals, the faculty member should be listed as a PI, co-PI or Senior Personnel (or similar). Consideration should also be given to the # of contributors for impact level. The contributions should align with the IT department strategic plan.

It is on the faculty member to document either Citation Indices, Impact Factors or IT recognized domains that demonstrate the strength of the publication, grant application or externally funded proposal.

E. **Professional Service (PS) (Categories of Faculty Performance, cont.)**

All faculty members are expected to participate in service activities, with the level of expectation varying with the faculty member’s workload model and FPA. Service activities can be to the department, college, university, or discipline. Faculty members need to describe their contribution to the service activity in detail – not just a list.

1. **PS Evaluation Rating Scale**

Service activities are recognized as important contributions, particularly those that support the work and functioning of the department. Specific department service activities are highly valued. Some department leadership roles have teaching reassignment and service activity needs to be factored into workload through, e.g., committee meeting frequency. Service activities need to be aligned with strategic goals and are categorized as follows:

a. **Satisfactory Service Expectations: ALL expectations at this level are required for ALL faculty**

1) Participates in discussions regarding curriculum.
2) Participates in department and college meetings and discussions.
3) Participates in other service activities to support the academic department and college. (such as orientation, preview days, etc.)
4) Attends graduation events. One per academic year – fall or spring term; summer graduation is required if teaching summer term.
5) Serves on department and/or college committees. Serves as elected representatives on university committees.
6) Serves to the discipline, including but not limited to, paper review for conferences and journals, service to national professional organizations, or on program committees of professional conferences.
b. **Noteworthy Service Expectations:** Satisfactory Service Expectation also required

1) Serves as a leading role in department, college or university committees.
2) Serves in department leadership roles (Assistant chair, program leads/coordinators).
3) Faculty sponsor for KSU student organizations.
4) Serves as a leader of civic and community organizations.
5) Frequently performs consulting or training services for business groups within his/her discipline on and off campus; or similar activities.
6) Serves on NSF (or equivalent) grant reviewing panel.
7) Contributions in department leadership roles beyond satisfactory contributions (i.e., ABET coordinator, major departmental or college initiative)
8) Takes a leadership role in external program accreditation. Includes writing external accreditation reports and leading department efforts for accreditation.
9) Develops successful new academic programs.
10) Contributions in leadership roles at the university level beyond satisfactory contributions. (i.e., major committee chairs, taking on a temporary leadership assignment)
11) Contributions to special department initiatives beyond satisfactory contributions.
12) Serves on editorial boards, or as editor of proceedings or journals.
13) Leadership service to national organizations that elevates the university’s national recognition in a positive way. (tenured faculty only)
14) Serves with distinction as a leader in community organizations.

c. **Unsatisfactory**

An unsatisfactory rating occurs when a faculty member does not achieve at a minimum a satisfactory rating.
IV. General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

The philosophy, expectations and workload models in this document apply for departmental expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review. Faculty members who are applying for promotion are expected to already be performing above their level of current expectations (Table 1) and at the rank to which they apply.

A. Interpretation and Adaptation of the University’s General Criteria – by Rank

Faculty members planning to seek promotion and/or tenure should keep in mind these criteria for promotion in the Information Technology Department at Kennesaw State University. Table 1 describes the expectations of faculty at different rank and workload models.

1. Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
   Meet Noteworthy Contributions in the area of Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring (refer to page 7-8).

2. Promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure
   1) Meet Noteworthy Contributions in Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring and Research and Creative Activities.
   2) Meet Satisfactory Expectations in the area of Professional Service.

3. Promotion of Associate Professor to Professor and Award of Tenure
   1) Meet Noteworthy Contributions in Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring and Research and Creative Activities.
   2) Meet Satisfactory Contributions in the area of Professional Service
   3) Demonstrate leadership activities in at least one of the three categories.

4. Post-Tenure Review

The Department of Information Technology places importance on the requirement that all faculty members who have received tenure in the Department continue to be active and productive members of the faculty throughout their careers. The process of post-tenure review, which is undergone by all KSU faculty at five year intervals, is described in the KSU Faculty Handbook.

V. Faculty Review Process

As per the university and college guidelines and the faculty handbook with the following exception:

Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions in the ARD and FPA. The burden of demonstration is on the faculty member, with the determination of contribution level made by the department chair. There is not a direct one-to-one relationship between the expectation levels (Satisfactory and Noteworthy) and Meets and Exceeds, as expectations vary by rank, workload model, and FPA agreements.
VI. Multi-Year Review Schedules
As per the university faculty handbook
http://www.kennesaw.edu/handbooks/faculty/section3_8.php

VII. References
Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook http://www.kennesaw.edu/handbooks/faculty/
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IX. Appendix

A. *Annual Review Document (ARD)*

Please see attached.

B. *Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA)*

Please see attached.