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I. Introduction

- College Overview

The College of Computing and Software Engineering (CCSE) is a unit within Kennesaw State University established effective January 2015, and is composed of three departments: Computer Science (CS), Information Technology (IT), Software Engineering and Game Development (SWEGD). The college resides at the Marietta campus but also has programs, students, and faculty at the Kennesaw Campus. The College of Computing and Software Engineering seeks to be recognized as a collaborative and collegial group of scholars who value excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The college 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 college offers undergraduate and graduate degrees, certificates, and minors.

All faculty members are expected to be leaders in teaching excellence or quickly developing to become leaders in teaching; all are professorial ranks are expected to be active in the scholarship of their discipline; and all are to be active in professional service. Untenured faculty who have recently joined the college are assigned reduced service expectation in their first years, and may have accommodations made to their teaching workload in order to support their development as excellent instructors and scholars. Faculty who have reached the rank of Full Professors are required to be excellent instructors, to lead with service contributions and service leadership, and to have a mature program of scholarship appropriate to their workload model.

Kennesaw State University is a fast-growing Comprehensive University that is developing in quality, depth, and breadth of program offerings and faculty scholarship accomplishments. The university is expected to continue to grow in both size and quality over the next decade, including the creation of additional doctoral degree programs. KSU’s classification as a Comprehensive University recognizes that the role of the faculty member has evolved as the universities’ graduate and doctorate program offerings continue to grow, placing growing emphasis on quality scholarship. Faculty teaching workload models range from a 5-5 lecturer model to the 2-2 Research-Leadership Model with recognition for the traditional teaching-focused faculty member while also supporting faculty focusing on scholarship and creative activity. College and department resources including travel and equipment funds will be favorably allocated to support significant scholarship. 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. Philosophy and Intent

These Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Review provide the overarching framework within which faculty will conduct their activities, how faculty will be evaluated annually, the expectations for faculty tenure and promotion, and how faculty will develop their academic careers within a positive and healthy college and department culture. These guidelines have the following goals:

- To create a clear structure of expectations for faculty, consistent with the university guidelines and requirements.
- Create a positive and healthy culture where each faculty member may pursue their professional activities, interacting in a professional and affirming way with their colleagues.
- Create a structure that rewards the pursuit of excellence and quality in all three areas of accomplishment in which faculty members are evaluated (Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service).
- Create a structure that encourages and rewards the accomplishment of scholarship products of national and international significance.
- To create a structure that supports a range of faculty workload models with different emphasis and allows variance for faculty at different stages of their careers.
- To create a structure to reward service needed to enable the college to thrive and grow, with degree programs that are innovative and thriving.
- Create an environment that nurtures each department faculty member's professional growth in teaching, scholarship and service, and also to motivate each faculty member to participate as valued colleagues contributing to a positive, and productive culture. This implies the creation of guidelines and incentives to motivate faculty toward accomplishing and excelling as is needed to achieve tenure, promotion and growth.
II. Overview of Workload Models within Shared Governance

*Excerpted from the KSU faculty manual, 2014-2015:*

KSU provides a common model and vocabulary to describe the varied work which 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:

- A typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year.
- All faculty must allocate at least 5% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution.
- Each department establish, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught.
- Each department must establish, in writing, equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research), be formally negotiated and incorporated into the faculty assessment process.
- Each department must establish, in writing, teaching load equivalencies for writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio and field experiences, etc., or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities.
- 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.

**The Workload Model and Shared Governance:**

Each department and college will establish flexible guidelines as to expectations of faculty members in the following four faculty performance areas:

- Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring;
- Research and Creative Activity;
- Professional Service;

Department review guidelines are most discipline-specific and are approved by deans and the Provost/VPAA as consistent with college and university standards, department guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for T&P decisions.

**The Workload Model and Faculty Performance Agreement**

Each individual faculty member shall divide his/her professional efforts among the three faculty performance areas noted above with Administrative Leadership as an option limited to faculty serving specific roles. 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.
III. Basic Categories of Faculty Expectations

- Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students
Consistent with KSU’s guidelines, CS 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 University, College, and Departmental priorities.

**Basic Expectations:** *All expectations at this level are required of ALL faculty*

The constantly changing CS field requires dynamic efforts to maintain currency in the field. Basic expectations include:

- Creating and updating syllabi at the beginning of each term, while adhering to department, college, and university standards, including those necessary for ABET accreditation.
- Continually developing and revising lecture materials, tests, and assignments.
- Designing and updating online sites/presentations.
- Developing and practicing personal teaching philosophies, consistent with the department’s mission.
- Interact with students in a respectful and professional manner, treating each student as a valued adult learner.
- Learning and improving different teaching methods, such as individual instruction, individual and group projects, and pedagogical innovation.
- 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.
- 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].

**Substantive Contributions:** *Basic Teaching Expectations also required.*

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.

- Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students on research projects, funded research projects, directed studies, special projects, and serving thesis committees.
- Teaching with distance technology.
- Contributing to development and implementation of innovative curriculum, courses, and pedagogy.
- Teaching an appropriate range of courses to support program needs.

**Significant Contributions:** *Basic Teaching Expectations also required.*

Leadership and Significant Contributions in teaching include, but not limited to, the following:

- Consistent excellent performance as evidenced by student evaluations with measurable accomplishments of learning objectives at a high level.
- Leading the development and implementation of innovative course sequences and concentrations, and program redesign.
- Leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of new pedagogy paradigm.
- Chairing master’s and doctoral thesis and dissertation committees.
Full-Time Faculty “Teaching Breadth” and Planning Requirement

Faculty are expected to provide flexibility in course assignments needed to support our degree programs and meet the needs of our students. Faculty will review a list of six preferred teaching courses, and review this list annually as part of the FPA process. This also becomes an input into the department scheduling process. Faculty will have an opportunity to review and provide feedback on draft teaching schedules.

This policy does not say that in a given year faculty will have to teach all of those six courses, and faculty preferences must be secondary to the needs of the programs and curriculum in any given semester.

Faculty must identify a minimum of six preferred teaching courses:

1. **Faculty with Graduate Status:** Faculty with graduate status are required to identify a list of at least six preferred teaching courses, consisting of the following at a minimum:
   - 2 graduate courses
   - 1 lower- or upper-division course

2. **All other Faculty:** All other department faculty are required to identify a list of at least six preferred teaching courses, consisting of at a minimum:
   - 2 lower-division
   - 2 required upper-division courses.

3. **Office hours Fall/Spring/Summer:** The office hours must be posted next to the faculty's office door.
   - Full-time faculty: 1.5/2 hours of on-campus office hours per 3/4-credit course section (regardless of enrollments). On-campus office hours should be distributed over 2 or more days. Full-time faculty has the option to offer up to 20% of his or her office hours virtually.¹
   - Part-time faculty: 1.5/2 hours per 3/4-credit course section (in which a minimum of 1 hour should be on-campus).
   - Part-time faculty with only fully online courses: 1.5/2 hours per 3/4-credit course section of virtual-office-hours¹ with availability on campus by appointment.
   - Program Coordinators: additional 4 on-campus office hours distributed over four days.
   - Assistant Chair: additional 6 on-campus office hours distributed over four days.

¹ **VIRTUAL OFFICE HOURS:** Like on-campus office hours, virtual-office-hours’ time frame and days should be listed in the syllabus. Virtual-office-hours need to be synchronous (Skype, GoToMeeting, Collaborate, Facetime, etc.). Necessary info and instructions required for students to participate in virtual-office-hours should be shared with the students on the first day of class. Like on-campus office hours, faculty should honor their virtual-office-hours.
Student Review of Teaching Effectiveness

All college classes will be evaluated using two mechanisms:

1. Using the department student survey instrument through Digital Measures. 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.

Computing faculty are expected to consider and reflect on the feedback provided by these mechanisms on their annual review document.

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:

- All evaluation instruments must be anonymous; the student cannot be determined from the information and presentation of the evaluation instrument.
- 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.
- The evaluation instruments must be delivered to the department administrator or chair in a "chain of custody" that excludes the faculty member.
Research and Creative Activity (Basic Categories of Faculty Performance, cont.)

All 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.

Computing faculty members have traditionally valued a wide variety of scholarly activities that include peer-reviewed publications, textbook-writing, patent applications, and grant proposal submissions. Key to the 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 must:

- Be critically reviewed by professional peers
- Be disseminated beyond KSU

Scholarly and research products are organized into three general categories:

- **Basic Contributions.** Modest contributions with low-level peer review, and low-levels of dissemination (may be localized to KSU).
- **Substantive Contributions.** Peer-reviewed contributions that are disseminated beyond KSU.
- **Significant Contributions.** Highest level of peer review with national and international dissemination.
- **Highly-Significant Contributions:** This category is reserved for premier journal publications and the highest levels of external funding. *No workload model requires this level, these achievements exceed expectations.*

Details on evaluating Computer Science scholarly activity and significance are included in Section IV.
• **Professional Service** (Basic Categories of Faculty Performance, cont.)

All faculty 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. 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. Service activities are categorized as follows:

- **Basic Service Expectations.** All expectations at this level are required of ALL faculty.
  - Participate in discussions regarding curriculum.
  - Participate in department and college meetings and discussions.
  - Interact with colleagues in a respectful and professional manner, treating each department member as a valued colleague.
  - Participate in other service activities required to support the academic department and college.
  - Abide by the Computer Science Department Professional Code of Conduct as set forth in the department bylaws.
  - Participate in Department Seminars.
  - Attending Graduation Events.
  - Serving on department and college committees.

- **Substantive Service Contributions.** Basic Service Expectations also required.
  - Leading ad-hoc committees.
  - Leading formal department committees
  - Service on the DFC.
  - Serving as elected representatives on university committees.
  - Serving in department leadership roles (Assistant Chair, program leads).
  - Service on program committees of professional conferences.
  - Service to national professional organizations.
  - Serving as ABET Accreditation Evaluators.
  - Developing external program review and accreditation documents.
  - NSF grant reviewing panel.
  - Reviewing papers for conferences and journals.
  - Faculty sponsor for student organizations.
  - Collaborating with public schools to strengthen teaching quality and to increase student learning.

- **Significant Service Contributions.** Basic Service Expectations also required.
  - Contributions in department leadership roles beyond substantive contributions.
  - Developed new academic programs.
  - Contributions in leadership roles at the university level beyond substantive contributions.
  - Contributions to special department initiatives beyond substantive contributions.
  - Leadership service to national organizations that elevates the university’s national recognition in a positive way.
The College of CSE values service in the preparation and review of program accreditation and program review documents. The department recognizes the contributions of tenured faculty for the creation of program review and accreditation documents as Substantive or Significant service accomplishments. Faculty who are on the Teaching Intensive or Service Intensive workload models may also count these as "scholarship of service" products.

- **Administration and Leadership** (Basic Categories of Faculty Performance, cont.)

  Administration and Leadership refers to activities of the Department Chair, Assistant Chair, Program Directors, Center Directors, and Program Coordinators. Activities may include:
  - day-to-day operational management of some administrative function or program
  - budgeting and budget reporting
  - strategic and operational planning
  - scheduling courses and events
  - supervision of faculty and/or staff
  - staffing functions, including screening, hiring and training employees
  - conducting performance reviews of faculty and staff
  - marketing degree programs and activities

  Each role has basic expectations set out in a job description and described in the department bylaws (Article III. Section 3). Leaders are expected to strive for and achieve accomplishments and success above the level of basic expectations.
IV. Evaluation of the Quality and Significance of Faculty Scholarly Accomplishments

PHILOSOPHY AND INTENT: The 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, Scholarship, Service) in order to encourage teaching excellence, and service activities. Service activities are valued because they are necessary for creating a productive and supportive environment for developing faculty, leading to promotion to the senior ranks, and to foster Scholarship and Creative Activities.

A positive synergistic outcome of this approach is to support faculty who wish to engage in the highest tier of scholarly activities, including publication in the top journals. This transition in emphasis is a needed prerequisite for the maturation of our department as a part of the maturation of Kennesaw State University as a Comprehensive University and strengthening of faculty credentials for participation in doctoral dissertation mentoring.

- Definitions of Scholarly Activity and Scholarship

Computing faculty members have traditionally valued a wide variety of scholarly activities that include peer-reviewed publications, textbook-writing, and grant proposal submissions. 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 must:

- Be critically reviewed by professional peers.
- Substantive and Significant contributions must be disseminated beyond the university.
- Basic contributions are not required to be disseminated beyond the university.

B. Definition of Peer Review

Peer Review is the process of evaluating one’s creative work by other experts in the same field. The process requires the independence and anonymity of the reviewers in order to achieve objective and unbiased evaluation of the work being reviewed, and to discourage favoritism. A “Peer reviewed”, manuscript must have been:

1. Blind or Double-Blind reviewed: The reviewers are not aware of the author(s) and their institution(s), and in the case of double-blind review, the author(s) are also not aware of the reviews.
2. Reviewers must have a high-level of expertise in the subject area of the review.
3. Authors whose manuscripts are being reviewed must not be involved in the review and disposition of their own submissions, including assignment of reviewers, communication with reviewers, handling review results, processing review scores, and acceptance/rejection decision making.
4. For reporting of scholarship products, an author who is serving on a conference committee or journal board in any capacity to which he/she has also submitted a product to be peer-reviewed, must disclose the details of their service role, and explain with specifics how their submissions were handled so as not to compromise points 1, 2, and 3 above.
A. Quality and Significance

In support of the philosophical goal of creating an environment and incentives to enable faculty to choose to pursue the highest computing publication venues, while also contributing to service and a positive department culture, a generalized ranking of publication venues and objective quality levels is established in Table 1. Computing scholarly activities and publication venues are grouped into general categories of significance. All recognized activities must have a visible “product” that can be examined and evaluated.

Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions in the ARD and FPA and Tenure and Promotion binders and narratives.

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

Technology Commercialization: The department seeks to encourage and support the creation of software or technology products for commercial or industry use. Technology Commercialization income stream greater than $500 must go through KSU either through grants office, a center, or the department; OR the project is approved as an “outside activity” by the Chair and KSU VP of Research.

The college recognizes four levels of “significance” for scholarship, research and three levels for Service and Teaching. These are defined specifically for each area (Teaching, Service, and Scholarship) in the appropriate section.

- **Basic:** all faculty must meet Basic expectations in each area.
- **Substantive:** Valued and recognized contributions of note and importance.
- **Significant:** The highest level of contribution, having demonstrable importance at the high level, peer recognized as significant.
- **Highly-Significant:** This category is reserved for premier journal publications and the highest levels of external funding. No workload model requires this level; these achievements exceed expectations.

Publication in *Highly Significant* top journals in computing (including 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. CS faculty travel funding to present research at national and international conferences is limited, tending to favor local and regional publication opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reviewable Product</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Contributions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Colloquium. <em>(ALL faculty are required to participate in the Department Colloquium every year.)</em></td>
<td>Presentation posted internally</td>
<td>Internal Peer Review: Department Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed and reviewed grant application, regardless of whether funded or not.</td>
<td>Grant Application</td>
<td>KSU grants office: <em>Awarded grants see below</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate publications in magazines like “Communications of the ACM”, where the review is editorial</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>External Editor or editorial board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Internal Grants</td>
<td>Grant Award letter</td>
<td>Internal Peer Review Grant Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantive Contributions:</strong> All other peer-reviewed publication venues not included in the higher levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference attendance and presentation of peer-reviewed submission.</td>
<td>Presentation posted internally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most computing conference and thesis products and journals will fall into this category (i.e. Conferences and journals with at most 40% acceptance rates or top-tier conferences in the respective research area)</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>External Peer Review: Program committee &amp; reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive External Grants funding.</td>
<td>Grant Award letter</td>
<td>External Peer Review: Grant agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook publications.</td>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>External Review: Publisher &amp; reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Contributions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member must explain and demonstrate why their journals are of “significant” quality. These must be publication venues of national and international significance.</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>External peer review: Journal reviewers, of national and international venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive External Grants (equal to or greater than $50,000)</td>
<td>Grant Award letter</td>
<td>External Peer Review: Grant agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly Significant Contributions:</strong> <em>This level is not required at any Workload Model, and EXCEEDs expectations.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member must explain and demonstrate why their journal is “Highly significant”, using accepted peer-based standards including but not limited to external rankings, journal impact factor, acceptance rate, citations, awards, acknowledgements, and review letters. These must be publication venues of national and international significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial competitive external funding award or technology commercialization income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTES:</strong> 1) Conference proceedings, regardless of how they are titled, are conference proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. 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 2) and at the rank to which they apply.

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 College of CSE at Kennesaw State University. Table 2 describes the expectations of faculty at different rank and workload models.

B. Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
   Meet Substantive Contributions in the area of Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring (refer to page 5).

C. Promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
   Meet Substantive Contributions in the area of Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring (refer to page 5).
   Meet Significant Contributions in the area of Scholarship. (refer to page 8).
   Meet Basic Expectations in the area of Professional Service (refer to page 9).

D. Promotion of Associate Professor to Professor
   Meet Substantive Contributions in the area of Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring (refer to page 5).
   Meet Highly-Significant Contributions in the area of Scholarship. (refer to page 8).
   Meet Substantive Contributions in the area of Professional Service (refer to page 9).

E. Post-Tenure Review
   The College of CSE places importance on the requirement that all faculty members who have received tenure in the College 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 after receiving tenure, is described in the KSU Faculty Handbook.
VI. General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks

The college employs tenured, tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and part-time faculty. The 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, and
3. Service-centric focus.

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 2. Department Workload Models & Rank-Based Expectations outlines expectations by workload model and rank. The computing accrediting body (ABET) requires that ALL 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 (Basic, Substantive, and Significant) do not directly translate to Annual Review Document (ARD) evaluation levels:

- Exceeds Expectations for the Workload Model
- Meets Expectations for the Workload Model
- Minimally Meets Expectations for the Workload Model
- Does Not Meet Expectations for the Workload Model

Faculty going up for promotion are advised that their argument is strengthened if they are already performing at the next rank and/or are making contributions above their level of expectation at their current rank.

Table 2. Department Workload Models & Rank-Based Expectations as both level of effort (percentage of annual time) and level of contributions.

[With additional variations approved by Faculty, Chair, and Dean, 2/2014.]
Nominal Teaching Load is exclusive of administration teaching reductions, and reductions earned through grant buyouts. At most one course per semester may be a grant buyout.

<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 Expectations (ref: Table 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Term 5-5</td>
<td>Teaching: Lecturer</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer 4-5</td>
<td>Teaching: Lecturer or Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90% of Effort</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Intensive 4-4</td>
<td>Teaching: Tenured</td>
<td>Basic &amp; Substantive</td>
<td>Basic &amp; Substantive</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80% of Effort</td>
<td>15% of Effort</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed-Workload</td>
<td>Service:</td>
<td>Basic, Subst. &amp; Significant</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>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 &quot;Significant&quot; 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 “Significant” 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Basic &amp; Substantive</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech Commercialization Tenured</td>
<td>70% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Workload</td>
<td>Pre-Tenure</td>
<td>Basic &amp; Substantive</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>60% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced Scholarship</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Two products per year. 30% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>10% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship-Intensive</td>
<td>Pre-Tenure</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Significant and Substantive: One substantive product and one external grant proposal submission as PI per year. 45% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>50% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-Leadership</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Significant: One significant product each year plus one active external funding award. 55% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>Any Rank and tenure status.</td>
<td>Basic &amp; Substantive</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>40% of Effort</td>
<td>5% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40% of Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Faculty Review Process

As per 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 (Basic, Substantive, Significant) and Meets and Exceeds, as expectations vary by rank, workload model, and FPA agreements.
VIII. Multi-Year Review Schedules
As per university and college guidelines and the faculty handbook.
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