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1 Introduction
The Department is housed within the Coles College of Business at Kennesaw State University. As such, the Department is subject to both the University's and College's Performance, Planning, and Evaluation guidelines.

The purpose of this document is to serve as a primary source of information regarding performance, planning, and evaluation guidelines for third-year, annual reviews and tenure/promotion guidelines for M&E faculty. Departmental guidelines are to illuminate and clarify, but not reinterpret or redefine the guidelines provided by the superior entities. The document also seeks to address any issues specific to the Department not covered by the College and/or University guidelines. If any portion of this document is in contradiction with University or Coles College policy, then University and/or College policy will take precedence. This document may repeat information included in the college and university documents. Statements in this document that are taken from the college or university guidelines are italicized and cited for its source.

2 Distinguishing Departmental Characteristics

2.1 Department of Management and Entrepreneurship Mission Statement

Our mission is to prepare our graduate and undergraduate students for professional opportunities and long-term career success. We seek to accomplish this mission by helping them build critical thinking, problem solving, communication, teamwork, and leadership skills. We emphasize the understanding of global perspectives, ethical standards of conduct, and the value of diversity.

We make every effort to be sensitive and responsive to the needs of the business organizations and sectors of society that we serve. We seek to meet the needs of business organizations by sharing our expertise, contributing to their growth and development, and supplying their needs for professionally competent human capital.

We strive to be creative, highly qualified professionals who make meaningful contributions to the professional and academic management and entrepreneurship communities by sharing our talents with local, state, national, and International organizations. We also strive to share our expertise and to further develop that expertise to best serve our professional organizations.

2.2 Characteristics of the Faculty

A spirit of cooperation and collegiality distinguishes the Department. All members of the Department recognize the importance of helpfulness to colleagues, willingness to share teaching materials, willingness to coauthor or assist with research projects, and
willingness to pitch in on service committees. Members of the Department are encouraged to appreciate the contributions made by others within the Department.

At the time of the creation of this document, the faculty members are at the following levels and tenure statuses. The numbers in the table are simply provided to illustrate the approximate composition of the Department and will change continuously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regents/Untenured</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full/Tenured</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Tenured</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Untenured</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (Perm./Non-Tenure-Track)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty-Tenured</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty-Untenured</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers include Richard Franza who has administrative assignments outside of this department, but his academic department “home” is this department.

2.3 Degree Programs Offered

The Department offers a Major in Management and Entrepreneurship for the BBA degree. Students may also choose to minor in Management and Entrepreneurship.

2.4 College Service Courses Offered

The Department plays a significant role in the business school housing three of the six upper division undergraduate courses required by all business majors: MGT 3100, MGT 3200, and MGT 4199; and three core MBA courses: MGT 8040, MGT 8050, and MGT 8999. Staffing these courses requires significant departmental resources.

3 Process Issues

3.1 Overview of the Performance, Planning, and Evaluation Process

The performance, planning, and evaluation process consists primarily of two closely related activities:

1) **annual evaluations and planning**

   The annual evaluation activity takes place between the faculty member and the departmental chair. This activity focuses on the immediate past year performance for (1) teaching, supervision, and mentoring and (2) professional service whereas research and creative activity is evaluated over a 5-year period. Faculty members are evaluated in up to four categories: (1) teaching, supervision and mentoring, (2) research and creative activity, (3) professional service, and (4) administration and
leadership. In each of the categories, the evaluation can be below expectations,
meets expectations, above expectations, or not applicable.

2) **Tenure and promotion decisions** Promotion and tenure decisions are handled
separately from annual performance evaluations. These decisions are made at
much longer periodic intervals across the employee’s career (usually around a 5
year time horizon). Promotion and tenure decisions are made as follows:
departmental peers, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. A College committee
of peers may be involved if requested by appeal. For more information on the
promotion and tenure process see:
https://web.kennesaw.edu/academicaffairs/sites/web.kennesaw.edu.academicaffai
rs/files/08.sectionfive2012.pdf

The annual evaluations and the tenure and promotion activities are closely related.
*However, years of service or successful annual reviews (achieving or exceeding
expectations) alone or meeting the minimum publications requirements are not sufficient
to guarantee a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision (Coles Performance
Document, Section 5.2.2)*

3.2 Composition of the Department Review Committee (DRC)

Department committees are elected by the tenure-track faculty of the department.
Department committees have a minimum of three tenured faculty members who must be
tenured and have an FPA that specifies 30% or less in the area of Administration and
Leadership outside the department. Non-tenured faculty can be elected to the committee,
however, they cannot vote on tenure and/or promotion decisions, given that tenure
decisions are a peer review process. Thus, only previously tenured faculty will make
tenure and/or promotion decisions. Individuals whose documents are under review at the
department level cannot serve on the review committee. A candidate under review for
Post-tenure review can serve on the Department Review Committee, since the
candidate’s portfolio starts at the college level. *(University Guidelines, Section Five, FH
3.7)*

The DRC is responsible for evaluating Third Year and Tenure/Promotion Portfolios each
year. Candidates should follow the guidelines for binder contents provided in the
appendix (2) of this document as well as guidelines in the Coles and University
documents.

3.3 Additional Promotion and Tenure Criteria

In addition to the University and College criteria, the Management and Entrepreneurship
Department committee will make tenure decisions based on the following criteria:
- The faculty member has completed annual performance evaluations with the
  Department chair and has followed the plans agreed to at those meetings.
- If applicable, the faculty member has shown a commitment to ongoing
  scholarship and demonstrated the ability to maintain their appropriate AACSB
  status.
• Recognize that research expectations for achieving tenure are slightly higher than what is generally expected in order to meet performance expectations. Additionally, lower level publications cannot be combined and converted upward to meet any requirement to have either “B” level or “A” level publications. A single publication in an A+ journal cannot be the sole research output during the period under consideration. (Coles Performance document, Section 5.2.2)

• At a minimum, a faculty member petitioning for promotion to full professor must significantly exceed the performance requirements outlined in the College faculty Workload Track during the period used for the evaluation. Further, a candidate must extensively document the significance and importance of his/her contributions to the relevant academic fields, using a variety of commonly used methods such as citations, awards, recognition by peers in their field and/or the community, leadership in activities in the academic profession, and any other suitable methods that clearly demonstrate the candidate to be a leader, mentor, scholar, expert, and/or distinguished colleague. (Coles Performance document, Section 5.2.3)

3.4 Changing Workload Options

We use the same workload options as the College of Business (see Table 1). There are five workload tracks: Teaching, Balanced-Teaching, Balanced, Balanced-Research and Research-Focused Track. The current faculty members are on tracks as shown in the table below. The numbers in the table are provided for illustrative purposes of the current composition of the Department only and are the status as of the time of this document. These numbers change annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced-Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over time, a faculty member may be reassigned from one workload track to another. A potential movement to a more research involved track (i.e., a movement to the right in Table 1) may only ever be initiated by the faculty member during the annual review meeting. To request such a reassignment, the faculty member must submit a formal letter to the department chair. This letter must provide strong evidence that: (i) the research productivity of the faculty member during the most recent three year period has been well above expectations for the current track and at a quantity and quality reasonably consistent with the expectations of the desired track and (ii) the faculty member has a clear agenda and reasonable prospects for continuing this level of performance in the coming years (demonstrated by, for example, papers under review, working papers, and projects in process). In the event that such a request is denied, the faculty member may appeal the decision of the department chair to the dean of the college. Any such
A reassignment would take effect in the earliest feasible semester given scheduling constraints (no later than the start of the next calendar year).

A potential movement to a less research involved track (i.e., a movement to the left in Table 1) may be initiated by either the faculty member or the department chair during the annual review meeting. A faculty member may request such a reassignment at his/her discretion by submitting a formal letter to the department chair. This letter should include an explanation of why the requested reassignment is in the best interest of his/her own career development and the goals and priorities of the department. The department chair may request such a reassignment if the faculty member has been performing below the expectations of the current track over the most recent three year period, based upon assessments made as part of the annual review process or as part of the tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review process. If following the initiation of such a request by either a faculty member or department chair, the other party objects to the requested reassignment, then the dean of the college will ultimately make the final decision. Any such reassignment would take effect in the earliest feasible semester given scheduling constraints (no later than the start of the next calendar year (Coles Performance Document, Section 3.8).

3.5 Disclosure of Awards, Extra Compensation, Promotion and Tenure

The chair will disclose to the Department on an annual basis faculty awards, promotions, and tenure decisions. The chair may also disclose extra compensation or course releases provided they can be disclosed while maintaining the particular faculty member’s confidentiality and anonymity.

4 Specific Comments on Faculty Activities

Faculty members are evaluated in up to four categories:

1. teaching, supervision, mentoring,
2. research and creative activity,
3. professional service, and
4. administration and leadership.

In each of the categories, the evaluation can be below expectations, meets expectations, above expectations, or not applicable. To exceed expectations the faculty member must go beyond the normal standards that are part of being a faculty member at KSU. It is the faculty members’ responsibility to provide evidence indicating ‘exceeds expectations’ in any of the four categories. We discuss departmental issues and provide evaluation guidance regarding (1) Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring, (2) Research and Creative Activity, and (3) Professional Service. However, the category of Administration and Leadership is so unique to the individual and position that general guidance on evaluation, such as that provided in this document, is not included.
4.1 Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

The following are activities regarded as exceeding the normal expectations of meeting class, availing oneself to students, having a comprehensive syllabus, utilizing appropriate technological delivery platforms, etc. that may be taken into consideration when evaluating teaching:

- Because of the extra effort in teaching large classes, faculty can ask for special consideration when teaching class sizes exceeding normal as determined by the course and circumstances
- Number of different courses taught per year
- Flexibility in meeting the teaching need of the department as it arises.
- New course development
- Innovative use of technology for class communication and facilitation (such as D2L or other University wide software)
- Development of new course activities/projects such as the development of a new case or group activity
- Online course development
- Exceptional Student feedback (formerly known as student course evaluation)
- Teaching awards
- Attendance at teaching training sessions/conferences
- Conducting directed studies
- Taking students on international trips
- Evidence of curriculum development across the departmental course offerings
- **Course coordinator** for core courses/Assurance of Learning (AOL) (Note: These are also listed in the Service area below)

The teaching activities listed above do not provide an exclusive list. Faculty can cite other activities as evidence of exceptional teaching.

Teaching activities such as those listed above may be presented as evidence for use in 1) annual performance review, 2) tenure and promotion portfolios, 3) course releases, 4) teaching assistance (such as a graduate teaching assistance), 5) additional pay, or 6) other consideration.

The faculty member and Department chair discuss teaching activities at annual performance evaluation meetings. The discussion should include the value of the work performed with consideration for both rank and track based on the evidence provided by the faculty member.

4.2 Research and Creative Activity

For each of the workload tracks, the below table indicates the required research productivity expectations for the immediate past five-year period:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Track</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Balanced-Teaching</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Balanced-Research</th>
<th>Research No or limited Doctoral Engagement</th>
<th>Research (Significant Doctoral Engagement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The equivalent of 2Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 3Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 2Bs and 2Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 3Bs and 2Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>Equivalent of 1A and 2Bs in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>Minimal Scholarly activities in research</td>
<td>Some scholarly activities in research</td>
<td>Active participation in scholarly activities in research</td>
<td>Active participation in scholarly activities in research, several of these activities reflect a high level of quality.</td>
<td>Active participation in scholarly activities in research, several of which reflect a high level of quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table reflects ‘other scholarly activity’ in research; however, those individuals on the teaching track are expected to have other forms of professional/scholarly activities related to teaching.

Intellectual contributions are a key component of scholarly activity.

The Department Scholarship Committee (DSC) will maintain both the criteria for ranking scholarship output and the Journal Ranking Benchmark list attached in this document (see Appendix 1). Our Department defines the quality of the scholarship based on the impact and selectivity of the journal in which a paper was published, or the audience and sponsor of the meeting (e.g., national versus regional, professional organizations). Faculty members should refer to the benchmark list maintained by the DSC and submit journal ranking requests prior to annual reviews.

**Weighting of Publications (Coles Performance document, Section 3.7.1):**

The following considerations are applied when evaluating the publication record of a faculty member:

- A publication in an “A+” journal is considered an extraordinary career accomplishment. Such a publication fully satisfies the publication requirements on any track for the 5-year period. Output at this level is greatly rewarded but is not required of any Coles faculty member. An “A+” publication is equivalent to 6 or more “C” publications.
- A publication in an “A” journal is considered a significant academic achievement. Output at this level is rewarded but is not required of any Coles faculty member (except for faculty members on the Research Focused track with Full Doctoral Engagement). An “A” publication is equivalent to 4 “C” publications.
• A publication in a “B” journal is equivalent to 2 “C” publications.
• Lower level publications cannot be combined and converted upward to meet any requirement to have either “B” level or “A” level publications (e.g., 2 “C’s” cannot be counted as 1 “B”; 2 “B’s” cannot be counted as 1 “A”).

The following list of intellectual contributions may be counted as evidence of ‘exceeding expectations’ after satisfying the above acceptable level of scholarship requirements by track:

• Additional peer-reviewed publications exceeding track expectations
• Published textbooks that are intended for academic or professional audiences
• Chapters published in books or monographs that are intended for academic or professional audiences
• Invited or non-refereed articles published in professional journals
• Presentations at professional meetings when peer reviewed
• Grants applied for and received
• Book reviews published in professional journals

Individuals on the Teaching track are required to have one ‘form of scholarship or professional/scholarly activity’ per year. Faculty on the teaching track (such as lecturers and senior lecturers) may satisfy the intellectual contributions requirement through outlets not available to faculty. Scholarship outlets for teaching track faculty include, but are not limited to, the Coles College Working Papers Series, Brown Bag Lunch Presentations, published comment letters to professional exposure drafts, presentations to professional organizations and consulting work.

Scholarly activities beyond the limit on the workload table listed above may be presented as evidence for use in 1) annual performance review, 2) tenure and promotion portfolios, 3) course releases, 4) teaching assistance (such as a graduate teaching assistance), 5) additional pay, or 6) other consideration.

The faculty member and Department chair discuss scholarly activities at annual performance evaluation meetings. The discussion should include the value of the work performed with consideration for both rank and track based on the evidence provided by the faculty member.

4.3 Professional Service

Service activities are designed to contribute to the growth of the faculty member and to the enhancement of the Department, College, University, and academic and business communities. Whatever the individual’s relative emphasis in the performance areas, all faculty members are expected to devote at least 5% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution (University guidelines, Section Five, FH 3.3).
Faculty members are expected to participate in the internal affairs and governance of the department, College, and University. Professional service activities directed at the academic or business communities are equally valued and important, and international service activities are encouraged. A reasonable amount of consulting (see University guidelines, Section 7) with businesses is likely to be beneficial to a faculty member’s professional development, teaching, and research efforts and may be an important component of a faculty member’s maintenance of qualifications. As a consequence, such activities are encouraged but should not interfere with other critical faculty activities, such as teaching, research, and uncompensated service (Coles Performance document, Section 2.3)

College and University guidelines state ‘internal’ service activities are expected (i.e., department, College and University) and ‘external’ service activities (i.e., professional service such as academic or business-related) are encouraged. In order to ‘meet expectations’ in service, faculty members must commit to internal service activities prior to engaging in external service activities.

Internal Service may take a variety of forms such as:
- Chair of University, College, or Department committees
- Other leadership roles on campus at the Department, College, University level or across the University System of Georgia.
- Advisor to student organizations
- Academic advising for students
- Committee membership on University, College, Department, or Professional organizations
- Course coordinator for core courses/Assurance of learning
- Evidence of coordinating, and supervising field placements, co-ops, and internships.
- Evidence of coordinating College or Department support faculty

External Service may take a variety of forms such as:
- Service as an officer in a professional organization in the discipline
- Presentations on professional topics to community groups
- Pro Bono Consulting work related to discipline
- Program coordinator or other leadership roles in professional conferences or meetings
- Organizer of meetings on the KSU campus or success in bringing professional meetings to campus
- Service as a reviewer for books, journal or academic conference articles, or grants
- Service as an editor or on an editorial board of a professional publication
- Service as a paper discussant or a chair of a session at a professional conference
Contribution in each of these above services can be differentially weighted based on criteria such as effort, time commitment and or intellectual contribution. Moreover, the service expectation will differ according to track as per college workload guidelines.

Non-professional community service activities (working with Scouts, church work, etc.), are not recognized unless the faculty member can make a connection with her/his professional responsibilities.

Faculty may cite other activities as evidence of service, provided they can be related to his/her professional responsibilities.

Service activities such as those listed above may be presented as evidence for use in: 1) annual performance review, 2) tenure and promotion portfolios, 3) requesting course releases, 4) seeking teaching assistance (such as a graduate teaching assistance), 5) additional pay, or 6) other consideration

The faculty member and Department chair discuss service activities at annual performance evaluation meetings. The discussion should include the value of the work performed with consideration for both rank and track based on the evidence provided by the faculty member.

5 Third Year, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

5.1 Portfolio requirements – A tenure track candidate for tenure, promotion, or third year review must prepare a portfolio demonstrating the quality and significance of his/her work, consisting of Binder 1 and Binder(s) containing supporting materials (guidelines for binder content are provided in the appendix). A lecturer applying for promotion or undergoing a periodic performance review must submit a portfolio consisting of Binder 1, with the addition of printed copies of teaching evaluations and evidence of relevant scholarly teaching activities and professional activities. Candidates must follow appropriate University, College and department guidelines for submitting portfolios to the DRC committee. (Coles Performance Document, Section 5.1)

5.2 Expectations for Third Year, Tenure and Promotion Reviews, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturer Reviews (Coles Performance Document, Section 5.2)

5.2.1 Third Year Reviews

Candidates are expected to have accomplishments consistent with three years of performance expectations in his/her workload track. At a minimum, a candidate must have a record of scholarship contributions (presentations, working papers, work in progress, acceptable record of submissions, etc.) and a portfolio of papers under review at refereed journals (and preferably resubmissions close to acceptance) suggesting that the candidate will be able to meet the research expectations for tenure. A candidate with
years of experience prior to KSU is expected to have refereed publications for the review period in line with publication expectations for a future favorable tenure decision. Also, as noted in each respective track, effective teaching is a necessary condition for tenure and promotion. A candidate's teaching evaluations should show improvements in the numerical evaluations as the faculty member gains experience in the classroom and receives feedback from peers. Finally, a candidate should undertake an appropriate level of service. The performance of a candidate for Third Year review will be evaluated as Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Working Toward Meeting Expectations, or Not Meeting Expectations.

5.2.2 Tenure Reviews

The awarding of tenure is a highly important decision through which the Department, College, and University incur a major commitment to the individual faculty member. Years of service or successful annual reviews (achieving or exceeding expectations) alone or meeting the minimum publications requirements outlined in this document for the corresponding track are not sufficient to guarantee a favorable tenure decision. Tenure is granted to faculty members whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of their current rank and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness and productivity (see the KSU Faculty Handbook).

5.2.3 Promotion to Full Professor

Expectations for promotion to full professor are outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook. At a minimum, a faculty member petitioning for promotion to full professor must significantly exceed the performance requirements outlined in College document during the period used for the evaluation. Further, a candidate must extensively document the significance and importance of his/her contributions to the relevant academic fields, using a variety of commonly used methods such as citations, awards, recognition by peers in their field and/or the community, leadership in activities in the academic profession, and any other suitable methods that clearly demonstrate the candidate to be a leader, mentor, scholar, expert, and/or distinguished colleague.

5.2.4 Expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers (Coles Performance Document, Chapter 7)

Consistent with university policies, lecturer and senior lecturer positions are not tenure track, and do not accrue any credit toward tenure. Lecturers and senior lecturers are employed for one-year terms. Reappointment of lecturers, senior lecturers, and promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer are dependent not only on their performance in instruction and service but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of Coles College and its departments.

Teaching-Focused Track or the Balanced-Teaching Track describes the general expectations for performance for lecturers and senior lecturers in the Coles College. Lecturers and senior lecturers are reviewed annually for contract renewal by the Department Chair and will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the
department chair every six years. In addition, there will be an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment. This Third Year performance review will provide feedback for promotion to senior lecturer in the sixth year when applicable under the university guidelines. For a positive review for promotion, a lecturer must demonstrate highly effective teaching (potentially coupled with substantial supervising, and mentoring of students) and be significantly engaged in scholarly teaching activities as described in College document. A successful review for promotion to senior lecturer in the sixth year restarts the six year performance review cycle. Third Year and Sixth Year reviews and promotion to senior lecturer will be performed by the department’s Faculty Review Committee.

5.2.5 Post-tenure review (Coles Performance Document, Section 5.2.4)

As stated in the KSU Faculty Handbook, a PTR is more comprehensive and concerns a longer time perspective than the annual performance review. Post-tenure reviews are conducted using the performance expectations delineated in Chapter 3 (College Document), over the most recent five-year period. The performance of a candidate for Post Tenure review will be evaluated as either Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance or Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance.

Once the candidate for Post-Tenure review (and the relevant department chair) is made aware of a decision of Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance, a remediation process (as fully described in the KSU Faculty Handbook) must commence. The maximum time allowed to complete a faculty development plan is three years. During this time, an assessment of progress made on the faculty development plan will be incorporated into the faculty member’s annual performance review. For a detailed description of actions that could be taken if the faculty member has not met the requirements of the faculty development plan after the three year period, see KSU Faculty Handbook, section 3.5.

6 Annual Review Process

This section will include information related to the evaluation of performance during the annual review process. The department and DFC are currently evaluating the performance expectations for teaching and service in the annual review process. This document will be updated when the process is complete and guidelines are provided for evaluating these performance standards.
Table 1 – Requirements to Meet Expectations during the Most Recent Five-year Period (Coles Perf Document, Chapter 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Track</th>
<th>Teaching-Focused (1)</th>
<th>Balanced-Teaching (2)</th>
<th>Balanced (3)</th>
<th>Balanced-Research (4)</th>
<th>Research-Focused (5) (No or Limited Doctoral Engagement)**</th>
<th>Research-Focused (5) (Significant Doctoral Engagement)****</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Demonstrated effective teaching and significant levels of scholarly teaching activities</td>
<td>Demonstrated effective teaching and significant levels of scholarly teaching activities</td>
<td>Demonstrated effective teaching and important levels of scholarly activities in teaching</td>
<td>Demonstrated effective teaching and reasonable levels of scholarly activities in teaching</td>
<td>Demonstrated effective teaching and reasonable levels of scholarly activity in teaching</td>
<td>Demonstrated effective teaching and reasonable levels of scholarly activity in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality service*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses per academic year***</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journal Publications ****</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The equivalent of 2 Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 3 Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 2 Bs and 2 Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 3 Bs and 2Cs in 5 years</td>
<td>The equivalent of 1A and 2Bs in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of scholarship or professional/scholarly activities or other forms of output not normally available to faculty on tracks (2)-(5)</td>
<td>1 per year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly activity in research</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Minimal scholarly activities in research</td>
<td>Some scholarly activities in research</td>
<td>Active participation in scholarly activities in research</td>
<td>Active participation in scholarly activities in research, several of which reflect a high level of quality.</td>
<td>Active participation in scholarly activities in research, several of which reflect a high level of quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Faculty on other workload tracks (1)-(4) are encouraged to participate on dissertation committees and can use this involvement to fulfill their service expectations. But, in order to do so, they would have to have research productivity equal to that of someone on the Research Focused track (5) during the most recent 5-year period.

**Faculty involved in a limited capacity with the DBA program are encouraged to participate on the dissertation committees and can use this involvement to fulfill their service expectations.

***The number of courses may be less due to course releases from grants, awards, programs, recognitions, exceptional publication records (A+ and A level PRJs), etc.

****See Journal equivalencies and departmental journal rankings

*****Faculty who have an extensive involvement in the DBA program, who serve as a faculty course leader for a DBA course, or who chair/co-chair doctoral dissertations.
Appendix I

Protocol for Determining the Assessed Value of Scholarship

This section outlines the process for petitioning the DSC to determine the assessed value of scholarship. The Department Scholarship Committee (DSC) will maintain both the Criteria for Ranking Scholarship Output and the Journal Ranking Benchmark List attached to this document. The Criteria for Ranking Scholarship Output is the core department document to guide the process for assessing value to scholarship output produced by members of the Management Department. The journal ranking benchmark list provides a list of publications and scholarship activities that are representative of the criteria. Journals listed serve as benchmarks indicating the rank of specific scholarly output at the A+, A, B and C level. This list will be used by the Department Chair and faculty committees when evaluating the scholarship output of faculty members for the purposes of annual faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure decisions and determining compliance with workload requirements for each track identified in the Coles Faculty Performance document. Both the criteria and benchmark list as initially approved by the majority of the department faculty and subsequently reviewed and amended by the DSC every two years will be available to all department members and will be maintained on the Coles College intranet.

Faculty members may petition the DSC to provide a specific ranking for any journal publication or scholarship activity not specifically included in the benchmark list. Decisions made by the DSC in response to faculty petitions will be recorded as part of a separate Evaluated Publication list for reference by all department members. Every two years when all publications on the Journal Ranking Benchmark list and Evaluated Publications list will be reviewed by the DSC and the list will be revised as determined appropriate by the committee.

Any department faculty member may, during the school year, petition the DSC to rank additional scholarly output not included on the Journal Ranking Benchmark list using the procedures outlined below. The DSC will evaluate the petition using the criteria provided in Attachment 1.

1. The petition should be submitted using the form provided in Attachment 2 to this document.

2. Petitions will be considered at the next scheduled meeting of the DSC and, if appropriate, the DSC will list the ranking on the Evaluated Publications list.

3. It is the responsibility of the department member initiating the petition to provide all evidence needed by the DSC to determine the ranking of the publication in question. Evidence to be submitted by the faculty member should include:

- An overview of journal information such as that found in Cabell’s or on-line sources. This should include journal title, circulation, readership, submission rates, acceptance rates and referee processes (number of referees, blind review etc.).

- Social science citation index data as provided through the citation reports available through Thompson Reuters web of knowledge found at: http://science.thomsonreuters.com/training/jcr/

- Rankings by credible journal ranking outlets and publications such as that published by Dr. Anne-Wil Harzing or published in respected journals.
• Official journal quality/ranking lists published by peer or aspirant schools that show the rank for a particular journal and other similar journals.

• A statement from the faculty member proposing a specific ranking for the journal in question and providing qualitative evidence of the journal's quality that augments the quantitative criteria discussed above.

• Specific statement of department member contributions to publications where there are more than three authors listed. This should include contact information for the lead author if needed by the committee to determine the contribution of the department faculty member to the publication.

4. The information must be complete, meaning that the submitting faculty member must search and provide all forms of evidence available at the present time.

5. All information must be submitted to a member of the DSC in electronic form so it can be easily shared with other committee members.

6. The DSC will apply the criteria provided in Attachment 1 to determine the assessed value of the publication in question and will add the assessment to the Evaluated Publication list.

Attachment 1

The general criteria for ranking scholarship output are provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>This category includes the most elite journals and publications at this level. These are the handful of journals in a discipline that are consistently viewed as the very top journals; have the highest citation impact factors and Author Affiliation Indices in the field; have very high circulation, readership, and visibility; high submission rates; low acceptance rates; and papers are typically heavily refereed. These journals typically publish the most original and best executed academic research papers. Papers published in these journals have been or will be recognized as making a significant or substantial contribution to knowledge, theory, policy, or practice. This designation is reserved for only the most elite scholarly outputs which have significant impact on the field of research and serves which enhances the reputation of the scholar and Kennesaw State University. Publications at this level are not required of any Coles faculty (they are rewarded, but not required). An A+ ranking for a publication may be indicated when the publication meets the following characteristics:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  - Has maintained an SSCI impact factor of 2.5 or higher for a sustained period
  - Is ranked by reputable ranking sources as among the top 5% of journal outlets. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>• Is ranked in the highest category of publications by peer and aspirant schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>These journals reflect the relatively small number of highest-quality peer-reviewed academic journals in each discipline, and publications at this level are not required of any Coles faculty (they are rewarded, but not required). These are journals consistently classified as being in the top tier levels by most prestigious opinion surveys, published journal rankings, and well-accepted external ranking lists. These journals have significant and substantial circulation, readership, and visibility; typically good submission rates; low acceptance rates; fair to good citation impact factors (but some highly regarded journals may not carry a citation factor); and reasonably high Author Affiliation Indices. These journals are very selective in what is published. The papers are heavily refereed, and these journals publish original and well-executed research papers (excellence in standards). Papers published in these journals have advanced or are likely to advance knowledge, theory, policy, or practice. Publications in these journals are considered significant academic achievements. This designation is reserved for scholarly outputs which have identifiable impact on the field of research and which are widely regarded as a high quality publication outlet consistent with the goals and mission of the Department. For publications of department faculty members, an A ranking may be indicated when the publication meets the following characteristics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has maintained an SSCI impact factor of between 1-2.5 or higher for a sustained period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is ranked by reputable ranking sources as among the top 15% of journal outlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is consistently ranked in the highest category of publications by peer and aspirant schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>These journals reflect the larger number of well-regarded quality peer-reviewed academic journals and most visible peer-reviewed professional journals. Papers in these journals are fully refereed according to accepted standards and conventions. At the very least, these journals should reflect an author affiliation index similar to that of the Coles College's peer and aspirant institutions, have some reasonable consistency in being classified as second tier journals in broadly accepted comprehensive journal publication lists, have modest citation impact factors (when available), and have a reasonable readership and circulation level. These journals publish original research of an acceptable standard. Papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
published in these journals have made or will make a contribution to knowledge, theory, policy, or practice.

For publications of department faculty members, a B ranking may be indicated when the publication meets the following characteristics:

- Has maintained an SSCI impact factor of between .50-1.0 or higher for a sustained period
- Is ranked by reputable ranking sources as among the top 40% of journal outlets.

Is consistently ranked at the mid-level category of publications by peer and aspirant schools.

| C | All other peer-reviewed journals. |
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Tenure & Promotion Review, Third Year Review: Binder 1 and Binder(s) Containing Supporting Materials (Required)

Binder 1

Your portfolio must contain the following, but is not limited to this list

CONTENTS

FRC suggestions in italics • Quotes from KSU Faculty Handbook

Portfolio Cover Page (standard form available on Academic Affairs web pages)

Contents (can use this table of contents, without the suggestions and quotes)

Portfolio Summary Sheet (standard form available on Academic Affairs web pages)

Narrative

"(no more than twelve pages, double-spaced, 12-point type, with one-inch margins). ...The narrative describes the quality and significance of the faculty member’s contributions during the period under review in the following areas as appropriate: Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students, Research and Creative Activity, Professional Service, Administration and Leadership."

Vita

"Vitas should be formatted to clearly demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty members’ accomplishments, especially to those beyond the department. An example of a vitae template can be found on the Academic Affairs webpage."

Annual review materials

Signed Annual Review Letters and copies of ARDs for all years under consideration

Coles College and Department guidelines

Coles Statement of philosophy and guidelines for faculty performance, planning and evaluation (at Coles intranet); Department guidelines and department Journal Rankings (some at Coles intranet)
It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide information in an organized, concise, manner to facilitate the Review process. The following list provides a list of required documents and suggested documents for the supporting materials (Binder 2) in the Review process.

From Faculty Handbook:

Contents of Binder(s) Containing Supporting Materials (Binder 2)
Binder(s) containing supporting materials must contain the following indexed sections, as consistent with the faculty member’s FPA:

Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students

Required documentation:
1. Table illustrating teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the evaluation period
   (See sample provided)
2. Student survey results for all courses (both quantitative and qualitative comments) during the evaluation period

This section contains illustrative evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member’s teaching, supervision and mentoring. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following (college and department guidelines may be more specific):
• Peer review letters
• Course syllabi
• Course materials
• Evidence of student learning
• Evidence of advising activities
• Evidence of faculty development
• (See also Section Three, Assessment of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring.)

Research and Creative Activities

Required documentation:
1. Table illustrating intellectual contributions with departmental ranking for entire evaluation period (See sample provided)

This section contains evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member’s research and creative activity. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following (college and department guidelines may be more specific):
• Excerpts from conference programs/proceedings
• Conference presentation evaluations
• Title pages and abstracts from professional journals or the full article
• Title pages and tables of contents from books or the full books
• Evidence of grant solicitation
• Book, chapter and article reviews
• Copies of exhibit and performance programs
• Photographs of commissioned or exhibited art works

**Professional Service**

Required documentation:

1. Table illustrating department, college, university, and/or professional service for entire evaluation period (See sample provided)

This section contains evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member’s professional service. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following (college and department guidelines may be more specific):

- Committee assignment documentation
- Copies of meeting minutes
- Copies of products developed
- Recognition by others of contributions
- Evidence of statewide, regional, national or international professional service

**Administration and Leadership**

This section contains evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member’s administration and leadership. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following (college and department guidelines may be more specific): Documentation indicating leadership assignments

- Evidence of program evaluation
- Supervisor, peer and employee evaluations
- Copies of products developed
## Online Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for 5-year period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term &amp; Year</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>Class GPA</th>
<th>Teaching Rating</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester 2008</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester 2008</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>MGT 4xxx</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are the minimum requirements to include in the table. Additional information may be added at the faculty member’s discretion.*
Sample Table to be included in Binder 2 for Research Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship between 2008-2012</th>
<th>Department Journal Rankings</th>
<th>Coles Equivalent</th>
<th>Coles College – Balance Track Expectations (for a 5-year period)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article title (2011) – Human Relations</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Equivalent to 4 Cs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article title (2010) - Journal of Managerial Psychology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Equivalent to 2 Cs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article title (2009) - Journal of Managerial Psychology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Equivalent to 2 Cs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Peer Reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Equivalent to 8 Cs</td>
<td>3 Cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholarly Activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Some Scholarly activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are the minimum requirements to include in the table. Additional information may be added at the faculty member’s discretion.
Sample Table to be included in Binder 2 for Service Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department service</th>
<th>College service</th>
<th>University Service</th>
<th>Academic service</th>
<th>Professional service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Committee (2012-2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee (2010-2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are the minimum requirements to include in the table. Additional information may be added at the faculty member’s discretion.