Candidates submitting materials for promotion and/or tenure (P&T) to the Departmental Review Committee (DRC) should consider the following ideas:

1. Faculty must carefully review multiple sources for guidelines of performance and expectations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance section of the “KSU Faculty Handbook”</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Faculty Performance Guidelines”</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Coles intranet</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental By-Laws</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Coles intranet</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Statement of Philosophy and Guidelines for Faculty Performance, Planning, And Evaluation</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>??? Need to “publish”</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- These documents provide important but sometimes incomplete, unclear, and/or conflicting guidelines. As a rule of thumb, standards established in departmental documents trump (i.e., are more specific and rigorous than) college documents, which subsequently trump university guidelines. When in doubt, faculty should consider all criteria and apply the strictest levels from all sources.

2. Faculty should craft their narrative, vita, and binders to:
   - Clearly identify the specific performance expectations of the position (e.g., associate professor, lecturer, etc.) and track (e.g., balance, research). The DRC reviews P&T packages from a wide variety of faculty, so re-stating performance expectations from departmental and college sources will facilitate committee review.
   - Clearly demonstrate achievement across the performance expectations across all areas (teaching, scholarship, service, and, if applicable, administration).
   - Address, not omit or conceal, any potential shortcomings across performance area.
   - Define areas of their expertise and/or specialization (e.g., research topics, course subject matter) within each of the different performance areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and, if applicable, administration.
   - Illustrate specific, tangible achievements among the performance areas whenever possible. The KSU faculty handbook points to considerations with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service.
3. In advance of package submission, faculty must follow established departmental guidelines to validate journal quality of all publications and clearly indicate journal quality in the vita and/or narrative.
   - Faculty should consider weighting of publications by quality (e.g., 1 A+ = 5 C’s) stated in departmental and college guidelines.

4. Although annual reviews (ARDs) should provide direction for appropriate levels of performance and thus indication of potential to advance to higher ranks, the faculty handbook states that “successful reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for promotion to rank.”

5. Following the university faculty handbook, faculty can make a strong case for promotion when their performance meets or exceeds “expectations applicable to the beginning level of the next highest rank.”

6. Following the university faculty handbook, faculty applying for promotion from associate to full professor should demonstrate highly-developed expertise in their field. “A professor is typically characterized as a leader, mentor, scholar, expert, and/or distinguished colleague.”
   - The DRC will generally consider the complete body of work across the faculty member’s career but will place emphasis on the most recent five-year period.

7. Lecturers should realize that they have performance expectations across not only teaching but also service and scholarship.

8. For administrators, the university, college, and departmental guidelines for P&T expectations for faculty with a heavy administrative load (e.g., department chair) are generally unspecific. The DRC will consider the relative strengths of all performance areas (teaching, scholarship, service, and administration) in evaluation of such faculty. Emphasis will be placed on administration, but such faculty should demonstrate performance in all areas.

9. In general, all faculty should feel free to seek insight from the Departmental Review Committee (DRC) for additional insight and clarity not only in advance of preparing your review package but also at any time in their career.

**Additional Points**

We need to sync the departmental “Statement of Philosophy and Guidelines ...” and the by-laws to eliminate any redundancies and conflicts regarding journal quality.

For departmental guidelines, it may be wise to remove references to specific impact factors in relation to journal quality. Impact factors seem to inflate each year, so departmental guidelines may become dated and thus understate “strong” impact factors. Perhaps the documents could rely primarily on relative strength (i.e., top 10%).