

T&P FAQ's

(Updated 01August17)

1) For 2017, what policies, procedures, and timelines are we following?

Answer: All faculty are following the policies, procedures, and timelines outlined in [Section 3.12](#) of the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook and on the [Faculty Affairs](#) website as well as what is in their Department and College Tenure & Promotion guidelines with the exception of the policies and procedures listed in the table below. These exceptions will follow the 2016-2017 KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.7. The exception **procedures** outlined in the table below appear in the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook and will become effective in Fall 2018 (see #26 below).

Special Notes for 2017-2018 Procedures and Effective Dates

Change in T&P Procedure	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Actions
Switch to P and T (i.e. must be promoted to Associate before being tenured)	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required	Approved by Senate & CDA
External Letters	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required	Approved by President Olens 29 March 2017
Only Professors voting on promotion from Associate to Professor	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required	Approved by Senate & CDA
Tally of votes recommending/not recommending an action	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required	Approved by Senate & CDA

2) **What are we looking for when evaluating a portfolio for tenure?**

Answer: In various parts of Section 3 of the 2016-2017 KSU Faculty Handbook, it is stated that: “Academic tenure is an employment status at the University that assures a tenured faculty member of continuous appointment from contract year to contract year, except under conditions of dismissal for cause (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 4.1.9), termination or layoff of tenured personnel due to program modification (see BoR Policy Manual [8.3.7.10](#)), or financial exigencies. The awarding of tenure is a highly important decision through which the University incurs a major commitment to the individual faculty member well into the future. Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure. It should only be granted to those faculty members whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of their current rank and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University. All tenure track faculty are expected to produce scholarship in at least one performance area. This scholarship must be consistent with departmental, college, and university guidelines. Only under exceptional circumstances will a candidate be recommended for tenure without at least one form of scholarship as articulated in approved tenure and promotion guidelines. In awarding tenure, the University recognizes the long-range value of the faculty member to the institution and ensures them the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the proper operation of the University.

The review for tenure involves a retrospective analysis of how well the individual has met the needs and expectations of the University during the probationary period. Perhaps the greatest value of that retrospective analysis is in how well it informs the judgment of colleagues about the individual’s prospects for future contributions and achievements as a KSU faculty colleague. The fundamental issue underlying the tenure decision is whether, in the judgment of teaching and administrative faculty colleagues, the faculty member will continue to meet institutional needs and expectations in the future. Based on BoR policy (BoR Policy Manual [8.3.7.3](#)), in addition to the minimum criteria above, tenure requires the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Neither the possession of a doctorate nor longevity of service is a guarantee of tenure.”

“In all cases evaluation of faculty performance will be based on evidence of the quality and significance (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.4) of the individual faculty member’s scholarly accomplishments in his or her respective areas of emphasis.”

“Reviewers’ deliberations shall be based on whether or not the candidate has met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in the department guidelines, in light of the evidence presented in the candidate’s portfolio as well as the reviewers’ first-hand observations of the candidate’s professional performance.”

This evaluation is done in the context of KSU being a “Comprehensive University” which is defined by the BoR as follows:

Institutions classified as comprehensive universities offer a number of undergraduate and master’s-level programs with some doctoral programs. Typically, associate-level degrees are not offered at comprehensive universities. Graduate programs at comprehensive universities are characterized as master’s-dominant. While teaching is a core focus at all USG institutions, the emphasis on basic and applied research is heavier at comprehensive universities than state universities or state colleges, but not emphasized as heavily as research universities. It is expected that institutions within this sector will be committed to being world-class academic institutions. (BoR Policy Manual, [Section 2.10](#))

3) **What are we looking for when evaluating a portfolio for promotion?**

Answer: In various parts of Section 3 of the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook, it is stated that: *“The professorial ranks are typically linked to the different stages of career development and accomplishment for university faculty. Faculty members at the different stages of an academic career tend to have different levels of experience, expertise, accomplishment, effectiveness, and productivity. They also tend to have different opportunities for contribution, leadership, and mentorship. Consequently, KSU’s general expectations for faculty performance and for promotion in rank will be dependent on experience levels and the faculty member’s career path.*

Experience is correlated with professorial rank, but years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for a promotion in rank. When a faculty member’s experience, accomplishments, and career development evolve to the point where expectations applicable to the beginning level of the next highest rank are being met, the faculty member can make a strong case for promotion. A decision of promotion will result from a thorough review of a faculty member’s accomplishments and contributions to the University by KSU teaching and administrative faculty colleagues. This review is accomplished in consideration of one’s situation and context and in relation to their stage of academic career development.”

“In all cases evaluation of faculty performance will be based on evidence of the quality and significance (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.4) of the individual faculty member’s scholarly accomplishments in his or her respective areas of emphasis.”

“Reviewers’ deliberations shall be based on whether or not the candidate has met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in the department guidelines, in light of the evidence presented in the candidate’s portfolio as well as the reviewers’ first-hand observations of the candidate’s professional performance.”

This evaluation is done in the context of KSU being a “Comprehensive University” which is defined by the BoR as follows:

Institutions classified as comprehensive universities offer a number of undergraduate and master’s-level programs with some doctoral programs. Typically, associate-level degrees are not offered at comprehensive universities. Graduate programs at comprehensive universities are characterized as master’s-dominant. While teaching is a core focus at all USG institutions, the emphasis on basic and applied research is heavier at comprehensive universities than state universities or state colleges, but not emphasized as heavily as research universities. It is expected that institutions within this sector will be committed to being world-class academic institutions. (BoR Policy Manual, [Section 2.10](#))

4) *How are “portfolios” submitted?*

Answer: Effective Fall 2017, all “portfolios” for all reviews are submitted electronically via Digital Measures. This includes any “3rd year reviews” for non-tenure track faculty that may be required by their department and/or college.

5) *Will there be a cover sheet and a physical, “Binder 1” this year?*

Answer: No. Effective Fall 2017, we will not have a hard-copy cover sheet nor a physical “Binder 1.” All of the required information that was formerly on the cover sheet will be included in Digital Measures.

6) *Can a candidate up for PTR (Post-Tenure Review) serve on a departmental T&P (Tenure & Promotion) committee?*

Answer: Yes, according to the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook (section 3.12B), “A candidate under review for Post-Tenure Review can serve on the department Promotion and Tenure committee, since the candidate’s portfolio starts at the college level.”

7) *For jointly-appointed faculty, whose T&P guidelines should be included in their portfolio, their home department’s or the sharing department’s?*

Answer: Both (unless stated otherwise in the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding)). You should refer to the Joint-Appointment MOU to determine which one takes precedence.

8) *For T&P, the committee should consider the faculty member's cumulative accomplishments, not just those achieved while at KSU. Would this also be true for third-year review though to a lesser extent since a new faculty member may be a newly minted PhD and not have much experience elsewhere.*

Answer: True... to a point. For T&P, accomplishments made at KSU should be given the most weight. But work done elsewhere must also be considered, especially when faculty have been granted “credit towards tenure” and/or are brought in at more senior ranks. The narratives should describe, and the committee should evaluate, the quality and significance of the contributions during the period under review in the three or four areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service and, if appropriate, Academic Leadership). If some of those past, non-KSU accomplishments, coupled with things they've done at KSU indicate to the committee that the candidate will continue being productive into the future, then using the non-KSU accomplishments is warranted.

Ditto for a 3rd year review of “new” faculty where you might need to take into account some work they've done as grad students and/or post-docs. But you need to emphasize to the candidate that their tenure and/or promotion hinges on what they've done at KSU.

9) *A faculty is going through Post -Tenure review and is also requesting a review for promotion, does the T&P Committee/Dept. Chair/Dean have to craft two separate letters or will one covering both reviews suffice?*

Answer: One letter is sufficient. Just make sure that there are two, clearly defined decisions (this would be especially important if promotion is negative, it's got to be absolutely clear as to what the decision about PTR (Post-Tenure Review) is).

10) *How do “signatures” work now that we are using electronic portfolios?*

Answer: When the person authorized to forward the portfolio to the next level of review does so, it will automatically be date stamped and “signed” within Digital Measures. As access to Digital Measures requires LDAP authentication, this is forwarding the document and is considered a digital signature.

10) *Is using “credit for tenure” and/or “credit for promotion” considered “Early” tenure and/or promotion?*

Answer: No

11) Why must decision letters from committees re: tenure and/or promotion be dated and signed by the chair of the committee?

Answer: The signature line provides the information to whom the response letter (if any) should be addressed. The date indicates the date of the decision which must be reported to the Board of Regents, and it begins the 10 day window for a response to be submitted. The date on the Digital Measures record showing when the portfolio was transitioned to the next level of review should match the date on the letter to the faculty.

12) When a faculty member submits materials for required Tenure and Promotion (T&P) review late (almost 48 hours), how should committees handle/address that?

Answer: According to the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.12:

“Queries about Process and Ethical Violations

Proposed revisions to the process are directed to the chair of the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process Review Committee. Committee membership consists of the chairs of College P&T Committees from the previous year. Disputes about the Promotion and Tenure procedures, including structure and content (conflict of interest or conflicting guidelines for example), will be directed to the chair of the process review committee for investigation and resolution. Violations of process (e.g., late letters, committees not elected according to guidelines, etc.), should be reported to the Provost, or his/her designee, as well as to all levels of review. In these cases, the college committee should make a recommendation to the Provost as to an appropriate course of action. Potential ethical indiscretions during the promotion and tenure process should be directed to the Provost, or his/her designee.”

Since your exact situation isn't specifically mentioned, here is what I suggest you do based on my interpretation of the above paragraph:

- 1) In general, late portfolios will not be accepted. It is only under truly extenuating circumstances (medical emergency, death in family) that a portfolio can be submitted after the published deadline. Changes in department/college/university administration or committee structure, having new T&P guidelines, being out of town for personal or professional business (other than medical/family emergencies), or other non-emergency situations are **not** acceptable reasons for missing a deadline.
- 2) The chair of the search committee and/or department chair should inquire as to why the portfolio was submitted late, past the published deadline. (If the search chair investigates, he/she should inform the Dept. Chair of his/her action).
- 3) If it is determined that it was for some legitimate reason beyond the control of the faculty member (e.g., medical emergency, death in family), I suggest just accepting the portfolio and proceeding as normal.
- 4) If the criteria in number 1 were not met, I suggest the chair of the Dept. T&P committee inform the Dept. Chair and Dean as well as the Chair of the College Review committee. The College T&P committee can meet to make a recommendation as to the

appropriate course of action (i.e., recommend accepting the late portfolio or not). If you go this route, the faculty member needs to be notified that you are doing this and refer them to the above section of the KSU Faculty Handbook. IF this is the route you follow, please let the Associate Vice President for Faculty know as the College committee must be convened immediately. Once again, the only reason for granting an exception is a truly extenuating circumstance.

13) *We have a faculty member coming up for promotion and tenure this year. Because of years of credit given to him at the time of hire, this also happens to be his year for pre-tenure review. What is the process for handling his tenure case and pre-tenure review? I assume that the pre-tenure review must be conducted regardless of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) decision at the department level. But, does the faculty member need to submit separate portfolios in Digital Measures (one for P&T, the other for pre-tenure review)?*

Answer: The 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook states:

"A faculty member who is granted two or three years of credit toward tenure may replace the pre-tenure review with a tenure review in the second year in the position (if taking three years of credit toward tenure) or in the third year of the position (if taking two years of credit toward tenure)."

The faculty member does not have to turn in two separate portfolios/narratives.

I'm assuming that this person is a teaching faculty; the faculty must check the "Pre-tenure," "Tenure," and "Promotion" indicating that they are submitting for Pre-tenure **as well as** P&T. The candidate will also indicate how many years of credit they were awarded and how many years of credit they are using.

Committees and Administrators need to clearly state what they are recommending in their letter which is uploaded in Digital Measures. If they approve tenure and promotion, I think that it is clear that the person made satisfactory progress in terms of pre-tenure review. If they recommend neither tenure nor promotion, they really must be very clear about their ruling on the pre-tenure review. Ditto if it's mixed (one way for tenure and the opposite for promotion).

14) *Can anyone serve on and/or vote at more than one level of review?*

Answer: No.

15) *How do we review portfolios of candidates who were at the former SPSU where they may have had different expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion compared to their KSU colleagues?*

Answer: Given the current differences in faculty performance expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion at SPSU and KSU, and while it is expected that faculty at the “New KSU” must meet Promotion and/or Tenure guidelines that advance the mission of the New University, faculty and administrators reviewing candidates must take into account the situational context of those undergoing review. Candidates will be judged at all levels of review in light of their past working conditions and performance expectations, and in terms of the flexible “workload models” available within their department/college at the time they undergo review.

16) *How do we handle the situation where certain departments may not have had T&P guidelines in the past?*

Answer: The current department guidelines for the basis of judging all faculty within that department. However, the situational context of the faculty member must be taken into account when evaluating the portfolio. See also #25 below.

17) *Do portfolios stop after two negative reviews?*

Answer: No. All portfolios eventually make their way to the President regardless of recommendations at any previous level of review.

18) *Are portfolios automatically reviewed by a college committee?*

Answer: No. At the request of the candidate under review, in the event of any negative promotion recommendation(s) among required levels of review, or at the request of any of the review levels, the portfolio goes to the College Review Committee as an appeals committee for a promotion review and recommendation.

19) *Portfolios and Annual Review documents at SPSU were different than what is used at KSU. So what specifically uploaded into Digital Measures?*

Answer: The easiest thing is to simply have all annual reviews, reappointment letters, SPSU SIRS summary letters (“verified” with chairs signature) etc. into Digital Measures. Those documents are the equivalent of KSU’s ARDs (Annual Review Documents)/FPAs (Faculty

Performance Agreements). The faculty must also submit CV in Digital Measures. It would be a "detailed" CV as is normal for their discipline.

The Evaluation materials including "FCARs (Faculty Course Assessment Reports)" and "SIRS (Student Instructional Rating Survey)" (the actual reports, not the summary) would be uploaded into Digital Measures as documentation to which reference is (presumably) made in the narrative. Whether the yearly CVs are removed or remain would be up to the faculty (i.e., they can either take the time to remove all the original CVs or just insert the entire packet from previous years, whichever is easier). The faculty submitting the portfolio must provide the documentation necessary for the reviewers to be able to judge the quality and significance of their work including evaluation of past work and recommendations for the future.

20) *How are “portfolios” submitted in 2017?*

In 2017, all portfolios (promotion, tenure, pre-tenure review, post-tenure review) are submitted using Digital Measures. Full instructions for candidates are at:

http://digitalmeasures.kennesaw.edu/activity-insight/portfolio_candidate_info.php

Full instructions for reviewers are at:

http://digitalmeasures.kennesaw.edu/activity-insight/portfolio_reviewer_info.php

21) *Are external letters required this year?*

Answer: No, not in 2017. They will be required effective Fall 2018 (see #24 below).

22) *Where do I find information about sample narratives, content of portfolios etc.?*

Answer: Most of this information is on the [Faculty Affairs](#) website. Section 3.12 of the KSU Faculty Handbook also contains needed information describing what material needs to be included in the electronic portfolio.

23) *Should we make a copy of all portfolio materials now?*

Answer: No copies of portfolio materials may be made. All material submitted in Digital Measures will be available to all subsequent levels of review.

24) *Changes in some of the process regarding Tenure and Promotion (e.g., switching from “Tenure and Promotion” to “Promotion and Tenure”, Requiring External Letters, etc.) have been discussed. Are those changes effective in 2017?*

Answer: No. In Dr. Papp’s “Campus Update” of November 2015, he stated “...Based on this input, the timeline for full implementation of new guidelines will be delayed until 2018.

Thus, for those going up for P&T in fall 2016, fall 2017, and fall 2018, guidelines to be used are as follows:

For the P&T cycle beginning in fall 2016: current guidelines must be used

For the P&T cycle beginning in fall 2017: current or new guidelines may be used

For the P&T cycle beginning in fall 2018: new guidelines must be used

These changes were subsequently approved by President Olens in the 2016-2017 Academic Year.

Based on the above dates, the following changes in T&P procedures will be implemented as outlined below (see also 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook):

Change in T&P Procedure	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018
Switch to P and T (i.e. must be promoted to Associate before being tenured)	No	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required
External Letters	No	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required
Only Full professors voting on promotion from Associate to Full	No	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required
Tally of votes recommending/not recommending an action	No	Appears in 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook but not implemented	Required

25) As you may know, our college and departments do not have formally approved T&P guidelines to date. Does that mean we default back to the University guidelines and thus the applicant would include Section 3 of the Faculty handbook in his/her portfolio?

Answer:

- 1) Any departments that have any previous versions of guidelines they should use them.
- 2) If there are not any, then you have to make a judgement based on the overall guidelines in the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook.
- 3) If #2 is true, then it will be even more important for letters from all levels justify their conclusions based on the information provided in the portfolio relative to the guidelines in the Faculty Handbook.
- 4) If #2 is true, then go ahead and have the faculty insert the relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook (not the whole handbook) in their portfolios with a note attached to that section indicating that there are no approved department/college guidelines.

See also #15 above.

26) When are portfolios due?

Answer: Pre-tenure/Tenure/Promotion/and Post-Tenure Review portfolios are due by 5:00 pm on the dates listed here:

http://facultyaffairs.kennesaw.edu/docs/resources/Tenure%20and%20Promotion%20Review%20Schedule%202017-2018%2005_02edit.pdf

All submissions are date and time stamped by the system.

27) What goes into the letters written by a T&P committee and those written by administrators evaluating a portfolio?

Answer: At each level, review committees and administrators must make a positive or negative decision on the question of tenure and/or promotion and must write a letter to be placed in the electronic portfolio (original to the candidate, copy to lower levels of review, copy to the Provost). The letter includes the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion and articulates the strengths and weaknesses that contributed to the decision.

Reviewers' deliberations shall be based on whether or not the candidate has met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in the department guidelines, in light of the evidence presented in the

candidate's portfolio as well as the reviewers' first-hand observations of the candidate's professional performance. The letters (those both supporting and denying an action) should cite the evidence presented in the portfolio relative to department, college and/or University guidelines.

28) *If a faculty is simultaneously undergoing review for Tenure and or Promotion and for Post-tenure Review (PTR), how is the portfolio reviewed?*

Answer: If a tenured faculty is under review for promotion and post-tenure review, simultaneously, the portfolio is reviewed by the department's tenure and promotion committee and the department chair only for the promotion review. The portfolio is then reviewed by the dean for promotion and post tenure review. The portfolio is subsequently sent to the Provost for a promotion consideration. If the Provost is inclined not to support a recommendation of previous levels for promotion, if previous levels of review are discrepant for promotion, or if previous reviews are consistently negative for promotion, the Provost sends the portfolio to the college committee for a promotion and post tenure review. The Provost then provides a promotion review and finally the President provides a promotion decision. If the President provides a negative promotion review and the portfolio has not been reviewed by the college committee for post tenure review, this committee will meet and provide this review during spring semester.

29) *Who gets the copy of a letter with the original signature?*

Answer: The letter with the original signature goes to the candidate who submitted the portfolio. A copy is uploaded into Digital Measures.

30) *I want to verify that we are no longer requiring any kind of review of lecturers other than ARDs.*

Answer: Correct, we are no longer requiring any kind of review of lecturers other than ARDs. But if a department wants 3rd year and multi-year (e.g., 6th year), then 1) it needs to go into your department guidelines and 2) all lecturers (and any other non-tenure track (NTT) faculty) must undergo the reviews.

31) Who all should be copied on the T&P letter written by:

- A. Department Committee**
- B. Department Chair**
- C. Committee of Chairs**
- D. College T&P Committee**
- E. Dean**

Answer: From the 2017-2018 KSU Faculty Handbook: "*At each level, review committees and administrators must make a positive or negative decision on the question of tenure and/or promotion and must write a letter to be placed in the portfolio (original to the candidate, copy to lower levels of review, copy to the Provost) [for administrative faculty, recommendation letters must be sent to the candidate's academic supervisors (e.g., department chair, dean) and administrative supervisors (e.g., Director of Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Director of the Division of Global Affairs, etc.).*"

Specifically:

A. Department Committee

Copy to the Provost.

B. Department Chair

Copy to chair of Dept. T&P committee

Copy to Provost

C. Committee of Chairs

Copy to chair of Dept. T&P Committee

Copy to Chair of the candidates department

Copy to Provost

D. College T&P Committee

Copy to chair of Dept. T&P Committee

Copy to Dept. Chair

Copy to Provost

E. Dean

Copy to chair of Dept. T&P Committee

Copy to Dept. Chair of candidate

Copy to chair of College T&P Committee (only if it went to the College T&P Committee)

Copy to the Provost

In all cases, a copy of the letters is uploaded into Digital Measures by the committee chair or the individual writing the letter.