



Kennesaw State University  
Academic Affairs

**Approval Form for Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

A copy of this form, completed, must be attached as a cover sheet to the department guidelines included in portfolios for Pre-Tenure, Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review.

I confirm that the attached guidelines, dated 11 / 27 / 2023, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology in accordance with department bylaws:

Matthew Laposata (P&T Chair)

Nov. 29, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Paul a Jackson

November 29, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (printed or typed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/ Date

College P&T Committee Approval - I Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Davi d Garofal o

November

I van Pul i nkal a

December 1, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (printed or typed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/ Date  
RHM - 08 Sept 16

**Kennesaw State University**  
**College of Science & Mathematics**  
**Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology**





The Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology is committed to achieving the Mission and Strategic Plans of the Department, the College of Science and Mathematics, and Kennesaw State University. These guidelines aim to support and elaborate on the guidelines for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review that have been established by the University System of Georgia (USG), KSU, and the CSM, as applied to faculty in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology.

Because department promotion and tenure (P&T) guidelines are discipline-specific an

## IV. Department Specific Guidelines for Each Area of Review

This section provides examples of specific activities appropriate for each performance area. Disseminated and peer-reviewed products that arise from faculty activities in any performance area are considered scholarship; examples of scholarship for each performance area are also provided. Lastly, this section provides various measures that can be used by the faculty member to demonstrate the quality and significance of their activities and accomplishments. In all cases, the list of examples given is meant to be illustrative and not exhaustive.

### A. Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

As stated in the KSU Faculty Handbook, *“Highly effective teaching and learning are the central institutional priorities of Kennesaw State University.”* As such, teaching and mentoring effectiveness are fundamentally essential for continued faculty employment, tenure, and promotion in rank. In the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology, teaching, supervising and mentoring activities may include, but are not limited to:

- High-quality teaching across a variety of instructional settings (e.g., traditional classroom, online/distance instruction, instructional laboratory, seminar, directed study, tutorials, undergraduate and graduate research and scholarship, field studies, study abroad).
- Incorporating effective pedagogical approaches and active learning into classes through group activities, writing exercises, case studies, instructional technologies, and other approaches.
- Developing and/or implementing new or innovative instructional materials.
- Curricular (e.g., new course, certificate program, or program) development, modification, implementation and evaluation.
- Securing external awards to fund the development and implementation of innovative pedagogical strategies.
- Mentoring students individually and collectively during office hours or extra tutoring sessions.
- Providing students with letters of recommendation.
- Providing advisement to students on issues related to academic progression or professional school and student career matters.
- Mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students in degree programs, particularly in research and scholarly activities.



## B. Scholarship and Creative Activity

The Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology recognizes a process of research that can include idea generation, identification of necessary resources, gathering and analyzing data, theoretical and computational calculations and/or modeling, and disseminating the results at professional meetings and in peer-reviewed formats. All aspects of this process are considered necessary scholarly activity. Scholarship, however, is defined specifically as a creative, intellectual work that is disseminated and professionally reviewed by peers in the discipline. This may include research based on the faculty member's training and expertise ("discipline-based research"), teaching and learning-based research, or other appropriate efforts as defined in the Faculty Performance Agreement.

Scholarly activity in scholarship and creative activity may include, but is not limited to:

- Establishment of an active, focused, sustainable, data-generating, research program.
- Mentorship of undergraduate or graduate students in directed study projects or related research mentorships.
- Establishment of collaborative relationships within the department, college, or university, or with colleagues at other institutions.
- Grant development for external and internal awards.

Research rises to the level of scholarship when it becomes disseminated and peer reviewed. Scholarship includes, but is not limited to:

- Discovery or applied research activities disseminated in peer-reviewed scientific and professionally based journals, monographs, book chapters, and on-line peer-reviewed publications.
- Industrial research that leads to patents, presentations, or publications in refereed journals.
- Publication and dissemination of research in technical reports written for governmental agencies, if the report is peer-reviewed by other professionals in the field.
- Publication of peer-reviewed textbooks and review articles.
- Presentations at professional conferences, consortia, seminars, etc.  
including any presentations produced from student mentorship.
- Externally reviewed grants.

Sources of evidence that can be used by faculty to address the quality and significance of their scholarship and creative activities may include, but are not limited to:

- External evaluation letter(s) from individuals in the candidate's field of research. Such letters are required in the promotion and tenure process and are outlined in [Section 3.12](#) "Faculty Review Process" in the KSU Faculty Handbook.



- Peer-reviewed publications:
  - The impact factor for the journal.
  - The citation number by others in the field.
  - The H index—an index based on a set of an individual’s cited papers (i.e., the number of publications) and the number of citations that they have received in other publications.
  - An external review of the significance of a publication by a peer in the field. Note that the reviewer should disclose their relationship with faculty member in such a letter.
  - For multi-authored papers, the candidate should describe their specific contributions to the work and may include letter(s) from co-authors addressing the candidate’s contributions.
  
- Grants or contracts:
  - Evidence of a funded proposal, such as an award notification from the funding agency.
  - Degree of competitiveness of the program or funding agency, such as the average funding rate of submitted proposals.
  - For awards with multiple Principal Investigators (PIs), the candidate should describe their specific contributions to the proposal and the proposed project and may include letter(s) from co-PIs addressing the candidate’s contributions.
  - For unfunded grant proposals, the candidate should include all reviewer comments, the proposal evaluation score (if one is given by the funding agency) and a copy of the grant application, including cover page with signatures.
  
- Book chapters:
  - Publisher reviews of chapter.
  - External review by editor(s) or by an expert in the field.
  
- Textbooks or books:
  - For textbooks, the candidate should indicate the number of adoptions of their textbook relative to comparable textbooks.
  - External review of the book or textbook by a peer in the field.
  
- Online Publishing of New Curricula or Teaching Materials:
  - Number of adoptions, uses, or downloads.
  - External letters of support from peers or users that address the online curricular materials.
  
- Conference Presentations:
  - Document if presentation was invited.
  - Note quality of conference for the research.
  - Note the scope of the conference (regional, national, or international).





Scholarship of service is distinguished from routine service work by the significance and scope of the leadership and the products produced by the activity. Examples include:

- Authoring a significant institutional document for the department, college, or university.
- Making significant contributions to writing institutional self-study reports, governance documents, or other notable institutional documents.
- Preparing accreditation reports, such as the report required for continued accreditation of the B.S. in Biology and Environmental Science degree programs.

Sources of evidence that can be used by faculty to assess and demonstrate the quality and

- Enriching the student experience (e.g., expanding student participation in local, national, or international conferences, volunteer or networking opportunities, student organizations, QEP engagement, experiential learning, honors experiences, student leadership experiences, study abroad, alumni engagement with KSU, student-facing seminars, summer undergraduate research programs; developing peer-to-peer mentoring).

(see Appendix B for specific examples of Student success metrics)

## **V. Workload Models and Promotion Guidelines**

University guidelines specify that each department will establish flexible guidelines as to the expectations of faculty members in the three faculty performance areas. The Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology and the College of Science and Mathematics recognizes two general workload models for Tenure Track faculty; and workload models for Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Professorial Ranks (e.g., Clinical Faculty) and Non-Tenure Track Lecturers. These models take into consideration departmental, college and university needs, and the professional goals of faculty. It is probable that a faculty member will have different emphases and assignments at different points in their career and will therefore consider transitioning between available workload assignments. The workload model followed will be determined by the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, based on departmental, college and university needs, and specified in the FPA upon approval by the dean. These m

## ***EEOB Tenure-Track Workload Models and Research Expectations for Promotion and Tenure***

- Focus 1: Research model (> 30% RCA Workload)

### *Assistant to Associate:*

One peer-reviewed publication (as lead author, last author, or corresponding author), one funded extramural grant, and a combination of scholarly deliverables appropriate to candidate's research program as agreed upon and elucidated in FPAs.

An estimation of RCA productivity to meet the required scholarly deliverables for this workload model:

### *Publication outcome guidelines:*

1. Have 1 peer-reviewed research outcome for every 10% workload effort in RCA over a rolling 6-year period. For example:
  - a. A faculty member with a 30% RCA workload should have 3 peer-reviewed research outcomes over 6 years.
  - b. A faculty member with a 10% RCA workload is expected to have 1 peer-reviewed research outcome.

### *Grant development outcome guidelines:*

1. Faculty should be active in generating and submitting proposals to funding agencies to sustain their research/scholarship program. This activity may include:
  - a. Submitting proposals to external agencies to support RCA efforts.
  - b. Obtaining grants from external agencies to support RCA efforts.
  - c. Using feedback from an unsuccessful proposal submission to focus projects by:
    - i. Obtaining additional preliminary data to demonstrate proof of concept
    - ii. Reworking proposal concepts based on referee reports.
  - d. Securing internal funding to seed projects and obtain preliminary data to support subsequent proposals to an external agency.

### *Associate to Full:*

Since promotion to Associate Professor: One additional peer-reviewed publication (as lead author, last author, or corresponding author), one additional funded extramural grant that is sufficient to support research goals, and a combination of scholarly deliverables appropriate to candidate's research program as agreed upon and elucidated in FPAs, that lead to candidate demonstrating national recognition in their field.

An estimation of RCA productivity beyond the baseline expectations for this workload model has been provided above.

- Focus 2: Teaching and Mentoring Model ( $\leq 30\%$  RCA Workload)

*Assistant to Associate*

One peer-reviewed publication (as lead author, last author, or corresponding author), evidence of sustained activity and promise of success in securing extramural funding (as indicated by funding agency feedback) that is sufficient to support research goals, and a combination of scholarly deliverables appropriate to candidate's research program as agreed upon and elucidated in FPAs.

An estimation of RCA productivity beyond the baseline expectations for this workload model has been provided in Table 1.

*Associate to Full*

Since promotion to Associate Professor: One additional peer-reviewed publication (as lead author, last author, or corresponding author), one funded extramural grant that is sufficient to support research goals, and a combination of scholarly deliverables appropriate to candidate's research program as agreed upon and elucidated in FPAs, that lead to candidate demonstrating national recognition in their field.

An estimation of RCA productivity beyond the baseline expectations for this workload model has been provided in Table 1.

*Post-Tenure Review*

Scholarly expectations follow the Focus model of the candidate.

*RCA > 30%:*

One peer-reviewed publication (as lead author, final author, or corresponding author) and extramural funding during the evaluation period, along with other expectations as spelled out in FPAs.

*RCA 30%:*

Combination of scholarly deliverables appropriate to candidate's research program as agreed upon and elucidated in FPAs.

**Table 1: EEOB Tenure-Track Research expectations for Promotion and Tenure  
Summary Table for 5-Year\* expectations by RCA Workload.**

See Section IV B of this document for guidance.

RCA workload %	expected peer-reviewed research outcomes (5-years)	additional peer-reviewed research outcomes (5-years)	total peer-reviewed research outcomes (5-years)
10	1	0	1
20	1	1	2
30	1	2	3
40**	1	3	4
50	1	4	5
60	1	5	6



Clinical Professors have strong records of contribution to and leadership in their specialty area. These contributions are in on-campus and off-campus work in clinical, educational, industry, and/or professional settings. Clinical Professors are typically characterized as leaders, mentors, and experts, and these accomplishments merit regional, national, or international attention and recognition. Clinical Professors continue to grow and develop in their clinical specialty area. By policy, the earned doctorate or equivalent in training, ability and/or experience is required for promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor. Neither the possession of the doctorate nor longevity of service is a guarantee of promotion.

The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the tenure-track professorial ranks. A portfolio, following the format and set of deadlines required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures. Clinical Faculty who are hired without credit toward promotion may apply for promotion during the fifth year of service (after serving a minimum of four years in rank). Each review provides feedback for optional promotion reviews as well as the next required six-year review. A successful review for the optional promotion review restarts the six-year performance review cycle.

*Expectations for Promotion by Rank for Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Professorial Ranks (ex. Clinical Faculty) in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology*

*Requirements for the rank Non-Tenure Track Assistant Professor*

Credentials:

1. Holds a Doctorate in the field or related discipline.
2. Maintains appropriate licenses and certifications if appropriate to practice in the clinical area or field-based areas.
3. Maintains professional growth by attending continuing education programs in the profession or field of specialty.

Teaching:

1. Mentors students in the classroom, field-based settings and clinical settings.
2. Responsive to student, peer, and administrative feedback.
3. Recognized as an excellent teacher through student and peer evaluations.

Service:

1. Coordinates assigned courses and provides pedagogical and technical support to faculty instructing these courses.
2. Participates in committees within the Department and College.
3. Actively participates in professional organizations.

Scholarship/Creative Activity and Innovative Project Development is not required but may be negotiated.





*teaching and student learning (or highly effective professional service and/or administration and leadership for lecturers/senior lecturers/principal lecturers with these prima p 6esponsibilities).”* Materials that can be used to demonstrate highly effective teaching can be found in section IV of this document. The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the professorial ranks. A portfolio, following the format required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedu6es, following the same schedule of deadlines. The portfolios for promotion to senior and principal lectu6er should demonstrate exceptional teaching ability and extraord

## Table 2: Expectations for Promotion by Rank for Lecturers in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology in the Performance Area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

General expectations for promotion in rank are described in Section VIII of this document. For promotion, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.

Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
<p>A lecturer should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning. They will be able to demonstrate how this philosophy has guided them in the development and selection of classroom pedagogies and activities for the courses they teach;</li> <li>• Demonstrate that they are a competent and highly effective teacher*;</li> <li>• Mentor incoming lecturers in their area of expertise;</li> <li>• Willing to support students through advising and mentoring.</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to continuing the expectations of a lecturer, the senior lecturer should demonstrate or develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership in curricular development in their area of expertise;</li> <li>• Leadership in advising and mentoring undergraduate in their area of expertise;</li> <li>• Demonstrate highly effective teaching through advanced pedagogical activities (refer to Section IV*).</li> </ul>	<p>The principal lecturer:</p> <p>Is expected to <i>continue performing</i> at the level achieved at the time of promotion from senior to principal lecturer. In</p>

**Table 3: Expectations for Promotion by Rank for Lecturers in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology in the Performance Area of Professional Service.**

General expectations for promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For promotion, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.

Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
<p>A lecturer should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that they have contributed in a meaningful manner to department, college or university service efforts in at least one area.</li> <li>• If they were not involved significantly in department, college or university level service, they should be able to demonstrate significant involvement in service to the discipline.</li> </ul>	<p>A senior lecturer should:</p> <p>Have taken on a leadership role in departmental (e.g., course coordinator), college, university or professional service within their discipline.</p>	<p>The principal lecturer is:</p> <p>Expected to <i>continue performing</i> at the level achieved at the time of promotion from senior to principal lecturer. This will result in a well-established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, and significance of professional service activities.</p>



## **VI. Annual Review of Faculty Performance**

### *Faculty Performance Reviews and the Promotion of Student Success*

As noted in Section 3.1 of the KSU Faculty Handbook (“the handbook”), faculty members at KSU submit regular performance evaluations. These include:

- Detailed annual review of faculty performance;
- Pre-tenure review for tenure-track faculty;
- Review for tenure by the sixth year for tenure-track faculty with professorial rank;
- Post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty with professorial rank after every five years submitted in the beginning of the sixth year;
- Reviews for elective promotion for tenured faculty in the professorial rank (optional);
- Review for elective promotion for non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank, including clinical and research faculty (optional);
- Review for elective promotion for non-tenure track lecturers (optional).

The three performance areas of evaluation for faculty are teaching, supervision, and mentoring; scholarship and creative activity; and professional service. In their performance evaluations, faculty should specifically stress the contributions of their activities to student success. As noted in Section 3.2 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, faculty should highlight activities that promote student success in at least one of the three performance areas of evaluation in both their annual review of faculty performance and in their multi-year performance reviews. In performance reviews for promotion and tenure, faculty members must demonstrate noteworthy achievement in activities that promote student success in one of the three performance areas. For instructional faculty (faculty who teach courses), teaching must be one of the three performance areas in which activities that promote student success are highlighted. Examples of activities that promote student success in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service are provided in Section 3.3 of the KSU Faculty Handbook.

### *Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA)*

The proportion of emphasis, or “workload”, a faculty member gives to each performance area is described in a written agreement between the faculty member, department chair, and dean – a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) – that is submitted annually. As stated in Section 3.2 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, “This agreement will be developed in consultation with the faculty member's supervisor(s), who will have the responsibility to negotiate, assign, and coordinate the distribution of the various activities of individual faculty to assure that the collective work of the department, college, and University is accomplished. The overriding factor in determining the activities of each faculty member must be the needs of that faculty member's college, department, and academic programs.





*Annual Review of Faculty Performance – Single-year Review*

Section 3.12 of the KSU Faculty Handbook describes, in detail, the annual assessment of a faculty performance – through the Annual Review Document (ARD) – in which the faculty relates their contributions in the three performance areas over the previous year to the agreed-upon criteria listed in the previous year’s FPA. As noted in the handbook, the ARD “...will convey accurate information and the criteria by which the faculty member is to be assessed, counseled, and judged. The professional performance at KSU must address the quantity, quality, and significance of the contributions.” Note, the ARD must highlight in one of the three performance areas activities that promote student success.

The ARD is submitted through the digital workflow system using a template specific to the College of Science and Mathematics and faculty performance in each of the three performance areas is rated by the chair on a five-point scale related to the faculty’s workload percentage in each performance area: 5 = Exemplary, 4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Needs Improvement, and 1 = Does not Meet Expectations (see Section 3.12 of the KSU Faculty Handbook for a description of each numerical rating and USG policy on workload percentages and faculty









- The case presented in the narrative must demonstrate a consistent, self-directed progression of professional growth in all areas. The faculty member must communicate a continuity across the years of the review period that transcends individual annual review outcomes.
- External evaluation letters from individuals in the candidate's field of scholarship must be included in the portfolio. For faculty submitting a portfolio requesting promotion from assistant to associate professor and tenure (including early action cases), three external letters will be required. For faculty submitting a portfolio requesting promotion from associate to full professor, three external letters will be required. The majority of letters must come from individuals who are neither coauthors nor dissertation committee members. These letters will evaluate the candidate's research and scholarship products and comment on their significance in the discipline. The candidate and the department chair will collaborate to develop a mutually acceptable, hierarchized list. This process should be initiated early in the spring term to ensure receipt of a letter before the portfolio due date in August. Details concerning external letters can be found in **Appendix A** of this document.
- A favorable review is dependent upon the case made by the faculty member in his/her narrative (and supporting documentation). A poor narrative and/or lack of relevant documentation is grounds for a negative decision.
- Carefully review the guidelines prior to submission, ensuring that the portfolio is complete with all required pages and sections (see the University Handbook Section 3.7).

## **VIII. Expectations for Promotion and Tenure**

To be awarded promotion and/or tenure, a faculty member must meet the expectations for his or her next rank in each performance area of evaluation (i.e. teaching, supervision and mentoring, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service). For faculty who entered KSU at the assistant professor rank or above, the probationary period is 5 to 6 years of service in rank, with a mandatory review for promotion and tenure being conducted in the sixth year of employment according to the University's promotion and tenure calendar.

Faculty members seeking promotion should already be meeting the expectations of the next rank. University guidelines specify the minimum service in rank that is necessary before promotion can be requested: for faculty without credit for previous work experience, 5 years as assistant professor for promotion to associate professor; for faculty receiving credit for previous work experience, 4 years as assistant professor for promotion to associate professor; 5 years as associate professor for promotion to professor. Promotion in rank is based upon performance and established criteria, and not the faculty member's time in service.

The Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology expects that tenure track and tenured faculty seeking promotion in rank and/or tenure will demonstrate effectiveness and leadership in the area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring, develop a focused, sustainable and productive research program in their area of expertise, and demonstrate significant contributions and leadership in the area of professional service. Specific expectations by rank for each of the performance areas are provided in Tables II (Expectations in the Area of Teaching, Supervision and Mentoring), III (Expectations in the Area of Scholarship and Creative Activity), and



**Table 4: Expectations for Promotion and Tenure by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology in the Performance Area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring**

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **tenure**, faculty members must meet the expectations for his or her rank in each area of evaluation. For **promotion**, faculty members must **already be meeting the expectations of the next rank**.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
<p>An assistant professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning. They will be able to demonstrate how this philosophy has guided them in the development and selection of classroom pedagogies and activities for the courses they teach;</li> <li>• Be able to demonstrate that they are a competent and highly effective teacher*;</li> <li>• Be proficient in the delivery of two courses;</li> <li>• Have teaching skills and knowledge sufficient to mentor an in-coming assistant professor in one of the two courses;</li> <li>• Have a clearly defined niche in advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students.</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, the associate professor should demonstrate or develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

**Table 5: Expectations for Promotion and Tenure by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Ecology,**

**Table 6: Expectations for Promotion and Tenure by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology in the Performance Area of Professional Service.**

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **tenure**, faculty members must meet the expectations for his or her rank in each area of evaluation. For **promotion**, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
<p>An assistant professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have evidence that he or she has contributed in a meaningful manner to department, college or university service efforts in at least one area.</li> <li>• If they have not been involved significantly in department, college or university level service, they should be able to demonstrate significant involvement in service to their discipline.</li> </ul>	<p>An associate professor should:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Have taken on a leadership role in departmental, college, university service or taken a leadership role in professional service within their discipline.</p>	<p>The professor is expected to <i>continue performing</i> at the level achieved at the time of promotion from associate to full professor. This will result in a well established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, and significance of professional service activities.</p> <p>*A faculty member who has chosen to excel in this area is expected to have a significant record of leadership roles at department, college, and/or university committees and/or in the professional/academic community.</p>

\* The professor is expected to demonstrate that they are highly accomplished in each performance area. After promotion to associate professor, a faculty member considering promotion to professor must continue to focus their efforts in scholarship and creative activity. In addition, they must excel in one other performance area.





Student Success activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Curricular development, enhancement, implementation, or evaluation	Course and curriculum alignment efforts; developing and implementing a new course (online, in-person), certificate, or degree program, lab manuals, educational software, or textbooks; offering micro-credentials; integrating skill development into the curriculum
Organizing or participating in providing academic supports outside of class	Common study hours, open lab, summer bridge program, course-prep boot camp, online review sessions
Enhancing assessment practices	Developing, implementing, and evaluating the effectiveness of alternative assessments to evaluate mastery of course learning outcomes while considering the nature of the grading scheme and allowing for failure
Developing, implementing, or disseminating (within the CSM, across KSU, or in collaboration with colleagues at other institutions) new or innovative materials, mechanisms, processes or programs for promoting effective, evidence-based practices or assessing teaching and learning	Inclusive practices, active learning, CUREs, flipped classrooms, experiential learning, continuous reflection templates, effectively teaching with technology, rubrics, common assessments
Mentoring, supervising, or incorporating student leaders in new or innovative teaching and learning activities	Training or providing guidance to Teaching Assistants, Learning Assistants, Supplemental Instruction Leaders, Dean's Scholars, or NOYCE Scholars and using their input to improve teaching and learning activities
Mentoring students for a degree program, internships, research experiences, professional or graduate school, or career	Mentoring or supervising undergraduate or graduate students in TSM or SCA endeavors; providing student letters of rec Tce 4- .03 09902 .95999 ref259.68 341.du42

*CSM Guidance for faculty when preparing FPAs regarding student success activities:* a. Working with colleagues is ok; just be sure to indicate your expected individual contribution

- b. Consider the complexity of the activity and include an indication of how much time it will take for you to engage in the activity so that you can speak with your Department Chair about workload expectations
- c. Be clear about how the activity will contribute to student success – be clear about the problem that you are working to address and for whom
- d. Describe how you will know that you have achieved your goals at the end of the year – share your planned assessment of the activity’s effectiveness, give indicators of quality and significance

*Timeline*

