

Checklist for Chair of the Department P&T Committee (202 -202)

8 S G D W H 202, Fall

- ¾ During an initial planning meeting, the following discussions should take place:
 - x A chair was elected during Spring 202 semester. The chair should be able to complete and advance the Watermark workflow. If not, or if the chair changes, email facultyactivitydata@kennesaw.edu.
 - x Remind committee members that maintaining confidentiality is a professional obligation of all members. E-mails not a confidential medium, so confidential discussions should not take place by email. Confidential files may be exchanged using OneDrive.
 - x Set up future meeting times and dates.
 - x Faculty members going up for review should not serve on the committee, and no person can participate in more than one stage of the review process. (A candidate under review for PTR can V H U Y H Q R S D W K P F I Q R P P H V E W H F D X V H W K H \ D U H Q R W U H Y L H Z H G E F R P P L J W W H H
 - x Department P&T committees, except for the KSU Library System, have a minimum of three tenured teaching faculty members. Administrative faculty, as defined in Section 3.11 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, are not eligible to serve on Department P&T committees.
 - x Committee members for department P&T committees must be at the same rank or higher than the rank that the candidate is being evaluated.
 - x When there are not three qualified faculty in a department, the department will elect tenured faculty from outside the department to serve on the review committee. Committee members elected from outside the department should come from the same or closely related disciplines or E H I D P L O L D U Z L W K W K H F D Q G L G D W H \ V D U H D V R I H [S H U W E ` 0
- ¾ By September

D O H W W H U F R Q W D L Q L Q J W K H F R P P L W W H H \ V U H F R P P H statement of their assessment of observed strengths and weaknesses is placed in portfolio via the digital workflow. The faculty member receives an email notification via the system, and they can Y L H Z W K H F R P P L W W H H \ V U H F R P P H Q G D W L R Q O H W W H U L Q W K H I response window begins.

- ¾ During the time frame of 1 R Y H P E H U ± ' H F H P E H U committee reviews pre-tenure portfolios for tenure-track faculty.
- ¾ By ' H F H P E H U letter containing a detailed assessment of the candidate's current readiness to be tenured, including a detailed description for each area of performance that addresses how the candidate meets or does not meet the actual expectations for tenure, as well as specific suggestions for maintaining and enhancing further preparations for a successful tenure review in the future is placed in the portfolio via the digital workflow. The letter must address each area of review in detail. A copy of the letter is placed in the portfolio via the digital workflow. The faculty member U H F H L Y H V D Q H P D L O Q R W L I L F D W L R Q Y L D W K H \ V W H P D Q G W K O H W W H U L Q W K H H O H F W U R Q L - Day response window begins D F X O W \ P H P E H U \

Committee Voting

- ¾ Since the committee must make a recommendation (except pre-tenure cases) a voting member must cast his or her vote unless there is a conflict of interest. When there is a conflict of interest, a voting member must disqualify himself/herself prior to the discussion of that portfolio and shall not be present for the discussion or vote on that case. Disputes regarding whether a committee member has a conflict of interest will be forwarded to Academic Affairs. All committee votes are to be by secret ballot. Potential ethical Q discretions during the process may also be directed to Academic

Checklist for Chair of the Department P&T Committee (202 -202)

8 S G D W ~~202~~ Fall

Affairs.

Optional Faculty Member Response

- ¾ Within 10 calendar days from the review recommendation at each level (date advanced in the HOHFWRQLF V\VWHP WKH IDFXOW\ PHPEHU KDV WKH ULJKW recommendation and justifications by submitting a letter into the electronic workflow. This response will become part of the portfolio that will be forwarded to the subsequent levels of review. The response letter should address the interpretation of the information in the portfolio, but it should not include new evidence to be considered in the review process. The reviewer (committee or administrator) does not respond to this letter.

Note: Department P&T guidelines are understood to be primary in promotion and tenure recommendations. Recommendation letters need to reference department P&T guidelines in justifying their recommendations.