

Workload Policy (effective spring semester 2019) **College of Architecture and Construction Management**

This document sets forth the Workload Policy of the College of Architecture and Construction Management and contains three divisions:

- 1. Workload Policy: College of Architecture and Construction Management**
- 2. Workload Policy: Department of Architecture**
- 3. Workload Policy: Department of Construction Management**

Preface

The College of Architecture and Construction Management formed a Workload Policy Committee consisting of membership of the college and departments faculty councils (CFC and DFC with the department chairs as de facto committee co-chairs). The committee charge from the dean on Oct 30, 2018 was to develop a Workload Policy as part of the college's and department's shared governance documents, guides, and policies that will serve as a guide, metric, and serve as a critical inclusion in each faculty member's FPA (Faculty Performance Agreement) beginning in spring semester 2019.

1.0 Workload Policy: College of Architecture and Construction Management (CoACM)

The College Workload Policy sets overall quality control and quality consistency comprehensively for each department. Each department has a unique policy relative to and consistent with the appropriate standards of its discipline yet consistent with the Kennesaw State Faculty Handbook and the policies of the College.

- 1.1 Definitions: These definitions may be repeated in subsequent department policies but they are set forth here as a consistent College standard.
- 1.2 Consistent with the Georgia Board of Regents, the College of Architecture and Construction Management uses two terms to define levels of achievement in the promotion and tenure, pre-tenure, and post-tenure and evaluation processes, specifically, “noteworthy” and “satisfactory” defined as follows:
 1. “Noteworthy” achievement is that which attracts attention because of some special excellence in an area.
 2. “Satisfactory” achievement is that which is sufficient or meets the needs of a specific area

1.1 Workload Policy Relative to Each Department

The CoACM Workload Policy recognizes that workload is reasonably and correctly defined differently in the Department of Architecture and the Department of Construction Management

1.2 Workload Policy Document Organization

1. Section 1.0: College of Architecture and Construction Management
2. Section 2.0: Department of Architecture
3. Section 3.0: Department of Construction Management

2.0 Workload Policy: Department of Architecture (Do_ARCH)

2.1 Purpose

This document sets forth the Department of Architecture's (DoARCH) metrics for faculty workload in the area of teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity [R/S/CA] and service. It should be seen as part of the department's shared governance documents and a companion document to the existing Promotion and Tenure (P&T) document. The P&T document sets forth the standards and procedures for awarding promotion and tenure in the Department of Architecture and it serves as a guide for identifying activities that are applicable to the metrics set forth in this document.

2.2 DoARCH Workload Metrics

The DoARCH Workload Metrics are in compliance with the policies and procedures of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures of Kennesaw State University. It is based on A Survey of Faculty Workload Practices at R3 Universities and Recommendations for KSU by the Voorhees Group LLC, a survey of Accredited Architecture programs in the region, the Promotion & Tenure policy at KSU, the Department of Architecture's Promotion & Tenure documents and established practices, and the American Collegiate Schools of Architecture's (ACSA) Research and Scholarship for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointments in Schools of Architecture 2017. The document has been approved by the Department Faculty Council, the Provost and submitted to the department chair and the dean for implementation.

Several working assumptions were identified during the course of the document's preparation. The faculty workload metrics for the Department of Architecture at KSU shall:

1. be compatible with standards and operating procedures at the University level
2. provide meaningful objective R/S/CA metrics for performance expectations consistent with expectations of an R-3 institution and comparable to other ACSA and NAAB accredited architecture programs
3. establish R/S/CA metrics that ensure maintenance of the highest degree of excellence within the Department of Architecture
4. maintain an awareness that evaluations shall take into consideration the faculty members' cumulative achievements
5. focus on R/S/CA metrics that can be implemented in a spirit of consistency, equity and fairness
6. reflect the collective understanding and discretion of the faculty regarding their responsibilities as members of the Architecture faculty
7. provide meaningful guidance and assistance to the dean, the department chair and the faculty as a whole in matters of faculty performance evaluation

This metric shall establish expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty, as well as recommendations for annual performance.

2.3 Overview of Faculty Workload Baselines

Kennesaw State University has established a baseline workload metric for tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. That baseline is a minimum 60%, 20%, and 20% respectively (otherwise known as 60|20|20). The Department of Architecture maintains this metric as its baseline. For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, the baseline workload metrics are 90%, 0% and 10% respectively (or 90|0|10).

Workload adjustments are made from these baselines depending on whether or not a faculty member is meeting expectations in the current model and on changes in career focus that a faculty member may initiate. Only in the case that a faculty member is externally funded (and in other such cases of workload reassignment by the chair and approved by the Dean) shall the faculty workload be adjusted from the 60%, 20%, and 20% baseline.

2.4 Categories for Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure

The Department of Architecture recognizes the three categories of evaluation identified under the KSU Faculty Handbook (3.3 Basic Categories of Faculty Performance) Evaluation of Faculty-Faculty Ratings Form. These are consistent with the categories for criteria for promotion and tenure as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook (3.5 General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review). Those categories are as follows:

1. Teaching
2. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity (RSCA)
3. Professional Service

Faculty shall demonstrate evidence of “noteworthy” achievement in the faculty performance categories of 1) Teaching and, 2) Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity For Promotion and Tenure. A minimum level of “satisfactory” must be evidenced in the faculty performance category of 3) Professional Service. Tenure-track Faculty should keep these standards in mind when considering their annual and three-year reviews.

2.4 Definitions

Consistent with the Georgia Board of Regents, The College of Architecture and Construction Management uses two terms to define levels of achievement in the promotion and tenure, pre-tenure and post-tenure, and evaluation processes. The two levels are “noteworthy” and “satisfactory”, and are defined as follows:

“Noteworthy” achievement is that which attracts attention because of some special excellence in an area and/or field of study

“Satisfactory” achievement is that which is sufficient or meets the needs of a specific area and/or field of study

2.5 Timelines

The P&T document assumes timelines of a three-year and five-year schedule for evaluation of faculty performance, likewise the post-tenure evaluation establishes a five-year threshold. The current document adopts a similar timeline for faculty performance expectations. It establishes:

1. three-year FPA (that should also identify the individual faculty member’s workload goals and objectives)
2. annual performance recommendations
3. three-year performance expectation metrics
4. five-year performance expectation metrics

2.5 Rolling 3-Year Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) Metrics

The Department of Architecture uses a three-year format for the FPA, understanding that career, scholarship and creative activity goals require both planning and implementation that may exceed the requisite annual timeline.

The Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) is a “look forward” document. It represents an informal contract between the faculty member and the chair. It should provide a description of the faculty member's intended activities and goals related to Teaching, R/S/CA and Service that advance the faculty member’s expertise, as well as the mission of the department, college and the university.

The Department of Architecture makes the following recommendation for FPA expectations:

2.5.1 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

1. Outline of Goals in support of Teaching,
2. Timeline for achieving goals and objectives
3. The FPA is aspirational, the faculty members shall choose to identify R/S/CA and/or Service achievements in support of their individual career goals and objectives
4. Faculty shall identify any professional development that will be engaged in support of reaching their stated goals and objectives, including workshops, potential funding sources to be pursued, collaborations that should be sought, etc.

2.5.2 Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

1. Outline of Goals in support of Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service
2. Timeline for achieving goals and objectives
3. The FPA is aspirational, the faculty members shall identify R/S/CA achievements in support of their individual career goals and objectives that they will be working toward. Those R/S/CA achievements should be based on the metrics chart below, such that they represent (in any combination) the three-year workload assignment
4. Faculty shall identify any professional development that will be engaged in support of reaching their stated goals and objectives, including workshops, potential funding sources to be pursued, collaborations that should be sought, etc.

5. Faculty shall identify any area of leadership, consistent with their area of expertise, where they are making a significant contribution to the department. This may come in the development of specific agendas like; programs (educational, outreach or scholarship), development and or coordination of labs, chairing annual conferences or symposia, etc.

2.6 Teaching

The KSU faculty handbook states that “All teaching faculty are expected to emphasize excellence in teaching...” Further, the handbook states that “Teaching effectiveness at KSU will be assessed and evaluated not only from the perspective of the teacher’s pedagogical intentions, but also from the perspective of student learning,” and that “every faculty member is expected to demonstrate scholarly activity in all performance areas.”

2.6.1 Teaching Workload

The standard faculty course load for a 60% teaching assignment is three, 3-credit, courses per semester and six, 3-credit, courses per academic year.

2.6.2 Teaching Metrics

Excellence in a scholarly approach to teaching is reflected in myriad efforts that include development of pedagogy, maintenance of expertise, and leadership. The department of Architecture evaluates faculty teaching holistically, meaning the entire range of faculty performance is taken into consideration. To demonstrate excellence in a scholarly approach to teaching, all faculty are expected to:

1. Revise courses from semester to semester; making these revisions deliberately and then systematically assessing the effect of the revisions on students’ learning
2. Demonstrate the ability to achieve the objectives of the courses being taught. The department of architecture offers the NAAB accredited professional B.ARCH program which is subject to NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC) which are assigned to specific courses. Faculty shall first and foremost teach to the SPC objectives assigned to the courses they are taught to ensure compliance with accreditation standards.
3. Demonstrate proficiency in, and continued pursuit of, the subject matter to which their teaching responsibilities have been assigned
4. Demonstrate leadership in curricular development
5. Collect and evaluate outcome data regarding student learning. These shall include:
 - 5.1 Student Course Evaluations (individual data)
 - 5.2 Department Self-Assessment Reports (collective data)
 - 5.3 Faculty may supplement the above (a & b) with targeted surveys of their own design to address data not covered in the standard reports or to collect feedback on specific strategies they are implementing in their courses. To be considered as part of the evaluation process these shall be included in the annual, tenure or post-tenure review packets
 - 5.4 Faculty in the Department of Architecture should maintain Student Course Evaluation averages in the range of 3.00 – 4.00 to be consistent with the department's overall mean scores. Faculty whose mean scores fall in the range of 3.00 – 3.50 will be considered satisfactory, above 3.50 would be consistent with noteworthy performance. Ranges that include means below 3.00 indicate necessary improvement.*

- 5.5 Over a rolling five-year period, the faculty shall participate in at least three Professional development activities related to teaching. These may include, but are not limited to the following:
 - 5.5.1 Internal KSU Academic workshops focused on teaching and learning (i.e. CETL, Faculty Learning Communities, etc.)
 - 5.5.2 External Academic workshops focused on teaching and learning
 - 5.5.3 Professional workshops focused on teaching and learning
 - 5.5.4 Disciplinary workshops that support currency in teaching subject areas

*While Student Course Evaluations ratings can provide a baseline for comparisons of performance from the perspective of student evaluations, they shall not be considered the sole means of evaluation. Additionally, the use of Student Course Evaluations should take into consideration participation, less than 30% participation will not yield reliable statistical data and therefore should warrant less weight in the overall evaluation of teaching. To ensure statistically valid data from the Student Course Evaluations, faculty shall dedicate class time to the on-line evaluation process.

2.7 Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA)

The KSU faculty handbook states that “Scholarly researchers ... approach their scholarship and creative activity in a systematic and intentional manner. They have a clear agenda and plan for their work in this area.”

In keeping with the Department of Architecture’s commitment to the advancement of traditional scholarship, professional practice and creative activity, accomplishments in the area of academic achievement are expected to be of high quality and of scholarly, artistic and/or professional significance.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity is broadly defined to encompass a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge, understanding, application, problem-solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy. It includes the scholarship of: discovery, integration, interpretation, application, as well as the scholarship of pedagogy and learning both within and across disciplines, artistic creativity, and professional practice. Activity in these areas becomes Research / Scholarship and Creative Activity when the work is formally shared with others and thus is subject to review of its quality, value and significance. It shall be peer reviewed, subject to editorial review or external criticism. To provide objective evaluation of creative and professional activities, these too must have a level of peer review to be considered.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity shall be considered for evaluation if it is relevant to the faculty’s area of scholarship and/or expertise, teaching, and/or professional work, and if it serves to advance their field or cognate disciplines. In cases where scholarship is a joint effort with others, there must be clear articulation and evidence of the extent and role of the faculty member in the execution of the work. Therefore, percentage credit may be assigned for collaborative work.

Faculty performance metrics and evaluations shall take into consideration the faculty member’s cumulative achievements. Consistent with the Architecture Programs P&T documents, evidence to support R/S/CA may fall under four general categories; Research / Scholarship, Professional and Creative Activities. The P&T Policy establishes equivalences for research and scholarship in each of these categories. For the purposes of this policy, R/S/CA shall refer to these four areas; traditional Research / Scholarship, Professional Work, and Creative Activities.

While academia holds a high priority on publications, the Department of Architecture recognizes that R/S/CA comes in many forms and that faculty may pursue additional avenues to achieve their individual career and R/S/CA goals and objectives either in tandem or

individually. Types of evidence of achievements to support R/S/CA* in the Department of Architecture may include, but are not limited to the following:

- a. Publications subject to editorial review such as books, edited magazines, journals or other publications. The degree of contribution to the R/S/CA profile of the faculty member depends upon the breadth of distinction and degree of impact of the publication.
- b. Publication in peer reviewed journals or peer reviewed conference proceedings**
- c. Curated Exhibitions of academic, professional or creative work
- d. Public Commissions – Public commissions shall come from a formal committee that has determined the quality and importance of the work, thereby constituting peer reviewed.
- e. Awards for academic, professional or creative work
- f. Funded Research
- j. Awarded Grants and sponsored programs
- h. Awarding of additional academic degrees
- i. Invited Lectures, Presentations or Juror at other academic institutions or professional organizations. Such invitations shall come from a formal committee that has determined the invitee possesses a specific expertise, thereby constituting a peer review process.
- j. Citations and or Reviews of academic, professional or creative work.
- k. In some instances, Service may be move toward R/S/CA.*** Consistent with the KSU Faculty Handbook, “service can move toward scholarship as it meets some or all of the following criteria:
 - i. The service is documented as intellectual work
 - ii. There is evidence of significance and impact from multiple sources
 - iii. There is evidence of individual contributions
 - iv. There is evidence of leadership
 - v. There is dissemination through peer-reviewed publications or presentations
 - vi. There is dissemination to peers, clients, the public, patients, etc.
 - vii. There is peer review of the professional service
- l. Un-awarded Grant applications and Private Commissions - while not published or peer reviewed this work, if critical, rises to a form of research investigation that leads to R/S/CA and contributes to the overall R/S/CA profile of the faculty member.
- m. Unfunded Research, Professional and Creative work – while not published or peer reviewed this work, if critical, rises to a form of research investigation that leads to R/S/CA and contributes to the overall R/S/CA profile of the faculty member.

* For a comprehensive list and definitions of R/S/CA achievements [see Architecture P&T Document]

** Faculty are encouraged to seek publication in journals and conferences recognized as of high academic or professional standing. Examples include, but are not limited to: ACSA National and Regional conferences, ACADIA, AIA annual conference, SAH, JAE, Architecture, Venice Biennale, etc.

***Service work is typically collaborative and as such there must be clear articulation and evidence of the extent and role of the faculty member in the execution of the work. In instance

where there is evidence that the service work is the effort of one faculty member it may rise to the level of category 1.

2.7.1 Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Metrics

In keeping with the Department of Architecture’s Promotion and Tenure Policies, the following chart of RSCA achievements and the percentages applied to each, shall be used for fulfillment of the annual workload metrics. Faculty with a 60|20|20 workload shall fulfill a list of R/S/CA achievements that total 20% for the year, faculty with a 60|30|10 workload shall fulfill a list of RSCA achievements that total 30%, and so on.

Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4
Progress toward the publication of a Book (33% annum)	Peer Reviewed Publications and Conference Proceedings, Exhibitions, Public Commissions, Awards, etc [a,b,c,d,e]	Funded Research, Grants, Sponsored Programs [f,g]	Awarding of additional academic degrees or licensure [h]
<i>RSCA Contribution</i>	<i>RSCA Contribution</i>	<i>RSCA Contribution</i>	<i>RSCA Contribution</i>
<i>Per instance 20% applied to annual workload</i>	<i>Per instance 20% applied to annual workload</i>	<i>Per instance 20% applied to annual workload</i>	<i>Per instance 20% applied to annual workload</i>
Category 5	Category 6	Category 7	Category 8
Invited Lectures, Jurors, or Presentations, Reviews, Citations [i,j]	Service Scholarship*** [k]	Grant Applications, Private Commissions, etc. [l]	Unfunded Research, Professional or Creative Work [m]
<i>RSCA Contribution</i>	<i>RSCA Contribution</i>	<i>RSCA Contribution</i>	<i>RSCA Contribution</i>
<i>Per instance 10% applied to annual workload</i>	<i>Per instance 10% applied to annual workload</i>	<i>Per instance 5% applied to annual workload</i>	<i>Per instance 5% applied to annual workload</i>

2.7.2 Annual Review RSCA Metrics

The Department of Architecture recognizes that R/S/CA achievements do not fit into discrete 12-month time-frames and that most significant work may be done over a period of several years. The annual review shall then be used to gauge / evaluate and measure the faculty member’s progress toward achieving their goals and objectives relative to Teaching, R/S/CA and Service as outlined in the three-year FPA.

In cases where scholarship is a joint effort with others, there shall be a clear articulation and evidence of the extent and role of the faculty member in the execution of the work. Wherein, co-authorship shall be applied on a percentage basis toward R/S/CA achievement.

To assist Faculty, Chairs and Deans in annual evaluations, the Department of Architecture makes the following recommendations for annual evaluation metrics, based on a twenty percent (20%) R/S/CA workload assignment:

2.7.1.1 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers have no requirements for R/S/CA in the standard workload agreement. Should the faculty member negotiate to include a ten percent (10%) R/S/CA, any combination of RSCA achievements in the above metric would apply.

2.7.1.2 Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

Faculty members shall identify any combination of R/S/CA Achievements, from the metrics chart above, that total their workload assignment (10% / 20% / 30%), assuming the quality meets at least the "satisfactory" definition per the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guideline Shared Governance Document.

2.7.3 Three-Year Review RSCA Metrics

The three-year review shall be used to measure the faculty member's progress toward achieving their individual goals and objectives relative to Teaching, R/S/CA and Service as outlined in the three-year FPA. To assist faculty, Chairs and Deans in the three-year evaluation, the Department of Architecture makes the following recommendations for annual metrics, based on R/S/CA workload assignments:

2.8.2.1 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers shall have [no] requirements for R/S/CA in the standard workload agreement. Should the faculty member elect to negotiate and include a ten percent (10%) R/S/CA, any combination of R/S/CA achievements in the above metric would apply.

2.8.2.2 Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

Faculty members shall identify any combination of R/S/CA Achievements, from the metrics chart above, that total their workload assignment (10% / 20% / 30%), assuming the quality meets at least the "satisfactory" definition per the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guideline Shared Governance Document.

Faculty members shall also demonstrate Leadership - identified progress toward, or accomplishments in the development of specific agendas such as; programs (educational, outreach or scholarship), development and/or coordination of labs, chairing annual conferences or symposia, etc.

2.7.4 Five-Year Review RSCA Metrics

The five-year review, which may correspond to tenure application or post-tenure review, should be used to measure the faculty member's progress toward achieving their individual goals and objectives relative to Teaching, R/S/CA and Service expected of the Department of Architecture for noteworthy performance by a faculty member. To assist faculty, Chairs and Deans in five-year evaluations, the Department of Architecture makes the following recommendations for annual metrics, based on R/S/CA workload assignments:

2.7.4.1 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers have no requirements for R/S/CA in the standard workload agreement. Should the faculty member negotiate to include a ten percent (10%) R/S/CA, any combination of RSCA achievements in the above metric would apply.

2.8.4.2 Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

Faculty members shall identify, any combination of R/S/CA Achievements, from the metrics chart above, that total their workload assignment (10% / 20% / 30%), assuming the quality meets at least the "satisfactory" definition per the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guideline Shared Governance Document.

Faculty members shall also demonstrate Leadership - identified progress toward, or accomplishments in the development of specific agendas such as; programs (educational, outreach or scholarship), development and/or coordination of labs, chairing annual conferences or symposia, etc.

2.8 Professional Service

The KSU Faculty Handbook defines professional service as when faculty use “their knowledge and expertise in a service opportunity to the University, the community, or their profession.” A faculty member’s Professional Service shall be balanced, where applicable, among University, College, and Departmental obligations, regional and national professional organizations, and community municipalities and organizations.

The Department of Architecture recognizes that Professional Service comes in varying types. Service can respond to an organizational responsibility, contribute to a collegial environment, form a part of one’s own professional development, contribute to student recruitment, or advance the standing of the Architecture Program within the professional architectural community. All of these types of service are valuable and contribute to a well-functioning and successful Department, College and University.

As per the department of architecture’s P&T documents, examples of faculty service are as follows:

- 2.8.1 Service to Department, College and KSU - service comes in the form of committee activity and the necessary charges of any faculty in the daily and yearly academic functions of the department, college and university.
- 2.8.2 Service to the Profession - service to the profession comes in the form of the lending of expertise to professional organizations. It falls to the faculty to identify where the professional service is directed, using the following guidance:
 - 2.8.2.1 What professional community receives the service?
 - 2.8.2.2 Is the professional service to an academic organization (NAAB, ACSA, AAUP, for example), to a professional organization (AIA, for example) or to a Creative organization (artists’ guild etc.)?
- 2.8.3 Service to the Community – the application of expertise pro bono to a community municipality or organization. This may come in the form of serving on boards, chairing committees or in the form of consultancy.

While the application of one’s personal time to charities and the community is of value in establishing the faculty member as a role model of community involvement and activism for its students, nevertheless, if this community service does not serve to advance the mission of the department, college or university it therefore is not considered as part of an individual faculty member’s professional service obligation.

In Annual Review Documents, simply listing service activities does not address the role played, the unique contribution made, nor the alignment between these activities and the mission of the Department, College, University or Profession. The faculty member shall discuss their individual contributions in the context of the Department or the College mission, and indicate the quality and significance of their Professional Service activities.

The College Dean and Department Chair shall attempt to distribute service and workload assignments equitably among all faculty members, and said services shall generally total a minimum ten to twenty percent [10% | 20%] of their service workload.

2.9 Balanced Distribution of Service Activities

Faculty members shall work with the Department Chair to maintain a balanced distribution of Service contributions in order to support both the faculty member’s career goals and the equitable functioning of the Department. In order to achieve this balanced distribution, some

descriptions are outlined and provided below to aid in gauging the time and impact of various service contributions:

- 2.9.1 **High Impact Service** may come in the form of leadership service roles where the faculty member has a primary or shared responsibility for accomplishing the mission, vision, or goals of an organization, task force or committee. High Impact Service may be accomplished at the Departmental, College, University, State, Regional, National or International level. This can be supported with documented outcomes and products of the Professional Service provided.
- 2.9.2 **Significant Service** may come in the form of service roles where the faculty member contributes a significant amount of time and expertise toward accomplishing an important task or goal. Significant Service may include elected or volunteer positions that call for the application of expertise, intellectual contributions or a significant amount of time and effort over the course of a semester or academic year.
- 2.9.3 **Organizational Service** may come in the form of participating in committees for the purpose of representing the Department or College in University communication or collaboration efforts. Organizational Service often calls for a minimal time commitment, but supports the successful functioning of the Department, College and |or University.

2.10 Annual Review Professional Service Metrics

Outlined below are descriptions and guidelines for time commitment and magnitude of engagement for various assigned service and committee contributions in order to establish an equitable and balanced baseline for what constitutes satisfactory or noteworthy, performance of faculty service contribution to the KSU and or professional community.

2.10.1 For Satisfactory performance in Professional Service

- 2.10.1.1 At a minimum, all Faculty members shall be expected to [satisfactorily] perform and demonstrate an active level of engagement and participation in the referenced service[s], as assigned by the Department Chair, and meet the required committee or required time commitment, for supporting the successful functioning of the Department, College and or University.
- 2.10.1.2 At a minimum, tenure-track and tenured faculty members are encouraged and expected to be engaged and demonstrate membership on 2-3 committees per 10% professional service workload. per semester, per academic year, where chairing and or co-chairing a committee is desirable.
- 2.10.1.3 Faculty members shall anticipate at a minimum one hundred twenty [120] hours per 10% of professional service workload assignment. This is consistent with the Faculty Workload Working Group's recommendation that "The minimum 10% service workload assignment equates to approximately 120 hours per academic year, with colleges and departments determining the expected type and indicators of quality".

2.10.2 For Noteworthy performance in Professional Service

- 2.10.2.1 The faculty member shall demonstrate an active engagement and participation in a leadership role of the referenced service[s], serving as a member, chair, coordinator, etc., and exceed the required committee or time commitment, while supporting the successful functioning of the Department, College, University and or an organization at or beyond the State, Regional, National or International level.

2.10.2.2 The faculty member engages in additional professional service obligations over and above those assigned by the department chair and exceeding the minimum requirements of satisfactory performance. These may come in the form of invitations to serve on special committees of the university, taking on additional service workload with the department or additional outside professional service loads.

3.0 Workload Policy: Department of Construction Management

Nothing in this document supersedes the Kennesaw State University (KSU) Faculty Handbook. The intent of the document is to supplement the KSU Faculty Handbook <<http://www.kennesaw.edu/handbooks/faculty/>> with additional information, requirements, and special conditions unique to the Department of Construction Management (CM).

3.1 Faculty Workload

1. In determining workload, each three-credit hour course is counted for 10% of a faculty member's time and effort per semester.
2. Course reassignments must be negotiated with the chair to accommodate and service commitments. In accordance with University guidelines, if a course reassignment is granted for scholarship or service, the time and effort spent in those activities should be equivalent to the time and effort that would have been spent in teaching the reassigned course.
3. In accordance with University guidelines, at least 10% must be devoted to institutional service.
4. Research and service as percentage will be determined by faculty members in consultation with department chair.
5. Chairing of master's thesis will be part of faculty workload expectations or accrued for future course reassignment. Faculty chairing five master's theses to completion will be eligible for one course release. Service of faculty members on thesis or dissertation committees in a non-chair role will not be eligible for course reassignment accrual.
6. Credit for the supervision of undergraduate research and delivery of a credit-bearing independent study will be determined at the college level and approved by the Provost or their designee.
7. Actual Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) percentages for each faculty member will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review.
8. Exceptions to the baseline model may be determined necessary at the college level with approval from the Provost or their designee as these exceptions impact resource distribution.

3.2 Workload Models

Some possible FPA workload combinations appear below. The models reflect various percentages of effort in the three performance areas of faculty.

60-30-10 Workload Model

Teaching (Six 3 credit hour)	60
Scholarship/Creative Activity	30
Service.....	10
Total	100

60-20-20 Workload Model

Teaching (Six 3 credit hour)	60
Scholarship/Creative Activity.....	20
Service	20
Total	100

90-0-10 Workload Model	
Teaching (Nine 3 credit hour).....	90
Scholarship/Creative Activity.....	00
Service	10
Total	100

64-26-10 Workload Model	
Teaching (Five 3 credit hour + One 4 credit hour...)	64
Scholarship/Creative Activity.....	26
Service	10
Total	100

67-23-10 Workload Model	
Teaching (Four 3 credit hour + Two 4 credit hour)....	67
Scholarship/Creative Activity	22
Service	10
Total	100

Expectations in the three faculty performance areas for different percentages of efforts are given below

3.3 Teaching Expectations

1. Teach courses within your knowledge range, as assigned based on the agreed workload
2. Prepare the course assessment and improvement report using departmental assessment and improvement plan for each course taught. This includes description of how the student evaluation results and other feedback from students, graduates, employers of graduates, peers, supervisors, and/or other knowledgeable persons in department and industry are used to provide continuous improvement in teaching.
3. Prepare a self-evaluation document on teaching effectiveness using the departmental teaching effectiveness assessment form.
4. Prepare syllabus of each course using the department standard syllabus template which include defining course learning outcomes, mapping of course learning outcomes with program student learning outcomes in accordance with accreditation agencies, office hours, email address, telephone number, grading policy, and penalties (if any) for absences and late assignments
5. Meet classes regularly and schedule at least 5 office hours a week
6. Be well prepared and organized
7. Make continual efforts to improve teaching
8. Maintain currency in the teaching discipline
9. Return graded assignments in a timely manner (with at least one significant graded assignment or exam returned before the course withdrawal deadline)
10. Serve on two capstone signoff and two faculty representative capstone panels and perform all capstone supervision responsibilities
11. Advise students as needed and assigned by the college or program
12. Participate or contribute to the workshops/conferences related to teaching, advising, mentoring, supervising and instructional technologies conducted by KSU's Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning (CETL) or other organizations.

3.4 Scholarship/Creative Activity Expectations (Annual)

1. 20% - Two Peer review papers [One Primary Author (12) + One Co-author (5)] + One Conference (3). Note: Here 20% includes publishing two peer reviewed papers and participating in at least one conference. In one paper faculty needs to be first author and in second paper faculty could be a co-author. Participation in conferences includes peer-reviewed paper presentation or participation in a workshops to enhance skills related to teaching or research. Seven conferences is insufficient without two peer-reviewed publications.
2. 23% - Two Peer review papers [One Primary Author (12) + One Co-author (5)] + One Conference (3) + One Internal - Departmental Proposal (1) + Two Professional Development (2)
3. 26% - Two Peer review papers [One Primary Author (12) + One Co-author (5)] + One Conference (3) + One Internal - Departmental Proposal (1) + Two Professional Development (2) + One Internal – College/University Proposal (3)
4. 30% - Two Peer review papers [One Primary Author (12) + One Co-author (5)] + One Conference (3) + Two Internal - Departmental Proposal (2) + Two Professional Development (2) + Two Internal – College/University Proposal (6)

3.4.1 Additional Options: Unfunded External Proposal (4); Funded External Proposal (6)

Note: 20% in the form of Two Peer review papers [One Primary Author (12) + One Co-author (5)] + One Conference (3) is required in any percentage of efforts. Faculty has the flexibility to create different combinations with Internal - Departmental Proposal, Professional Development, College/University Proposal, Unfunded External Proposal and Funded External Proposal to meet the remaining percentage of the efforts.

Legend: (Adding points specified for each activity comprises the assigned percentages)

Examples:

1. Internal - Departmental Proposal: Year End Budget Request, Conference Travel Budget Request. The proposals could include introduction of new software, improving the quality of instruction through improved classroom infrastructure, getting CETL involved in enhancing a faculty's teaching style, going to a conference to enhance or improve teaching subject to availability of funds. The proposal could be about using end of the year moneys to enhance student's learning experience. It should be left to the discretion of the Chair and Dean who review these proposals and categorize them as a scholarly activity or a professional development activity.
2. College/University Proposal: CETL Proposals, Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) Proposals

3.5 Service Expectations

3.5.1 Service to University, College, or Department 4 Points

Service to the University, College, or Department is valued at 4 points (4 points for each organization) for various capacities on University, College, or Department committees. Examples of service include:

1. participating in the work of committees
2. contributing to the formulation of goals
3. actively sponsoring/advising student organizations
4. developing programs
5. assisting with administrative functions

6. contributing to recruiting activities
7. assisting with fund-raising activities
8. contributing to the work of advisory committees, foundations
9. alumni, or civic groups on behalf of the university

Examples of service to the Department may include but not limited to:

1. Advising Student Chapters
2. Contribution to committees such as documenting minutes of faculty meetings, advisory meetings
3. Representing department at Open House events, Construction Education and Foundation of Georgia (CEFGA). Note: The department will furnish guidelines clarifying the value or "weight" of each level of service.
4. Fund raising activities such as procuring scholarships, software grants
5. Serve as coach for at least one student competition teams
6. Participate or contribute in two professional development activities related to teaching, supervising, and mentoring

3.5.2 Workload Weighting

The accompanying spreadsheet titled <CM Workload Weighting> accompanies and is an integral component of this Workload Policy: College of Architecture and Construction Management (effective spring semester 2019).

Note: A spreadsheet titled "CM QuickGuide for Determining Workload" is available and is intended as a summary, guide, and aid and should be interpreted in conjunction with the Construction Management Promotion and Tenure Guide.