

PREAMBLE

This Kent State University at Ashtabula Faculty Handbook has been prepared to provide a description of the major processes, procedures and practices that direct and affect the professional and academic rights of the faculty at Kent State University at Ashtabula, hereinafter referred to as Kent State Ashtabula. Specific information is included on the advisory role of the faculty in governance, and procedures and expectations regarding faculty growth and development. The handbook also contains information on the structure and organization of the Campus. By including information on how Regional Campus policies and procedures are carried out locally, this handbook is also intended to complement the Kent State University Regional Campus Faculty Handbook, which applies to the entire Kent State Regional Campus system.

This handbook includes information of general interest to the Kent State Ashtabula Campus faculty about those university policies and procedures most relevant to their professional academic life. For complete information on related policy, see the primary sources: the University Policy Register and the Collective Bargaining Agreements for tenure-track faculty and for FTNTT faculty (all available in the Kent State Ashtabula Dean's office). Nothing in this handbook should be construed as being contradictory to those documents in any way; indeed, in case of contradiction, those documents take precedence.

Kent State University at Ashtabula Faculty Handbook

Table of Contents

I. Matters of Governance and Related Procedures

Full-time faculty members at the Ashtabula Campus have governance responsibilities at the campus, **College of Applied and Technical Studies (CATS)**--formerly Regional College), and within their respective academic units on the Kent Campus. They are charged by both tradition and practice to make sure that the standards and missions of their institutions mesh with the highest standards of their individual disciplines.

A. Role of Ashtabula Campus Faculty in Departmental Affairs

Ashtabula Campus faculty are represented on a number of departmental, school or college committees, including Faculty Advisory Committee, School and/or College committees and curriculum committees. They also participate in a variety of other matters relating to the academic responsibilities of their departments, schools and colleges, including search committees, reappointment, tenure, and promotion committees, and other committees.

Ashtabula Campus faculty hold rank within their respective academic departments and are then reviewed by their colleagues for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. However, tenure, when earned by a Regional Campus faculty member, is granted to the faculty member in the Regional Campuses, not the Kent Campus.

The colleges and academic departments at the Kent Campus, including **CATS**, are responsible for such academic matters as course approvals, evaluation and assessment of instruction, curriculum development and evaluation. The decisions made at the unit, department, school, and college level directly impact each regional campus, so it is important regional campus faculty have a role and voice in departmental matters. Therefore, to ensure coordination and integration regional campus faculty participate in governance to their respective academic departments and units.

B. Faculty Senate

Faculty involvement in the governance of the University is two-fold. First is the Faculty Senate, a university-wide body of representatives elected at large from each academic unit having a full-time faculty of more than thirty members (department, school, regional campus). The Ashtabula Campus is represented by one senator elected for a two-year term. Regional Campus representatives may also, by election or appointment, serve on the Executive Committee of the Senate. Moreover, faculty other than elected Senators may serve on various committees of the Senate. The Faculty Senate functions primarily in the establishment and periodic review of University-wide academic and professional standards.

C. Ashtabula Campus Faculty Council

Ashtabula Campus Faculty Council (FC) is composed of all tenure-track faculty (TT) and full-time non-tenure-track (FTNTT) faculty appointed as resident faculty to the Ashtabula Campus. This Council is an advisory and recommendatory body to the Campus Dean and Chief Administrative Officer (hereafter "Dean"). The Dean serves as ex-officio, non-voting member for the Council.

It is the purpose of the FC, or designated subcommittees to advise and recommend on all faculty matters, including, but not limited to, the following: faculty personnel issues, appointment of new resident faculty, review of full-time non-tenure-track (FTNTT) faculty assigned to the campus, allocation and reallocation of faculty positions, campus program development, evaluations relating to faculty salary adjustments, campus planning and budget priorities, issues relating to teaching assignments and workload equivalencies, faculty professional improvement and other scholarly leaves, issues relating to the advising and retention of students, and ensuring that instructional standards are followed.

The Constitution of the Ashtabula Faculty Council is located in section *V. Other Academic Unit Guidelines* of this Handbook.

D. Committees

Full-time tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) and non-tenure-track (FTNTT) faculty members are encouraged and invited to participate actively in at least two committees and to serve on search committees to fulfill positions in their areas or programs as needed. Exceptions to this would be T/TT personnel actions, such as reappointment, tenure, promotion, or Merit Awards. Below are the standing and ad hoc committees at the Ashtabula Campus in addition to related **College of Applied and Technical Studies** committees:

AAUP Representatives

Beitler Award

Belonging, Equity and Access Committee (BEA)

Commencement Speaker Committee

Enrollment Committee

Faculty Senate Representatives

Handbook Updates

Mentoring Resource Committee

Merit Awards

Provost's Regional Campus Tenure or Promotion Advisory Committees

Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure Committee

College of Applied and Technical Studies Advisory Committee Representative

College of Applied and Technical Studies Curriculum Committee Representative

Scholarship and Financial Awards Committee

Student Complaints Committee

University Teaching Council Representative

Committee Descriptions:

AAUP Representatives: one T/TT faculty member is elected to represent the T/TT faculty and an FTNTT faculty member is elected to represent FTNTT faculty. Each is elected by members of their respective bargaining units per their Collective bargaining Unit agreements. These faculty members represent the Ashtabula faculty at AAUP meetings.

Beitler Award: this committee annually reviews vitae of former students who began their academic career at the Ashtabula Campus and have made notable contributions to their

vocation or profession. This committee awards the Roger T. Beitler Distinguished Student Award to the selected candidate at the May Commencement ceremony each year.

Belonging, Equity and Access Committee (BEA): this committee creates, maintains, and sustains a comprehensive plan to promote campus belonging, diversity, equity, and inclusion. The committee supports, advises, and collaborates with campus departments to recruit, retain, and develop a diverse community of students, faculty and staff while promoting inclusive excellence in teaching, service, and research. The committee advances the campus's mission of promoting diversity, equity and inclusion as a core value shaping every aspect of campus life.

Commencement Speaker Committee: this committee reviews recommendations of Dec./May graduates to represent the graduating class. The committee selects the candidate and helps the speaker prepare the Commencement speech.

Enrollment Committee: meets to discuss student issues; creates a cooperative relationship with Campus staff involved with student recruitment, enrollment, and retention.

Faculty Senate Representatives: one T/TT faculty member is elected to represent the T/TT faculty at Ashtabula. FTNTT Senate representatives are elected from the entire pool FTNTT to represent all FTNTT faculty at the University.

Handbook Update: faculty review and make recommendations to modify the Handbook. The Dean may also suggest recommendations to be considered. Handbook revisions are shared and accepted by the FC, as necessary.

The Mentoring Resource Committee consists of both tenured and full-time non-tenured (FTNTT) faculty, with at least 10 years of experience with Kent State University. Mentors must have good communication skills and an excellent understanding of both the environment and students at Kent State University – Ashtabula Campus.

Purpose: To offer advice, guidance, direction, and support for all faculty seeking information, advancement, and opportunities at Kent State University Ashtabula.

Merit Awards: this committee is made up of T/TT faculty that submit files to the merit process.

Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure Committee: The T/TT faculty review all T/TT and FTNTT files for reappointment, promotion and tenure and make recommendations to the campus Dean.

Provost's Regional Campus Tenure or Promotion Advisory Committees: faculty members chosen for these committee meet in March to assess RC Tenure or Promotion and to hear appeals.

College of Applied and Technical Studies Advisory Committee Representative: a faculty member serves at meetings of the CATS.

College of Applied and Technical Studies Curriculum Committee Representative-a faculty member serves at meetings of the CATS.

Scholarship and Financial Awards Committee-the committee reviews and selects student recipients of various campus scholarships.

Student Complaints Committee-faculty members listen to students' concerns and make recommendations to address.

University Teaching Council Representative-a faculty member serves at meetings of the University Teaching Council.

E. Community Advisory Groups to Ashtabula Campus Academic Programs and the Dean

Both the evolution of the Regional Campuses and their role and mission dictate that external advisory groups play an important part in their continuing development. Because of the practice of encouraging each campus to grow in a way that is compatible with the community in which it operates, the external advisory groups from campus to campus do not have identical titles. In general, these groups function at two distinct levels:

a. Community Advisory Group to the Ashtabula Campus and the Dean

Each Regional Campus has what is in effect an advisory board, the membership of which is determined by the board itself. It advises the Dean on the educational needs and concerns of the community. In sum, the Dean informs the group of developments on Campus. At the Ashtabula Campus this advisory group is titled the Ashtabula Area College Committee, Inc.

b. Community Advisory Groups for Academic Programs

Each campus also maintains advisory groups for its programs to comply with the Board of Regents' requirements. These groups inform the Campus Dean and faculty of developments in the field, apprise them of pertinent community needs, and assist with curriculum development and revision, recruitment, placement of graduates, and program promotion. Advisory committees presently operate for all associate degree programs offered at the Ashtabula Campus.

F. Participation by Ashtabula Faculty on University Committees

Ashtabula faculty may have the opportunity to participate on University Committees (for example, the Academic Hearing Panel and/or numerous others). Committees such as these are recognized as service. Any faculty member performing service at any level in the University enhances their professional standing and benefits the campus. Faculty are encouraged (but not required) to do as much they can around their teaching/advising workloads. Note that committee work has value for T/TT and FTNTT faculty but is not required as a part of the review criteria for FTNTT.

II. Teaching assignments and Workload, including workload equivalencies and related procedures.

A. Teaching Assignments

The Ashtabula Campus Dean and Chief Administrative Officer, in collaboration with the Assistant Dean and in consultation with faculty, is responsible for assigning Ashtabula Campus faculty to courses and determining a faculty's workload each term. Workloads are communicated to faculty in accordance with guidelines and deadlines established by the faculty CBAs. These workload assignments are made upon consideration of enrollment projections, faculty eligibility to teach, and other University needs.

The faculty member's academic unit has the responsibility to approve faculty to teach [specific](#) courses. Requests for additional course approvals should be processed through the Ashtabula Campus Academic Affairs Department.

While faculty are full members of their respective Kent Campus academic units, their tenure and teaching assignments are in the Regional Campus System, which is budgeted separately from the Kent Campus. In accordance with the CBAs, the University has the right to reassign an individual to a different campus from his or her initial appointment. Such decisions are made by the Vice President for System Integration and are governed by considerations of seniority as well as the procedures outlined in the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreements.

B. The Schedule of Classes

At the direction of the Dean, the Assistant Dean (Ashtabula Campus Academic Affairs Office) collaborates with faculty on the development of the Ashtabula Campus Schedule of Classes. The Assistant Dean assigns faculty to course sections, creates faculty workload letters, and manages the overall campus Schedule of Classes which includes but is not limited to class size, modality, class section meeting days and times. Last-minute assignment changes might be unavoidable because of higher or lower student demand, faculty illness, and other such exigencies. **As per the CBA, Faculty Council should approve the Schedule of Classes.**

C. Teaching Loads

Regional Campus faculty have a standard teaching load as follows, although other duties (administrative appointments, program coordination, special assignments, etc.), may and should provide load equivalencies as determined by the Dean.

Tenure, Tenure Track Faculty:

The teaching load for a regular full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member is 24 hours (or equivalent) per academic year.

Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The teaching load for a FTNTT faculty member is 30 hours (or equivalent) per academic year.

D. Workload Equivalences

Workloads and Workload equivalencies for Ashtabula Campus faculty are the same regardless of rank or bargaining unit membership.

At the discretion of the Campus Dean, a faculty member who makes special contributions to the Campus in areas other than classroom teaching may receive special assignment hours, equivalent to teaching hours to carry out those contributions. (This provision does not refer to the normal, expected faculty activities considered to be “service.”)

Credit-bearing Courses

The Ashtabula Campuses will assign workload for teaching assignments that follows the workload amounts established by the academic units on the Kent Campus include the **College of Applied and Technical Studies**. Ashtabula Campus faculty can expect to receive the same workload for the same course taught by a Kent Campus faculty member.

Ashtabula Campus Faculty Council Chair

The FC Chair is given a six-hour workload each academic year (three in the fall term and three hours in the spring term) for the duties and responsibilities of the Chair’s position.

Clock Hours to Workload

If the need should arise to convert clock hours to a workload equivalency the Ashtabula campus will use the following a standard formula: One workload hour is equal to forty-five clock hours (2700 clock minutes)

E. Overload Assignments

Overload teaching assignments arise from extraordinary and unforeseen staffing circumstance and should not expected by a faculty member each term as part of their normal teaching assignment. Compensation for teaching overload at Kent State Ashtabula is governed by the policy described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. In situations where there is a choice between using a temporary faculty member or assigning overload to a full-time faculty member, the decision shall be made by the Dean. Faculty are not required to accept an overload teaching assignment.

Compensation for any overload assignments regardless of the term is paid to the faculty member during the spring term each academic year in accordance with practices established by the Regional Campus System.

F. Summer Teaching Assignments

Summer teaching opportunities may be available for Kent State Ashtabula faculty members and are contingent upon course demands and enrollment projections. The Dean makes summer teaching assignments. The Regional Campus System follows the rule of equitable distribution of opportunities for summer employment among members of the regular faculty bargaining unit. In actual practice, this principle requires supervision by faculty members and administrators alike because staffing changes are irregular and positions are often not filled until the last moment, when many faculty are away from their campuses.

Tenured or tenure-track faculty are to receive the first opportunity to teach summer school (including intersession) before any other Kent State faculty member or non-KSU personnel (Collective Bargaining Agreement). When classes are available, summer teaching shall be

offered to faculty on this basis: regular full-time tenure-track, FTNTT, and finally, adjunct. The FTNTT faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement stipulates that, after tenure-track faculty, Kent State Ashtabula FTNTT faculty are to be given “next priority in consideration” for summer teaching.

Should a full-time faculty member desire to teach a summer course on another Regional Campus, he or she must every year and in writing contact the Dean of the campus where teaching is desired to inform the Dean of the interest in a summer teaching assignment. This writing notification is provided to the Dean during the preceding fall term by an established deadline (generally, in November). This notification does not guarantee that a course will be offered, only that the faculty member’s name is added to the list for consideration if resident/tenured faculty at that campus are unavailable to teach the course. There is no reimbursement for travel to and from the campuses where assignments are made.

The normal summer load of 6 hours per term for tenured and tenure-track faculty, referenced in the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall be understood as embracing the opportunity for compensation of services totaling up to a maximum of 12 hours for all Summer Terms combined excluding Intersession. The provision that there shall be no additional payment for any overload assignment accepted by a faculty member in excess of these limitations shall be retained.

Intersession Teaching

Opportunities to teach a single course each year during intersession, a three-week period between the end of spring semester and the beginning of summer classes, may be available for Kent State Ashtabula faculty members. Course offerings are approved by the Dean and contingent upon course demand, enrollment projections, and the probability of the successful delivery of the course in the intensive intersession format. An intersession assignment does not count for either summer load or for overload.

Compensation for summer courses may be subject to the University’s *Enrollment Contingency* policy as described in the CBA, Article IX, Section 4-B-2.

G. *Policy regarding assigning of DL courses:*

1. In all cases, the faculty member(s) will retain all ownership interests in his or her contribution to the development or revision of a distance education course unless agreed otherwise in writing by the faculty member(s) and the University.
2. The University may, in its sole discretion, request that a faculty member(s) develop or substantially revise a distance education course and provide additional compensation and substantial assistance including, but not limited to, assistance by course designers provided by the University. If the Faculty member(s) agrees to this request, the faculty member(s) and the academic unit administrator must agree in writing to all the terms of the project on a form to be provided by the University before the project begins.

III. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Although Kent State Ashtabula faculty members have their appointment in the regional campus system, they are also regular members of their respective departments and colleges/schools, and so can serve on faculty advisory committees and their designated subcommittees at all levels of university governance. A description of the standing college level committees appears in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. A complete list and description of university level committees appears in Faculty Senate Catalogue of Committees.

A. Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

Per University policy regarding faculty tenure and promotion (see University Policy Register 3342-6-14), “For the purposes of this policy ‘scholarship’ is broadly defined to include research and the publication of scholarly and creative work. For the purposes of this policy ‘service’ is broadly defined to include administrative service to the university, professional service to the faculty member’s discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university.” In this context, “teaching and service. . . may be demonstrated by self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation, client evaluation, external colleague evaluation, and adjudication.”

Because of the emphasis on teaching and service in the regional campuses, faculty members have a special responsibility to develop, continue, and sustain, in the long term, a program of high-quality teaching and service; indeed, greater consideration *must* be given to these areas when evaluating faculty whose appointment is at a regional campus. **It is incumbent upon the candidate for promotion to demonstrate consistently superior qualifications—which might include nominations and awards, peer reviews, student survey responses, work in the scholarship of teaching, or significant innovation and/or improvement—to apply the weighting formula at every level of evaluation.**

B. Tenure and Tenure-track Faculty

The quality of a candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service is of central importance in personnel decisions. Criteria for assessing this quality for candidates for promotion, tenure, and reappointment are developed departmentally and collegially, and appear in their respective departmental handbooks. Guidelines used to weigh those criteria in tenure and reappointment reviews are developed by the Ashtabula Campus and appear below. ***As per the CBA, the weighting criteria described in this handbook is binding throughout the RTP process.*** Information regarding minimal expectations of performance and years in rank are described or referenced in the original appointment letter, in the University Policy Register (3342-6-06, 3342-6-08), and procedural guidelines and timetables circulated annually by the provost’s office.

Faculty eligible for promotion will be nominated either by their unit faculty advisory committee (department, school, or independent college), by self-nomination, by the unit administrator, or by an academic administrative officer of the University in the spring semester. Candidates for tenure or reappointment will be notified in the spring that a review will begin early in the fall semester of the next academic year. The provost’s office initiates the review process for all candidates by

circulating the annual guidelines and timetables for faculty review to units throughout the University. The unit administrator will make these materials available to the candidates for promotion, tenure, and reappointment no later than three weeks before the deadline for submission of files and supplemental materials, which is at the end of the first week of the fall semester. At the same time in tenure and reappointment reviews, the Dean will make available to the candidate and the unit copies of Kent State Ashtabula's method of weighting unit criteria. Tenure, reappointment, and promotion evaluations at all levels of review and on both the Ashtabula and Kent Campuses should follow the Kent State Ashtabula's method of weighting unit criteria.

Kent State Ashtabula candidates are responsible for developing and organizing a file that presents evidence supporting their promotion, tenure, or reappointment. The file is certified as complete by the unit administrator and is then available for review by the unit and Ashtabula Campus promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee via FlashFolio. The chair of the Council then convenes the promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee. Members of the committee are all tenured TT members of Council. The file is read by all members of the committee and is the subject of candid discussion, except that no member shall be present while the committee discusses or votes on his or her own case, or on the case of a domestic partner or relative. Further, no member other than the Council chair shall be present while the committee (1) discusses or votes on a promotion to a rank higher than that of the individual member, or (2) while the committee discusses or votes on the tenure of an individual in a rank higher than that of the individual member. After the committee meeting, each member prepares and signs an evaluation form in support of his or her vote and conveys the evaluation to the faculty chair. The Council chair then summarizes the committee's vote, deliberations, and signed evaluation forms in a letter of recommendation to the Dean. Votes in tenure and promotion considerations are "yes" or "no". Three-fourths of the tenure and promotion committee voting "yes" represents an endorsement of the candidate. In reappointment considerations, a third type of vote, "yes with reservation," is also allowed. A vote of "yes with reservation" is a positive vote for reappointment, but it carries with it an additional note of concern. A simple majority of the reappointment committee voting "yes" or "yes with reservation" represents an endorsement of the candidate.

After reviewing the materials and advisory recommendations, the Dean makes a recommendation to the appropriate college/school dean. The review process continues with recommendation letters from the college/school dean and the Vice President for System Integration prior to consideration by the Provost. Candidates for reappointment, tenure or promotion should consult the appropriate appendices of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or sections of the annual Procedures and Policies Governing the Review of Faculty for information regarding appeal and grievance procedures.

Although a faculty member may stand for both promotion and tenure at the same time, it should be remembered that these are two distinct personnel actions requiring separate files and documentation, procedures, timetables, and guidelines. Moreover, undergoing a successful tenure review is a necessary condition for promotion to associate. Candidates for promotion to full professor must hold the rank of associate and will be evaluated on their accomplishments since their promotion to that rank.

C. Kent State Ashtabula Guidelines for Weighting Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria

1. Weighting formula

Weighting recognizes the increased teaching load among regional campus faculty members and factors that reality into the criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

With that in mind, Teaching should be measured as 60% of the total assessment of the candidate's qualities when measured against Scholarship (25%) and Service (15%). To make the formula easier to apply, we can measure percentages at points towards a total of 100, which would be *excellent* in all categories. What changes at the levels of reappointment, tenure, promotion to associate, and promotion to full professor, is the total points needed to meet department standards at each level.

The scale would be as follows:

Teaching:	Excellent 60	very good 50	good 40
Scholarship:	Excellent 25	very good 20	good 15
Service	Excellent 15	very good 10	good 5

a. Reappointment (total needed for yes=75/100)

Kent State Ashtabula considers the annual probationary reappointment review to be a formative and mentoring evaluation, an opportunity to help colleagues establish a record in scholarship/research, teaching, and service that will be enough for continued reappointment and ultimately a successful tenure review. Candidates for review are not evaluated along single, isolated dimensions of performance, but the committee evaluates their *whole performance*, viewed as a unified, integrated record of scholarship, teaching, and service. However, given the need to convey weighting to the regional campus candidate's home department, the committee should keep in mind the following general principles:

Thus, *excellence* in teaching will be weighed in such a way as to balance deficiencies in scholarship or service that may place them at the *very good*, *good*, or *poor* level as per the candidate's department guidelines. Clearly, performance at the *good* or *poor* levels in one or more categories might warrant a "yes with reservations," or in the case of scholarship, a "no" vote in a reappointment review.

b. Tenure (total needed for yes=80/100)

While each candidate should strive for *excellence* in every category in their tenure review as per their department or college guidelines, the weighting criteria above would suggest that *excellence* in teaching would mandate a positive assessment if the candidate was rated at the *very good* or *good* level in scholarship and service. With the weighting considered, a *very good* in teaching would still support *very good* scholarship and *very good* or *good* service for earning tenure.

c. Promotion to associate (total needed for yes=85/100)

It is in the best interest of the candidate to strive for *excellence* in scholarship while seeking promotion to associate, whether in conjunction with a tenure review or as a separate or later action. However, with the weighting in place, *excellence* in teaching and *very good* in scholarship would

qualify the candidate for promotion, should service be at least *good*. Given the higher expectations in the scholarship category, it should not be expected that *very good* teaching would serve to carry only a *very good* in research (with *good* being inadequate even with the weighting); *excellent*, *very good*, or *good* service would suffice for promotion should the above criteria be met.

d. Promotion to full professor (total needed for yes=90/100)

Candidates for promotion to full must provide evidence of significant accomplishment beyond those achieved at the associate level, and thus should strive to demonstrate *excellence at all three levels*. With weighting in place, *excellence* in teaching and service should be enough to overcome a *very good* or *good* in scholarship in pursuit of promotion to full professor.

2. Summary guidelines for applying weighting:

For tenure

Teaching	Scholarship	Service	80
Excellent 60	Excellent 25	good 5	90
Excellent 60	very good/good 20/15	very good/good/10/5	90/80
Very good 50	very good 20	very good 10	80
Good 40	Excellent 25	Excellent/very good 15/10	80

For promotion to associate:

Excellent 60	Excellent 25	very good 10	95
Excellent 60	very good 20	Excellent/very good 15/10	95/90
Very good 50	Excellent 25	very good 10	85
Very Good 50	very good 20	Excellent 15	85

For promotion to full:

Excellent 60	Excellent 25	very good 10	95
Excellent 60	very good 20	Excellent/very good 15/10	95/90
Very good 50	Excellent 25	Excellent 15	90
Excellent 60	Good 15	Excellent 15	90

D. Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Per Article X, Section 1. of the *Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, FTNTT faculty members “are full-time faculty of Kent State University who are appointed annually to a limited term of employment with the University. Appointments and offers of employment in this role are made annually at the sole discretion of the University. The normal duration of appointment is nine months, encompassing a full academic year, excluding summer and intersession(s) following the conclusion of one (1) academic year and the inception of the next academic year.” Per Article X, Section 3. of the *Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective*

Bargaining Agreement, “[w]hile it is recognized that appointments for FTNTT Faculty members covered by this Agreement are made annually and that the term of each appointment is limited to a single academic year, a FTNTT Faculty member may be offered an appointment for a subsequent academic year if programmatic need, satisfaction with performance of previous responsibilities, and budgeted resources supporting the position continue in accord with the conditions and provisions of Section 2.A. of this Article and with the procedural expectations detailed in Section 2.B.”

According to Article X, Section 2.A. of the *Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, “[t]he provisions of this Section do not, however, create any right to expectation of continuous employment nor do they create a right to renewal of appointment as a regular and routine condition of employment save as the University, at its sole and exclusive discretion and in accord with the provisions of this Article, may deem suitable in accord with the priorities of continuing programmatic need, its assessment of demonstrated satisfactory performance of current and previous responsibilities in a faculty capacity by the FTNTT Faculty member, and its determination of sufficient budgeted resources to continue to sustain the position. In the event of unsatisfactory performance, unit administrators should discuss the performance issue(s) with the FTNTT Faculty member as soon as possible.”

1. According to Article X, Section 2.B. of the *Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, “[a]cademic units, regional campuses and Colleges without departments or schools are encouraged to develop guidelines for the allocation and reallocation of FTNTT Faculty positions and include those guidelines in the unit/regional campus’ section of the Faculty Handbook and/or the handbooks currently in effect or as such handbook(s) may subsequently be modified, amended or otherwise revised for this purpose. The following are a list of suggested considerations:

1. Completion of one (1) successful Full Performance Review;
2. Completion of more than one (1) successful Full Performance Review;
3. The University’s commitment to affirmative action and its policies adopted there under;
4. Quality of the bargaining unit member’s contributions as documented with the accumulated record; or
5. The impact on the academic program or regional campus resulting from the release of the FTNTT Faculty member, which may be assessed by necessary credentials, experience, academic rank and competence to perform the instructional and/or other responsibilities of such a FTNTT Faculty member which are essential to a designated program(s).

In accordance with procedures and timelines established by the University, as annually distributed through the Provost’s office, an Ashtabula Campus FTNTT candidate for review is responsible for developing and organizing a file presenting evidence supporting [their](#) continuing appointment. The file is then made available to the Ashtabula Campus promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee. The FTNTT Performance Review Committee will be chaired by the Council Chair and

will consist of all tenured TT faculty and may include FTNTT faculty holding senior ranking* that are not up for review. The file is read by all members of the committee and is the subject of candid discussion, except that no member shall be present while the committee discusses or votes on the case of a domestic partner or relative. After the discussion and vote, the Council chair summarizes the committee's vote and deliberations in a letter of recommendation to the Dean. Votes in FTNTT performance reviews are "yes," or "no." After reviewing the materials and advisory recommendations, the Dean will make a judgment regarding reappointment in view of the candidate's past record, programmatic needs, and budgeted resources supporting the position. Each FTNTT faculty member is to be provided with a written summary of the outcome and conclusions of the review and an indication of whether an additional appointment may be anticipated and, if so, under what programmatic, budgetary and/or anticipated staffing or projected enrollment circumstances. FTNTT candidates for review should consult Article VI of the *Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement* regarding appeal and grievance procedures.

* Whenever possible, the FTNTT representatives should hold at least the rank of Associate Professor or Associate Lecturer, preferably Professor or Senior Lecturer. If FTNTT Faculty members at these ranks are not available or willing to serve, the committee may consider FTNTT Faculty members who hold the Assistant Professor and Lecturer ranks and who have at least ten (10) years of consecutive employment as a FTNTT Faculty member.

E. Kent State University at Ashtabula Criteria for FTNTT Faculty Three-Year Term Performance Review

Per Article X, Section 7 of the *Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, FTNTT faculty members completing three or six consecutive academic years of annually renewable contracts shall be subject to a Full Performance Review during the third and sixth year respectively, before an additional appointment can be anticipated or authorized. While acknowledging the varied contributions and responsibilities of FTNTT faculty members, classroom instruction is the principal responsibility of an FTNTT faculty member in the Instructional Track, so the goal in the three-year Performance Review is to document excellence in teaching. Such excellence may be evaluated in multiple ways, including, but not limited to, effective course design and teaching materials, a pattern of positive written comments on student evaluations, supportive peer evaluations, and ongoing efforts to reflect upon and improve the act of teaching, and consistently positive SSI scores. Fulfilling those minimal expectations and responsibilities required of *all* faculty members as delineated in Section II is necessary—but not sufficient—for teaching excellence.

1. The Full Performance Review file will normally include the following items:
 - a. Past Performance Review letters, if any;
 - b. A self-evaluation providing an assessment of the candidate's teaching during the period under review, as well as the candidate's performance of other responsibilities, if any;
 - c. An up-to-date curriculum vitae;

- d. The syllabi for courses taught during the period under review;
 - e. The Evaluation Summaries of Student Surveys of Instruction (SSI) for all courses taught during the period under review. SSI summaries include both numerical data and student written comments; and
 - f. One peer teaching review each year during the period under review.
 - g. Evidence of Efforts on the part of the candidate to remain current in his or her field and/or to enhance teaching skills.
2. At the candidate's discretion, the Full Performance Review file *may* include other materials that will clarify and/or enhance her or his record of excellent teaching, including but not limited to:
- a. Samples of examinations, assignments, study guides, and/or other course materials;
 - b. Evidence that the candidate has remained current in the pedagogical theory of her or his discipline;
 - c. Details of innovations in teaching, e.g., service learning or the use of learning technologies;
 - d. Documentation of teaching awards or nominations;
 - e. An account of scholarly or professional activity necessary to maintain professional standing in the discipline; and
 - f. Assessments of other contributions beyond the contractual expectations for FTNTT faculty members.

3. Evaluation Process Overview

Each year the performance review process necessarily has new FTNTT candidates and new Performance Review Committee members who may be unfamiliar with the process and how to operationalize the criteria in reviews. This section provides a guide to how this can be done—without prescribing how it *must* be done—to facilitate evaluation consistency and to clarify expectations as committee recommendations are made to the Dean.

A candidate's teaching performance can be evaluated using a three-rank scale of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Because of the differences among disciplines—and acknowledging the varied contributions and responsibilities of FTNTT faculty members—it is inappropriate to quantify absolutely the scale noted above. Based on the standards of the relevant discipline, the testimony provided by the candidate's file and peer reviewers, and the discussions during the committee meeting, each member of the Performance Review Committee must necessarily apply her or his own professional judgment in the review to make a vote of "yes," or "no." Usually, a record of performance judged to be excellent receives a "yes" vote, while an unsatisfactory record receives a vote of "no." A candidate's record of performance is judged to be

satisfactory in most respects, but is problematic in others. Examples of problematic aspects of a candidate's record include, but are not limited to:

- a. A poorly organized or incomplete file, e.g., files lacking peer teaching evaluations when appropriate;
- b. SSI scores on various dimensions of a candidate's performance evidencing a recurring problem, e.g., showing disrespect to students or being unavailable for student consultation;
- c. A recurring kind of student written complaint left unaddressed in the self-evaluation, e.g., "It took weeks to get our papers back";
- d. Poorly crafted syllabi evidencing an inadequate number or kind of evaluations of student learning; and
- e. Evidence that the candidate's courses are insufficiently rigorous.

FTNTT candidates undergoing a three-year performance review are strongly encouraged to acknowledge these facts as they prepare their files and to explain fully why they think their teaching performance should be considered excellent or satisfactory.

F. Kent State Ashtabula Criteria for FTNTT Faculty Performance Reviews after Nine Years of Consecutive Employment and Two Full Performance Reviews (Simplified or Abbreviated Performance Review)

Per Article X, Section 8 of the *Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, after nine (9) twelve (12) and fifteen (15) years of consecutive appointments, FTNTT Faculty members shall undergo a simplified performance review". While acknowledging the varied contributions and responsibilities of FTNTT faculty members, classroom instruction is the principal responsibility of an FTNTT faculty member in the Instructional Track, so the goal in the Simplified Performance Review is to document excellence in teaching. Fulfilling those minimal expectations and responsibilities required of *all* faculty members as delineated in Section V is necessary—but not sufficient—for continuing teaching excellence.

1. The Simplified Performance Review file will be electronically submitted, and will normally include the following items:
 - a. A narrative of up to five pages in which the candidate describes her or his professional activities during the past three years;
 - b. An up-to-date curriculum vitae; and
 - c. The summaries of Student Surveys of Instruction (SSI) for all courses taught during the period under review. SSI summaries include both numerical data and student written comments.

2. At the candidate's discretion, the Simplified Review file *may* include other materials that will clarify and/or enhance her or his record of continuing excellent teaching, including but not limited to:
 - a. Past Performance Review letters, if any;
 - b. A self-evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance during the past three years;
 - c. Recent peer teaching reviews;
 - d. Samples of syllabi, examinations, assignments, study guides, and/or other course materials;
 - e. Evidence that the candidate has remained current in the pedagogical theory of her or his discipline;
 - f. Details of innovations in teaching, e.g., service learning or the use of learning technologies;
 - g. Documentation of teaching awards or nominations;
 - h. An account of scholarly or professional activity necessary to maintain professional standing in the discipline; and
 - i. Assessments of other contributions beyond the contractual expectations for FTNTT faculty members.

3. Evaluation Process Overview

Each year the performance review process necessarily has new candidates and new Performance Review Committee members who may be unfamiliar with the process and how to operationalize the criteria in reviews. This section provides a guide to how this can be done—without prescribing how it *must* be done—to facilitate evaluation consistency and to clarify expectations as committee recommendations are made to the Dean.

A candidate's teaching performance can be evaluated using a three-rank scale of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Because of the differences among disciplines—and acknowledging the varied contributions and responsibilities of FTNTT faculty members—it is inappropriate to quantify absolutely the scale noted above. Based on the standards of the relevant discipline, the testimony provided by the candidate's file, and the discussions during the committee meeting, each member of the committee must necessarily apply her or his own professional judgment in the review to make a vote of "yes" or "no." Usually, a record of performance judged to be excellent receives a "yes" vote, while an unsatisfactory record receives a vote of "no." A candidate's record of performance is judged to be satisfactory in most respects, but may be problematic in others. Examples of problematic aspects of a candidate's record include, but are not limited to:

- a. A poorly organized or incomplete file;

- b. SSI scores on various dimensions of a candidate's performance evidencing a recurring problem, e.g., showing disrespect to students or being unavailable for student consultation; and
- c. A recurring kind of student written complaint left unaddressed in the self-evaluation, e.g., "It took weeks to get our papers back."

FTNTT candidates undergoing a simplified performance review are strongly encouraged to acknowledge these facts as they prepare their files and to explain fully why they think their teaching performance should be considered excellent or satisfactory.

G. Kent State Ashtabula Criteria for FTNTT Faculty Performance Reviews after Eighteen Years of Consecutive Appointments

Per Article X, Section 9. A. of the *Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, "[a]fter eighteen (18) years of consecutive appointments, and every three (3) years thereafter, FTNTT Faculty members shall be reviewed by their academic unit administrator. This administrative performance review will follow the format, procedures and timelines established by the University, as annually distributed through the Office of Faculty Affairs. To complete this review, the academic unit administrator will schedule a meeting with the FTNTT Faculty member who will submit, prior to the meeting, a current vitae and a narrative of 1-3 pages in which the FTNTT Faculty member describes her/his professional activities during the past three (3) years prior to the meeting. A FTNTT Faculty member who successfully completes this review is eligible for a three (3) year term of annually renewable appointments which is conditional from year to year only upon continued satisfaction with demonstrated performance, continued programmatic and staffing need within the academic unit, and continued budgetary resources supporting the position."

Per Article X, Section 9. B. of the *Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement*, "[a]t the conclusion of this review and after consultation with the Dean, if applicable, the academic unit administrator will provide the FTNTT Faculty member with a written summary of its outcome and conclusions and an indication of whether an additional appointment may be anticipated and, if so, under what programmatic, budgetary and/or anticipated staffing or projected enrollment circumstances. In the event that an additional appointment is not indicated, the academic unit administrator will include in the written summary provided to the FTNTT Faculty member an explanation of whether lack of adequate satisfaction with performance or the absence of anticipated continuing programmatic need or budgeted resources to support the position is the reason. The FTNTT Faculty member may, if desired, seek review of the decision by the established Faculty Advisory Committee or Council of a regional campus and by the College Dean or his/her designee, if applicable, as provided for in Article VII, Section 1 of this Agreement. An additional appointment immediately subsequent to the completion of this administrative performance review normally is expected to be part of a three-year term of renewable annual appointments as defined in Section 6 above, provided that continuing programmatic need and budgeted resources supporting the position can be anticipated for the term in question. In the unusual case when a FTNTT Faculty member is approved for a three-year term of annually renewable appointments, as

defined in Section 6 above, and the unit administrator determines that a subsequent review is needed due to performance concerns, the academic unit administrator will include a performance plan and timeline for this subsequent review in the written summary of the review provided to the FTNTT Faculty member as described in B.1. above of this Section 9.”

IV. Criteria, performance expectations, and procedures relating to Merit Awards

In conformity with the tenure-track *Collective Bargaining Agreement*, the University will sometimes establish an additional salary increment pool for recognizing documented *Faculty Excellence* in achievement, performance, and contribution. “Merit” is performance *above and beyond job expectations* for faculty at Kent State Ashtabula.

A. General Principles

In conformity with the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*, two broadly defined areas of demonstrated faculty excellence, consistent with the mission of Kent State Ashtabula, are to be recognized through Merit Awards: (1) *Teaching* (2) *Research/Creativity* and 3) *Service*.

Procedures, allocations, and timelines for determining Merit Awards for any given year shall be conducted in accordance with guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost.

B. Criteria for Determining Merit Awards

Because of the significant variation in the roles and responsibilities, disciplines and departments, as well as college or school expectations, the formulation or application of one specific, narrowly circumscribed definition of “Merit” is inappropriate in the determination of Merit. However, a more general and useful conception of “Merit” can be applied, which is based on a few guiding criteria and certain identifiable qualities, activities, and issues common to all excellent faculty members, regardless of their varied roles and responsibilities. Thus, the following guiding criteria shall apply in determining “Merit.”

“Merit” is demonstrated by the following:

1. The evident performance by a faculty member in *Teaching*.
2. The evident performance by a faculty member in *Research* (including creative productivity) is above and beyond expectations of standard, acceptable faculty performance.
3. The evident performance by a faculty member in campus, university, professional, and appropriate community *Service* that is above and beyond time commitments and contributions usually expected of faculty members.

In determining the extent to which the performance, contributions, or achievements of a faculty member satisfy these guiding criteria for “Merit,” it is useful to consider some *examples* of (1) expected or “baseline” faculty performance, and (2) meritorious faculty performance.

1. Being mindful of the significant variation in faculty roles and responsibilities, disciplines, and departments, as well as college or school expectations, *examples* of expected or “baseline” faculty performance during the “merit period” may be evidenced by:
 - a. Average classroom performance teaching 24 load hours/year as evaluated by student surveys;
 - b. Regular attendance at office hours;
 - c. Writing student recommendations;
 - d. Some effort to remain current in pedagogy;
 - e. Some participation in campus service activities, e.g., service on a campus, department, or university committee or two;
 - f. Some effort to remain current in the area of expertise, e.g., a conference attendance or two.
2. Being mindful of the significant variation in faculty roles and responsibilities, disciplines and departments, as well as college or school expectations, *examples* of meritorious faculty performance during the “merit period” may be evidenced by:
 - a. Consistent above-average classroom performance as indicated by student surveys and/or peer reviews;
 - b. Assisting students with publications or presentations;
 - c. Recruitment and retention activities;
 - d. Classroom pedagogical and technological innovations;
 - e. Teaching or service awards;
 - f. Extensive, positive contributions of time and effort to campus, department, university, professional, and public service;
 - g. Significant scholarly or creative contributions as determined by the faculty member’s discipline;
 - h. Efforts in campus or university outreach;
 - i. Bringing recognition to Kent State Ashtabula.

C. Campus Procedures and Process for Determining Merit Awards

General Guidelines

- A. Forms, deadlines, and instructions for submitting a merit file will be made available by the Dean and the FC Chair when Merit Awards are to be made.
- B. The Faculty Merit Review Committee consists of all faculty applying for merit in a given review period.
- C. Merit is awarded in three distinct categories:
 1. Teaching
 2. Research/ Creative Activity
 3. Service

- D. Faculty can apply for merit consideration in one or more categories.
- E. The Faculty Merit Review Committee when considering candidates only seeks to review completed ballots and an abbreviated CV. An abbreviated CV contains only the accomplishments for the time period under review. Any CV submitted as part of the merit process with accomplishments achieved outside the review period will not be considered for merit.
- F. Merit files and materials submitted after established deadlines will not be considered.
- G. Members of the Faculty Merit Review Committee cannot vote or rank themselves when reviewing files. They should only vote /rank the other applicants.

Ashtabula Campus Merit Review Process:

1. The Dean in conjunction to with FC Chair notify the tenure, tenure-track faculty of the merit process, provides instructions, forms, and deadlines.
2. Files will be submitted to Dean's Office by 5:00 pm on the established submission deadline.
3. The Dean will provide the Faculty Merit Review Committee electronic and hard copies access to merit files within three business days of the submission deadline.
4. The FC will construct and provide an electronic ballot form for everyone to use to rank candidates.
5. Each member of the Faculty Merit Review Committee will review and rank each file in the merit categories in which they also submitted a file. In ranking the files, faculty must list reasoning behind rank (strengths and weaknesses of files).
6. Faculty will NOT vote for themselves.
7. Electronic Ballots must be received by the established deadline.
8. All those who submit files must be involved in the voting.
9. If someone does not vote/ rank the files, their file will be removed from consideration.
10. The Dean's office will compile casted ballots such that:
 - a. Track who voted.
 - b. Separate comments and ranking by assigning random letters to each faculty.
 - c. Create a ranking order (without names attached).
 - d. Compile Comments for review (without names attached).
11. Committee will meet to review rankings with comments attached (without names attached) and recommend preliminary monetary figures to the Dean.
12. After the committee meets, they will send a summary letter of merit recommendation to Dean.
13. The Dean will make a preliminary determination of the Merit Awards and notify individual faculty members, the Council, and the Provost. Faculty members who wish to know their discrete ranking in each category by the Dean or by Council may request that information from the Dean.

14. A faculty member shall have the right to request reconsideration of the preliminary determination. The request for reconsideration shall be made, in writing, to the Dean for transmission to the Council for its review and recommendation on reconsideration. A necessary condition for Council review of a written request for reconsideration is that the request must give an informed and substantive reason for reconsidering the preliminary determination. An informed reason is based upon at least as much information as was available to Council. Thus, the expectation is that any faculty member requesting reconsideration will have reviewed the documentation submitted by all applicants for Merit Awards who would be affected by a revision of the preliminary determination. A substantive reason discloses a significant misinterpretation or a real and verifiable error in the preliminary determination. Thus, disappointment about the size of an award alone is insufficient reason to request reconsideration. Those appealing may request to present their reconsideration rationale to the Council. After evaluating all requests for reconsideration, the Council will make a final recommendation to the Dean.
15. The Dean will make a final determination of Faculty Merit Awards and notify affected individual faculty, the Council, and the Provost.

V. Other Ashtabula Campus Academic Unit Guidelines

A. Ashtabula Campus Faculty Council Constitution

We the faculty of Kent State Ashtabula hereby establish a Faculty Council for the purposes of being a recommendatory and/or advisory body to the Dean. The Council shall be responsive to the faculty and exist on its good graces. It shall follow the letter and spirit of all University *Collective Bargaining Agreements* and the *University Policy Register*.

Article I: Name

The name of this organization shall be the Faculty Council of the Kent State University Ashtabula Campus (FC).

Article II: Purposes

The purposes of the FC shall be:

1. To provide a means for the faculty to meet for discussions of such aspects of campus life as may concern them.
2. To provide a means of communication between the faculty and the non-teaching personnel.
3. To act as an advisory and recommendatory body to the Dean of the Ashtabula Campus.

Article III: Membership

Section 1

The Faculty Council membership consists of all Tenured/Tenure Track (TT) faculty, and representatives of the Full Time Non-Tenure Track (FTNTT) faculty. The number of representatives of the FTNTT faculty shall be equal to one less than the number of TT faculty residents at the Ashtabula campus. The FTNTT faculty will be responsible for selecting these representatives at the beginning of the Fall academic year. The remaining FT and Part-time (PT) NTT faculty may attend monthly faculty council meetings, participate in discussions, and submit agenda items for consideration.

Section 2

Only tenure track faculty may hold office in the FC. Non-tenure track faculty are eligible for membership on all standing and ad hoc committees, including search committees. Exceptions are those involving personnel actions, such as reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Section 3

The Dean of the Ashtabula Campus or his/her designee shall be an ex officio non-voting member of FC.

Article IV: Officers

Section 1

The officers of FC shall be a chairperson and a vice-chairperson.

Section 2

The officers shall be nominated no later than the second (March) meeting and elected no later than the third (April) meeting of the Spring Semester and shall serve for a two-year period.

Section 3

No officer shall serve more than two consecutive (two-year) terms in the same office.

Section 4

The above officers must be assigned full-time to the Ashtabula Campus.

Article V: Duties of the Officers

Section 1

The duties of the chairperson shall be:

- a. to preside at all meetings of the Council;
- b. to appoint all standing and ad hoc committees and their chairpersons;
- c. to prepare and circulate the agenda for meetings of the council;
- d. to provide for the representation of the faculty of the Ashtabula Campus on any official body or at any official function;

- e. to secure a recording secretary to take the minutes of Council meetings;
- f. to serve as campus representative on Regional Campus Faculty Advisory Committee (RCFAC);
- g. to serve as Chair of the Ashtabula Campus Reappointment/Promotion/Tenure Committee.

Section 2

The duties of the vice-chairperson shall be:

- a. to assume the duties of the chairperson should he/she be unable to fulfill them;
- b. to assist the chairperson in performing such duties as the chairperson may request.

Article VI: Meetings

Section 1

Regular meetings of the Council shall be held monthly, excluding June, July, September, and January at a time to be determined by the membership.

Section 2

Special meetings of the Council may be called by the Chairperson or the Dean, after consultation with the Chairperson, or at the request of five members.

Article VII: Voting

Section 1

For the purposes of voting, a quorum is defined as the number of members present at a regular or special meeting.

Section 2

Voting may be by voice vote, show of hands, or by secret ballot if requested. For a motion to pass, a simple majority vote shall be required.

Article VIII: Amendments

Section 1

This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority of members present at any regular meeting of the Council.

Section 2

All proposed amendments must be distributed in writing to the members two or more weeks before voting is to take place.

Article IX: The Normal Order of Business for Council Meetings Shall be as Follows:

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of minutes of last meeting

4. Chair's report
5. Dean's reports
6. Committee reports
7. Old business
8. New business
9. Announcements and statements for the record
10. Adjournment

ARTICLE X: Handbook Modification, Amendment and Revision

Section 1

The implementation, modification, amendment, and revision of this Handbook are governed by the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements.

Section 2

The Ashtabula Campus FC will review and update this Handbook, as needed, but at least every three (3) years. Suggestions for modifications or amendments to the Handbook may be initiated at any time by the Dean of the Ashtabula Campus or by any Ashtabula Faculty member. Further, the Dean may direct that the Handbook be modified, amended, or revised to reflect changes in Ashtabula Campus or University policy.

Section 3

Proposed modifications or amendments are subject to discussion, revision, recommendation, and vote by the FC.

Section 4

All modifications, amendments and revisions of the Handbook require the approval of the Dean and the Provost.

B. Ashtabula Campus Faculty Travel Policy

The following travel guidelines have been established for all Ashtabula Campus full-time TT and FT-NTT Faculty:

General Guidelines

1. The following parameters have been established by the Ashtabula Faculty Council for reimbursement of professional travel:
 1. Up to 90% reimbursement of allowable travel expenses for presentations of papers or posters.
 2. Up to 75% reimbursement of allowable travel expenses for conference attendance

only.

2. Costs associated with creating posters are not reimbursable expenses.
3. A maximum of up to \$1,000 per faculty member per fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will be allocated to cover the cost of allowable travel expenses.
4. Actual reimbursements will be determined by the number of requests. Funding is NOT GUARANTEED as requests may exceed the pool of funds available.
5. The University Policy Register provides detailed policies related to University travel and allowable travel expenses. It is the faculty member's responsibility to know what is permitted as an allowable travel expense per University Policy.
6. When submitting for travel reimbursement faculty must submit ORIGINAL receipts for allowable expenses as required by the University Travel Policies.

Travel Request Process

1. Prior to travel *Faculty Absence Authorization/Expenditure Estimate* form [or its electronic equivalent](#) must be completed, submitted, and approved by the Assistant Dean.
2. Faculty should include with their absence Authorization form the title of your paper/presentation, if you are giving one, should be provided. In addition, information regarding the benefits of your participation/attendance should be included. This information can be provided in a separate attachment.
3. Attach a copy of the conference program that details what is included in fees.
4. Additional funding sources, if applicable, should be indicated. Possible funding sources include the University Teaching Council (UTC), University Research Council (URC), and the Professional Development Center.
5. After traveling complete the online travel reimbursement workflow located in Flashline.
6. Submit original travel receipts for allowable expenses to the Assistant Dean's Secretary in Academic Affairs.