

**Faculty Handbook of Kent State University's  
School of Peace and Conflict Studies**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Matters of School Governance and Related Procedures .....	1
A.	Preamble .....	1
B.	Goals, Objectives and Mission of the School .....	1
C.	Structure and Organization of the School .....	2
1.	Definition of the Faculty .....	2
2.	Research, Teaching, Service and Practice Roles and Responsibilities of the Faculty .....	2
3.	Faculty Ranks.....	2
4.	Graduate Faculty Status .....	3
5.	Administrative and Service Positions .....	4
6.	School Committees .....	4
7.	Strategic Partnerships.....	7
8.	Faculty Affiliates.....	8
9.	Centers, Research Clusters, and Working Groups .....	8
D.	Faculty Employment and Working Conditions.....	8
1.	Recruiting Faculty.....	8
2.	Grievance Procedures .....	9
3.	Climate of Collegiality.....	9
4.	Faculty Code of Ethics.....	9
5.	Faculty Leaves .....	10
6.	Faculty Absence and Travel Policy.....	10
7.	Faculty Sick Leave and Personal Leave.....	10
8.	Outside Employment and Other Outside Activities.....	11
9.	Copyright Restrictions .....	11
10.	Minimum Salaries and Salary Review.....	11
11.	Academic Misconduct.....	11
12.	Policy on Consensual Romantic or Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students.....	11
E.	Revision of the Handbook.....	12
II.	Teaching Assignments and Workload, Including Workload Equivalencies and Related Procedures .....	12
A.	Workload Summary Reports.....	13

B.	Teaching Assignments and Class Schedules.....	15
C.	Team Teaching.....	15
D.	Summer Teaching Assignments.....	16
E.	Syllabi .....	16
F.	Office Hours.....	16
G.	Grades and Student Records .....	16
H.	Final Examinations .....	17
I.	Student and Peer Evaluation .....	17
J.	Participation in University Activities.....	17
K.	Other Faculty Duties .....	17
III.	Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Criteria (& Criteria and Processes Relating to Other Faculty Personnel Actions).....	17
A.	Tenure Track (TT) Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion .....	17
1.	Reappointment of TT Faculty .....	18
2.	Tolling.....	18
3.	Tenure and Promotion of TT Faculty.....	19
4.	Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of TT Faculty.....	19
5.	Research Scholarship .....	20
6.	Teaching.....	28
7.	Service and Citizenship.....	29
8.	Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Files.....	29
B.	Renewal of Appointment and Performance Reviews of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty .....	31
1.	Annual Renewal of NTT Appointment.....	31
2.	Third-Year and Subsequent NTT Full Performance Review.....	31
3.	Promotion of NTT Faculty.....	32
4.	Peer Evaluations of Teaching .....	32
5.	Unsatisfactory Performance .....	32
IV.	Criteria, Performance Expectations, and School Procedures Relating to Faculty Excellence (Merit) Awards for TT Faculty.....	32
V.	Appendix One: Criteria for Tenure and Promotion .....	47

# **I. MATTERS OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND RELATED PROCEDURES**

## **A. Preamble**

This departmental handbook (hereinafter “Handbook”) contains the operational policies and procedures for the School of Peace and Conflict Studies (hereinafter “School”) within the College of Arts & Sciences (hereinafter “College”). The policies and procedures contained in this Handbook shall not conflict with any University Policy of Kent State University, any applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement, or any federal, state or local law. If a conflict arises between policies and procedures here stated and other policies and procedures including those of the University Policy Register or any Collective Bargaining Agreement in force, policies and procedures having wider authority shall take precedence over those stated here.

## **B. Goals, Objectives and Mission of the School**

Since the killing and wounding of Kent State students by the Ohio National Guard on May 4, 1970 on its Kent campus, Kent State University has been a leader in fashioning positive institutional responses to violent conflict. The School of Peace and Conflict Studies is one such endeavor.

The School’s predecessor, the Center for Peaceful Change (1971-1994), was established in 1971 as the university’s original living memorial to the students killed on May 4, 1970. It was established to research, teach and promote peaceful mechanisms of social and political change. The Center was renamed the Center for Applied Conflict Management in 1994, which it remained until it expanded and transitioned to become the School of Peace and Conflict Studies in August, 2017. In 1974, the Center’s degree program, called “Integrative Change,” was established. The name of the degree was subsequently changed to “Peace and Conflict Studies,” and still later it was changed to “Applied Conflict Management,” with corresponding curricular changes.

The School of Peace and Conflict Studies promotes interdisciplinary research, teaching, practice and community outreach on conflict analysis and resolution, peacebuilding, and the prevention of violence. Housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School facilitates collaborative efforts, from the local to the global, so as to critically examine, formulate, recommend, and apply effective responses to destructive conflicts and violence.

The School endeavors to conduct research about and to teach a dynamic blend of conflict management theory and practice that is oriented toward increasing social justice and sustainable peace.

Understanding the sources, dynamics, stages and cycles of conflicts are an integral dimension of School research and teaching. Also valued is applied knowledge about tools, tactics, and processes to constructively manage conflicts. Pedagogies that are interactive, cooperative, and participatory are privileged in the School of Peace and Conflict Studies courses as well as in the training work School faculty conduct in the community so that participants may learn applied conflict management skills to be used in the community, the workplace, in a variety of life settings, and in relationships. Awareness of and redressing power inequalities between conflict parties and the structural sources of those inequalities is a central concern in the constructive approach to managing conflicts that marks the School’s philosophy.

## **C. Structure and Organization of the School**

### **1. Definition of the Faculty**

The terms "Faculty," "members of the Faculty," and "Faculty members" used in this handbook are defined as full-time faculty members of academic rank who hold NTT or TT appointments at the University and who, therefore, are members of the bargaining units as defined in the current Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs). Unless otherwise specified, participation in consensus decision making and voting rights on departmental matters are restricted to the Faculty with full-time appointments in the School.

In addition to the consensus decision making and voting Faculty, all other faculty members such as part-time, temporary, or adjunct appointments are eligible to attend School faculty meetings and participate in the deliberations; they do not have decision making or voting privileges.

### **2. Research, Teaching, Service and Practice Roles and Responsibilities of the Faculty**

Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the School, College and the University according to the terms and condition of his/her letter of appointment. Not all faculty members contribute to the School in the same manner. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to be involved in significant research activity, serve on graduate student committees, and direct graduate student research. TT faculty must present evidence of their endeavors as witnessed by peer-reviewed publications, proposals submitted for extramural funding, and dissemination of research in various peer-reviewed venues as appropriate to their areas of specialization, and to the field of Peace and Conflict Studies. Activity in Peace and Conflict Studies professional organizations is expected of TT faculty members. For all full-time faculty members, public service, community outreach and applied practice as it relates to the mission of the School is also expected.

Service to the University is a responsibility of each faculty member. School, College, and University committee or task force membership is expected as a normal part of a faculty member's contributions, less so for non-tenured faculty than for tenured faculty. Service expectations may vary according to one's position and other work expectations, as specified in letters of appointment or workload statements.

### **3. Faculty Ranks**

The definitions of faculty ranks follow:

Instructor: This rank is intended for persons initially hired with a master's degree. Normally, the School does not hire at the rank of Instructor for full time positions.

TT Assistant Professor: This rank is normally the entry level rank for tenure-track track faculty holding the doctorate in Peace and Conflict Studies or an appropriate cognate discipline.

TT Associate Professor: Hire to or promotion to this rank presumes prior service as a TT Assistant Professor, significant academic achievements, and possession of the doctorate in Peace and Conflict Studies or an appropriate cognate discipline.

TT Professor: Promotion to this rank requires credentials and significant academic achievements beyond those required for promotion to TT Associate Professor, and possession of the doctorate in Peace and Conflict Studies or an appropriate cognate discipline.

**Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT) Appointments:** Full-time non-tenure track faculty (NTT) appointments are made on an annual basis. An NTT faculty member who has successfully completed three (3) consecutive years of employment and one (1) Full Performance Review becomes eligible for appointment to a three-year term of annually renewable appointments which are 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 (*See NTT CBA*). NTT appointments are not included under the umbrella of the University policy and procedures regarding faculty tenure (*See the University Policy Register*) and NTT faculty members are not entitled to any rights with regard to tenure. NTT faculty ranks and the promotional process for NTT faculty are detailed in the NTT CBA.

NTT offers of appointment will include the specific academic rank.

There are six full-time NTT ranks delineated in the NTT CBA. These include:

- Lecturer, Associate Lecturer and Senior Lecturer - for NTT faculty members who have not earned a terminal degree in their discipline and whose professional experience and demonstrated performance warrant these ranks.
- Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor - for NTT faculty members who have earned the terminal degree in their discipline and whose professional experience and demonstrated performance warrant these ranks.
- NTT appointments shall also specify the track in which the appointment is offered. Tracks include:
  - Instructional. FTNTT Faculty members whose primary role is to deliver instruction.
  - Clinical. FTNTT Faculty members whose primary role is to deliver instruction and/or supervision in a clinical setting.
  - Practitioner. FTNTT Faculty members whose primary role is to deliver instruction or serve in professional programs and applied areas.
  - Research. FTNTT Faculty members whose primary role is to engage in research activity funded by external sources.

**Part-Time Faculty Appointments:** When the School cannot meet its teaching needs from the ranks of its full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, full-time non-tenure track (NTT) faculty and graduate students, part-time faculty appointments will be made from an established pool of qualified applicants not currently on regular appointment at the University.

#### **4. Graduate Faculty Status**

The School's tenure-track faculty members staff many of the courses in the Conflict Analysis and Management track in the Political Science (POL) PhD program, serve on POL doctoral comprehensive exam committees, and on POL dissertation committees. Thus, the School normally requires that all faculty hired for tenure-track positions be eligible for appointment to the graduate faculty. The Administrative policy regarding graduate faculty is included in the University Policy Register (*See the University Policy Register*). The status of Graduate faculty members shall be assigned by the F4 Committee of the Political Science Department (see Section III of the POL Department Handbook).

## 5. Administrative and Service Positions

### a) *School Director*

The School Director (hereinafter “Director”) is the chief administrative officer of the School (see Department Operational Manual) and reports directly to and is accountable to the Dean of the College (hereinafter “Dean”). The Director is responsible for recording, maintaining, and implementing the policies and procedures stated in this Handbook through regular and thorough consultation with the School faculty and its committees as provided for in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Director is an ex officio, non-voting member of all School committees, and may make appointments as necessary and permitted to School committees and to the various administrative and service positions in the School.

The Director shall strive to create a collegial, cooperative, transparent atmosphere in which all faculty members can most effectively realize their capabilities for teaching, research, service, practice, and community outreach in fulfilling their professional duties and obligations.

The Director shall solicit items from the faculty for the faculty meeting, make regular reports on the health of the School, communicate information from the university administration in a timely manner, select and supervise non-academic staff members and maintain effective office organization. These responsibilities are exercised in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) and in accordance with the University Civil Service regulations.

The Director of the School of Peace and Conflict Studies shall have no teaching responsibilities until the completion of the 2019-2020 academic year, which will include the 50<sup>th</sup> Commemoration of the May 4, 1970 shootings. Commencing with AY 2020-21 and for all subsequent years, the Director of the School shall teach one course per academic year.

Procedures for the selection, review and reappointment of the Director are included in the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement.

### b) *Non-academic Staff*

The School’s non-academic staff includes all classified and unclassified staff positions within the School including but not limited to the secretarial staff. Each position has specific duties as defined in the applicable position description.

## 6. School Committees

All School committees are advisory and recommendatory to the Director. The membership, structure, and function of some of the School’s committees are governed by the University Policy Register and the Collective Bargaining Agreements, where applicable. The Director may establish other School standing and ad hoc committees in consultation with the Faculty Meeting.

The Director will solicit requests from faculty members for positions on the various committees. The Director, when making appointments to committees, will be mindful of the diversity of specializations and areas of study among the School faculty and will consider the expertise and interests necessary for the effective functioning of specific committees. The Director’s recommendations shall be submitted to the Faculty for approval.

The standing committees are: Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC); Curriculum Committee (CC); and Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). There is also an *Ad Hoc Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion* Committee, and various other *ad hoc* committees as needs arise.

Membership on FAC consists of all the TT faculty and the maximum number of NTT faculty as allowed in order to meet the TT CBA requirement that TT faculty members will be a majority on FAC.

The NTT faculty members will serve one year terms and will be appointed by the NTT faculty members in advance of the School faculty's annual August retreat or its equivalent, i.e. the first faculty meeting of the academic year.

The *Collective Bargaining Agreement* requires that each Department/School must hold a meeting of the full Faculty at least once each semester.

All School committees have the obligation to make the Faculty Meeting vital and the center of School policy making and should distribute minutes of their respective meetings to the School faculty in a timely fashion.

With respect to NTT faculty representatives on School committees, this should be determined with the concurrence of the NTT faculty.

a) *Decision-making in the Faculty Meeting and in School Committees*

In keeping with the principles of the field of Peace and Conflict Studies, the Faculty Meeting and all School committee meetings shall be conducted in an egalitarian manner to facilitate the participation of all faculty members.

The Director shall solicit agenda items for the Faculty Meeting and shall distribute the agenda for the meeting at least one full day in advance.

The principles and processes of consensus decision making shall govern the facilitation of School committee meetings. However, if after extensive discussions consensus can't be achieved, a faculty member may call for a vote on the issue being discussed, and a vote must then be held. In such instances, a 60% or greater majority is needed for passage. There shall be no secret voting or proxy voting at the Faculty Meeting or committee meetings.

In routine, non-controversial matters that must be decided before a Faculty Meeting is scheduled, the Director may poll the faculty with electronic ballots, submitted directly to the Director or the Secretary. Faculty members will have two full business days to cast their votes. If any Faculty member objects to the holding of an electronic vote during that period, a regular Faculty Meeting must be called instead.

b) *The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)*

Membership on the School of Peace and Conflict Studies FAC consists of all Faculty members with full-time appointments in the School, including NTT Faculty members. The FAC is structured and operates as described in the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The School's FAC should be convened by the Director at least twice per semester and chaired by the School Director. A simple majority of the School's full-time faculty members shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of the Faculty/FAC Meeting. Faculty on leave or excused by the Director are excluded for purpose of quorum determination.



The FAC provides recommendations and advice on all academic matters central to the mission of the School. The Chair, in consultation with the FAC, sets the agenda for the meetings and circulates agendas in advance of the meeting. FAC members may request that items be added to the agenda. Additional meetings of the FAC may be called by a request of at least one-third of the members of the FAC.

c) *The Curriculum Committee (CC)*

The CC is composed of at least one faculty member who is designated its chair whether or not there are additional members. In consultation with the Director and the Faculty Meeting, the CC chair makes recommendations to the Faculty Meeting on any and all matters which affect the undergraduate academic programs of the School including but not limited to faculty proposals for new courses, changes in course content, major and minor requirements, and other curricular matters. The CC or its chair are largely responsible for decisions on course substitutions and similar advising matters, but are encouraged to consult with the full faculty, particularly on decisions that deviate from past practices and/or may set precedent. The CC chair shall serve on the College Curriculum Committee.

d) *Ad Hoc Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee for TT Faculty*

The policies and procedures which govern the School's Ad Hoc Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee are included in University Policy. The Ad Hoc RTP Committee is a recurrent ad hoc committee whose functions are assigned by university policies, including the CBA, the University Policy Register, and guidelines from the Provost's office. Within these limits, the Committee applies more explicit School-adopted criteria and standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as set forth in below in this Handbook. Membership is composed of all tenured faculty members in the School at or above the rank that the faculty member under consideration is applying for. Where there are not enough School faculty members to populate the committee, faculty members from other cognate departments will be appointed to the committee by the Director, following consultation with the FAC, the Dean and the candidate(s).

The RTP committee reviews materials relevant to the professional performance of faculty who are candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion in rank and makes recommendations to the Director on each of these personnel decisions. The recommendations of this committee and that of the Director are forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

e) *Student Academic Complaint Committee (SACC)*

The purpose of the Student Academic Complaint Committee (SACC) is to hear and discuss any academic complaints lodged by students and to make recommendations to the School Director concerning the resolution of those complaints. As in the work of all of the School's committees, the School's SACC is expected to use the processes and principles of constructive conflict management in conducting its business.

The Student Academic Complaint Committee (SACC) shall consist of two full-time TT or NTT faculty members of the School and an undergraduate Applied Conflict Management major or minor in good standing in the School. The faculty members of the SACC, including its Chair, shall be selected at the first Faculty Meeting of the academic year. The policies and procedures of this committee are governed by University Policy 3342-4-02.3.

In the event that a member of the Student Academic Complaint Committee is the subject of or may otherwise be involved with a student complaint, the Director will select a replacement from the full-time

TT or NTT faculty. If the Chair of the SACC is the subject of or may otherwise be involved with a student complaint, the Director will appoint a member of the Student Academic Complaint Committee to chair the committee and the Director will appoint an additional member to the committee from the Faculty.

*f) The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)*

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) consists of all full-time TT faculty members of the School. During its first meeting of the academic year, FEC shall elect one of its members to serve as Chair. The School Director is an ex officio member of the committee.

FEC processes and criteria for assessing TT faculty performance shall be used annually solely for the purposes of recommending merit and determining workload. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will annually award points to each faculty member for items submitted on their respective FEC forms. Based on the items listed and submitted on the FEC form, FEC will make a preliminary determination of the points to be awarded to each faculty member. This shall be completed no later than two months after the FEC forms are due. All faculty members will be informed about these point allocations and will have the opportunity to appeal the FEC point allocations either in writing or in person to FEC. Also see the relevant section below regarding FEC's role in recommending merit awards to TT faculty.

The FEC responsibilities include: annually recommending to the Director the ranking of TT faculty for merit increments based on university policy and the criteria approved at the Faculty Meeting; recommending to the Faculty Meeting the policies and guidelines which, upon approval, become the basis of awarding merit in the following merit cycle.

The FEC "Faculty Submission Form" and associated criteria for scoring faculty productivity is at the end of this handbook. Changes to the FEC criteria and the Faculty Submission Form are considered changes to the Faculty Handbook and therefore must follow the procedures for changing the Faculty Handbook.

*g) Graduate Program Liaison*

A tenure-track faculty member of the School, appointed by the Director in consultation with the Faculty Meeting, shall serve as the School's representative to the Political Science Department's Graduate Studies Committee.

*h) Representative to the College Advisory Committee (A&S CAC)*

A tenured member of the School faculty, appointed by the Director in consultation with the Faculty Meeting, shall serve as the School's representative to the College Advisory Committee.

*i) Library Liaison*

A Faculty member will be appointed annually by the Director, in consultation with the Faculty Meeting, to serve as liaison between the School and University Libraries. This liaison will solicit recommendations from faculty member for book and film orders, journal subscriptions, and other matters relevant to the School's relationship with University Libraries.

## **7. Strategic Partnerships**

The School welcomes strategic partnerships to promote conflict resolution within the Kent State community. One such partnership includes Student Mediation Services (SMS) which collaborates with

Student Affairs. SMS provides conflict resolution services such as coaching, mediation, facilitation and training to students on campus, especially within Residence Services and Greek Life.

## **8. Faculty Affiliates**

The School of Peace and Conflict Studies welcomes faculty members from other units who desire faculty affiliate status due to their research and teaching interests dovetailing with the School's mission to promote interdisciplinary research, teaching, practice and community outreach on conflict analysis and resolution, peacebuilding, and the prevention of violence. Faculty affiliates contribute to the School's collaborative efforts to uncover and critically examine effective responses to destructive conflicts and violence and to increasing social justice and sustainable peace. Kent State University colleagues desiring faculty affiliate status will submit to the Director a current CV and a short descriptive statement highlighting the arenas of collaborative work they hope to engage in with the School. The School Faculty Meeting decides on the granting of faculty affiliate status.

## **9. Centers, Research Clusters, and Working Groups**

The School of Peace and Conflict Studies encourages the formation of interdisciplinary faculty clusters and working groups with faculty members from other units focused in thematic areas to stimulate and carry out collaborative projects including grant applications, publications, conferences, seminars, and outreach of various sorts. If School funds are dispersed to working groups or research clusters, reporting requirements for the use of said funds will be established. Formalized administrative units like Centers may also become part of the School's structure; in that event, this handbook will be revised to detail responsibilities and appropriate administrative reporting requirements.

## **D. Faculty Employment and Working Conditions**

### **1. Recruiting Faculty**

#### *a) Recruiting Full-time Faculty*

The School supports the goals of equal opportunity and affirmative action in recruiting and in making appointments to the full-time faculty. The Director, in consultation with the full-time faculty, recommends members of an ad hoc search committee to the Faculty Meeting. Diversity will be taken into account in determining committee composition. The committees conducting searches should provide opportunities for graduate and undergraduate student involvement in the search process. The responsibility for organization of the search and for maintaining search records rests with the Director.

The Search Committee, in consultation with the Director, recommends to the Faculty Meeting job descriptions and candidates to be interviewed.

After the interviews have been concluded, the Faculty Meeting, shall recommend to the Director whether to offer a TT faculty appointment and to whom.

#### *b) Recruiting Temporary, Part-time Faculty*

The Director consults with the Faculty Meeting on temporary positions in accordance with University regulations. A file of pool candidates for temporary positions shall be maintained by the Director.

## 2. Grievance Procedures

### a) *Informal Procedure*

Faculty grievances that are not directly related to the terms or conditions of employment and are not academic appeals are appropriately addressed within the School, whenever possible. The School highly values direct communication using the principles and processes of constructive conflict management. Any faculty member who has concerns or a grievance is strongly encouraged, before initiating a formal grievance or appeal, to talk with the principals involved and/or the Director about their concerns. The Director may seek the advice and recommendation of individual faculty members or a faculty advisory group in seeking informal resolution of a dispute or complaint. The Director and/or faculty members will initiate an informal dialogue with the parties involved in a dispute and strive to reach a resolution agreeable to all parties. If this dialogue does not produce a satisfactory resolution, parties may seek assistance from an impartial third party as needed to assist in resolving their issues.

### b) *Formal Procedure*

The School of Peace and Conflict Studies acknowledges and endorses the ideal expressed in the TT CBA that “all disputes should be resolved informally, whenever possible, before the filing of a formal grievance” and likewise encourages “open communications so that resort to the formal grievance procedure will not be necessary” (Article VII, Section 1. C. 1.). Similarly, the School endorses related commitments in the NTT CBA: “The University and the Association share a mutual commitment to open communication and efforts to resolve issues of concern or disputes in a timely way and through informal means wherever practicable” (Article VII, Section 1)

Grievances related to employment with the university concerning the interpretations and application of provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement follow the procedures of the applicable CBA. (*TT CBA Article VII; NTT CBA Article VII*)

University Policies on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment as detailed in the TT Collective Bargaining Agreement, and Article VII, Section 2 of the TT CBA, specify the necessary procedures for appealing decisions involving a substantive academic judgment. These include decisions concerning reappointment, tenure, promotion, academic freedom, professional ethics, or sanctions for cause. Formal procedures for addressing such grievances are described in the applicable *Collective Bargaining Agreement*.

## 3. Climate of Collegiality

The School emphasizes conflict resolution as a means of addressing tension and disagreements. While there are no requirements for how colleagues interact with one another, there is an expectation that faculty members will operate collegially with one another and with staff, emphasizing mutual respect and collaboration.

## 4. Faculty Code of Ethics

All members of the School faculty are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards as teachers, scholars, university citizens and colleagues. The University policy regarding faculty code of professional ethics can be found in the University Policy Register.

## 5. Faculty Leaves

All leaves, sponsored or unsupported, personal or professional, are subject to the approval of the Director, the Dean and the Provost. University leaves include but are not limited to:

- Research leaves (See UPR 3342-6-11.8).
- Leaves of absence without pay (See UPR 3342-6-11.9).
- Faculty professional improvement leaves (See UPR 3342-6-12).
- Research/Creative Activity appointments (See UPR 3342-6-15.3).
- Professional development leaves (See NTT CBA, Article XVI Section 2).

## 6. Faculty Absence and Travel Policy

Faculty members who will be absent from campus for professional or personal reasons must submit a “Request for Absence Form” with the Director. The request should be made at least one week prior to the planned absence and is subject to the approval of the Director and the Dean. Arrangements for any classes to be missed during the absence must be addressed to the satisfaction of the Director before approval will be granted.

Attendance at professional meetings is encouraged for both TT and NTT faculty, and approved travel expenses incurred in attending such meetings will be reimbursed if approved prior to travel according to the University’s travel policies, and subject to the availability of School funds. In general, full-time faculty members of the School who do not have start-up funds are eligible to receive \$750 per academic year from the School for travel to professional meetings and conferences.

For TT faculty to be eligible for School travel funds in the form of \$750 per academic year, they must meet the following three conditions: 1) they must have exhausted any start-up funds granted as part of their initial hire; 2) they must be presenting a paper at a panel or a roundtable; 3) they must also have applied for travel funds from either the URC or the UTC, as appropriate.

For NTT faculty to be eligible for School travel funds in the form of \$750 per academic year, they must also have applied for travel funds from the University Research Council or the University Teaching Council, as appropriate.

## 7. Faculty Sick Leave and Personal Leave

The Director is responsible for keeping complete records of faculty sick leave; however, faculty members are also required to submit the appropriate sick leave forms to the Director. Sick leave forms should be completed and submitted to the Director within forty-eight (48) hours after an absence (See relevant sections in the University Policy Register).

Conversion of sick leave to personal leave will be done in accordance with relevant provisions of the CBAs (TT CBA Article XIII, Section 7; NTT CBA Article XII). Requests to convert accrued sick leave to personal leave are intended to cover absences due to mandatory court appearances, legal or business matters, family emergencies or any other personal matters. (TT CBA Article XIII, Section 7.)

## **8. Outside Employment and Other Outside Activities**

Faculty members may engage in professional activities outside the university provided the activities do not interfere with the faculty member's teaching, research, or service responsibilities to the School, Campus, College or University (See, University Policy Register 3342-6-24). Continuing outside employment for remuneration must be approved in advance by the Director and the Dean. Each academic year, each faculty member must disclose and seek approval for all continuing outside employment on the form provided by the University. Any outside employment or other outside activities are subject to the Faculty Code of Ethics and the University's conflict of interest policies (See University Policy Register 3342-6-17 and 3342-6-23)

## **9. Copyright Restrictions**

All faculty members should be aware of current copyright laws which restrict the copying of published materials. For further information, contact the University's Office of Legal Affairs.

## **10. Minimum Salaries and Salary Review**

Minimum faculty salaries in each academic rank are specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreements. Faculty members wishing to request a salary review to match a bona fide offer of employment, or to address a salary discrepancy, or in other unusual circumstances may do so in accordance with the relevant Collective Bargaining Agreement.

## **11. Academic Misconduct**

The University policy regarding misconduct in research and scholarship and the Administrative policy and procedures regarding allegations and instances of misconduct in research and scholarship is included in the University Policy Register. (See University Policy Register 3342-3-05 and 3342-2-05.01)

## **12. Policy on Consensual Romantic or Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students**

### *a) Terminology*

For the purposes of this policy, the term "faculty," "faculty member," or "teaching faculty" refers to all those who teach and/or do research at the University including (but not limited to) tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, part-time instructors, lecturers, holders of research appointments, graduate students with teaching responsibilities, visiting faculty, and advisors.

The term "student" refers to a person enrolled at Kent State University in any capacity, including (but not limited to) full-time or part-time; undergraduate or graduate; for-credit or not-for-credit; or degree or non-degree.

### *b) Policy*

The School's educational mission is promoted by professionalism in faculty/student relationships, and professionalism is fostered by an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Actions of faculty members and

students that harm this atmosphere—which occurs when those in positions of authority abuse or appear to abuse their authority—undermine professionalism and hinder fulfillment of the School’s mission.

The School strongly believes that a romantic and/or sexual relationship between a student and a faculty member—even if such a relationship appears consensual—undermines the School’s academic mission and should be avoided.

In addition, the School imposes the following formal restrictions: Romantic and/or sexual relationships, and the pursuit thereof, between faculty members and graduate or undergraduate students are prohibited whenever the faculty member has direct professional responsibility for or authority over the student. Positions of professional responsibility or authority include the following: course instructor; formal advisor; independent study director; internship coordinator; dissertation, MA, or Honors Thesis committee member; MA or PhD Advisory Committee member; TA/RA supervisor; or similar formal hierarchical relationships.

Furthermore, no faculty member may pressure, cajole, or otherwise coerce an undergraduate student to avoid a hierarchical professional relationship (e.g., taking a faculty member’s course) in order to pursue a romantic and/or sexual relationship.

Finally, while the School does not expressly forbid them, romantic and/or sexual relationships between faculty and graduate or undergraduate students at Kent State are also discouraged when no clear professional, hierarchical relationship between the faculty and student exists (see above). Failure to comply with this policy may result in discipline or dismissal according to the rules appropriate to the individuals involved.

## **E. Revision of the Handbook**

This Handbook was approved by the Faculty Meeting on XXXX 2017, and it is reviewed at least once every four years. The Director and a committee of faculty members shall conduct the review and present recommendations to the FAC for approval. In addition, during regular Faculty Meetings, a faculty member may propose changes to any provision of the Handbook, provided the proposal was provided to the faculty in writing no less than 48 hours prior to the start of said meeting. Following discussion, consensus shall be sought for any Handbook changes. Absent consensus, a faculty member may call for a vote on the proposal. A 60% or greater majority of those voting is necessary to amend or alter the Handbook.

Before any addition or alteration to the Handbook is officially incorporated into the Handbook, the addition or alteration must be approved by the Dean of the College. In reviewing this Handbook the Dean may request revisions before lending final approval. If these revisions are not adopted by the School, the Dean shall consult the CAC with regard to the provision(s) in dispute before making a final determination and certifying final approval of the Handbook. Further, the Dean may direct that the Handbook be modified, amended or revised to reflect changes in College or University policy. See Article VI, Section 7 of the TT CBA for details regarding the handbook review and modification process.

## **II. TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS AND WORKLOAD, INCLUDING WORKLOAD EQUIVALENCIES AND RELATED PROCEDURES**

All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the School carry a maximum workload of twenty-four (24) credit hours per academic year. Full-time non-tenure track faculty members carry a maximum

workload of thirty (30) credit hours per academic year (See the University Policy Register). The workload for each individual faculty member is assigned by the Director with the approval of the Dean. The FAC shall advise the Director on issues related to teaching assignments, class schedules and the appropriate application of workload equivalents. The Director shall provide each faculty member with a statement of her/his workload.

### **A. Workload Summary Reports**

Each TT Faculty member is to prepare and submit an annual workload summary report for the previous academic year by September 15<sup>th</sup> (See relevant CBA section). The annual workload summary report submitted by the Faculty member shall be in the form of an annual updated curriculum vitae, a brief summary of the previous year's professional activities, and the course syllabi for each course or section of course taught by the Faculty member during the previous academic year. The Director shall add to the report copies of the summaries of course evaluations for each course taught during the previous academic year. If necessary, the Director may request additional information from the Faculty member to clarify summary information and the Faculty member shall respond in a timely fashion.

The purpose of this report is to document the workload, including utilization of specified workload equivalencies, for that academic year. This report may be used in planning future workload equivalencies. Any other use of the report requires consent of the Faculty member. Modification or revision of the specification and/or application of workload equivalents listed below in Table 1 require the approval of the Faculty Meeting.

For each semester of the regular academic year, each FTNTT Faculty member shall receive a statement of his/her specific workload assignment at least thirty (30) days prior to the beginning of the semester, as per the NTT CBA.

The following table codifies mandatory workload equivalencies that the Director will assign each year. Nontenured, tenure-track faculty qualify for a two-course equivalency until the year when one stands for tenure in order to develop effective courses, establish a research program, and begin to supervise student research. Workload equivalencies specific and appropriate to FT NTT Faculty members for service and other assigned duties may also be developed as appropriate and in keeping with the relevant section of the NTT CBA. The FEC points referenced in Table 1 will be determined on an annual basis by FEC.

The Director may also, in consultation with FAC, assign workload equivalencies for other specific duties that are considered essential to the academic mission of the School. Calculation of applicable workload equivalencies may not always be directly linked to credit hours of instruction. Class size, number of preparations, grading and/or student assessment and other factors may be considered when workload equivalencies are calculated for FT NTT faculty members.



**Table 1. Workload Equivalents Table**

<b>Title / Name of Assignment</b>	<b>Load Equivalent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Brief Description of Duties</b>
Chair of Curriculum Committee	3	Year	Overall coordination of undergraduate studies, including issues associated with: recruitment, retention, advising, curriculum, course scheduling, etc.
CACM Internship course instructor and CACM Individual Investigation course instructor	3	Year	Supervision of Internships by Applied Conflict Management majors and minors during Fall and Spring semesters, and delivery of Individual Investigation courses during Fall and Spring semesters.
Student Mediation Services Program Manager	18	Year	Overall coordination and implementation of Student Mediation Services programs in cooperation with the Division of Student Affairs, Office of Student Conduct, and Residence Services.
College Advisory Committee Representative	3	For two consecutive years of service	Granted to a tenured faculty member following service as the School's member of the CAC for two consecutive years.
Conflict Management Intervention Services & Training Coordinator	6	Year	Provision of conflict management intervention services, facilitation, and trainings to other academic units, businesses, community organizations, etc.
Published Research Productivity	12	Year	40 FEC points for published research over the previous four year period.

<b>Title / Name of Assignment</b>	<b>Load Equivalent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Brief Description of Duties</b>
Published Research Productivity	9	Year	35 FEC points for published research over the previous four year period.
Published Research Productivity	6	Year	30 FEC points for published research over the previous four year period.
Published Research Productivity	3	Year	25 FEC points for published research over the previous four year period.

## **B. Teaching Assignments and Class Schedules**

Ordinarily, a faculty member will teach a range of courses, including upper-division and (when appropriate) graduate courses in their area of specialization, but also including lower-division and Kent CORE courses. The Director shall solicit the preferences of faculty members for courses and days and times that they prefer to teach. The primary considerations for course assignments are prior teaching experience, subject expertise, unit need, and shared responsibility among the faculty for teaching graduate, undergraduate, and introductory courses.

Questions regarding teaching assignments should be addressed to the Director. In the case of an unresolved dispute regarding course teaching assignments, the faculty member may request review by the FAC which will make a recommendation to the Director. Scheduling of classes is the responsibility of the Director.

## **C. Team Teaching**

Team teaching of courses is welcomed within the School. Faculty members who team teach a course with one other colleague three times within six years will receive credit for teaching two courses. When team-teaching the course with one other colleague the first time, no credit is given. When team-teaching the course a second time with a colleague within a four-year period, credit will be given for teaching one course. Upon team teaching the course a third time with a colleague within a six-year period from the first

time it was taught, a second course credit will be given. Team teaching the course with another colleague a fourth time will start a new such cycle. Team teaching with more than one colleague will be handled on a case by case basis, as will be team-teaching more often than what is described here.

#### **D. Summer Teaching Assignments**

Summer teaching cannot be guaranteed to any faculty member. The size, content, and staffing of summer courses are dictated by budgetary constraints, curricular needs, and scheduling issues. The Director, in consultation with the Curriculum Committee, determines the list of course offerings which meet the objective of sound curriculum planning and an effective response to student demand. Within these requirements, the Director will endeavor to distribute summer teaching opportunities equitably among faculty members who express an interest. Faculty members may elect not to accept a summer assignment. See also the relevant section in the respective CBAs.

#### **E. Syllabi**

All faculty members are expected to provide students with a syllabus. While there is no standardized format for syllabi, it is recommended that the syllabus includes identifying characteristics such as course title, department, section number, as well as the semester and year the course is offered. Syllabi should also include best ways to reach the faculty member including office hours.

The course objectives and expectations for the class should be outlined within the syllabus as well as required textbooks. The syllabi should include a general calendar of the substance of the course with important deadlines for assignments, tests, the course withdrawal deadline and enrollment/registration dates. Syllabi should include a statement regarding disabled students. Syllabi should also include a grading policy for class requirements in addition to a statement on cheating and plagiarism.

#### **F. Office Hours**

During a regular academic year semester, each faculty member who is the instructor of record for one or more courses (other than thesis, dissertation, or individual supervision) shall be available for consultation through office hours either in person or electronically for a minimum of five hours per week. During a summer session or intersession, each faculty member who is the instructor of record for one or more courses (other than thesis, dissertation, or individual supervision) shall be available for consultation through office hours either in person or electronically for a minimum of three hours per week.

The office hours shall be posted on the faculty member's office door and communicated to the School office as well as to the faculty member's students. If a student, for a legitimate reason, is unable to meet during the faculty member's scheduled office hours, the faculty member shall make appointments to meet with the student at an alternate time.

#### **G. Grades and Student Records**

All faculty members must inform students of their progress throughout the semester. Grades are a faculty member's responsibility and should be assigned fairly and objectively. Submission of final grades must comply with University Policy, including but not limited to the deadline for the timely submission of grades. Repeated failure of faculty members to provide grades in compliance with University Policy will be taken into consideration in reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit decisions. Students have a

right to inspect the written work performed during a course and discuss the grade with the faculty member.

All members of the School must comply with all laws and University Policies which govern the privacy of student education records, including but not limited to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). These regulations require, among other things, that faculty members keep thorough academic records and forbid the posting of grades by name, social security number or any other system which might identify a student with her/his education record.

## **H. Final Examinations**

In accordance with University Policy as described on the final exam schedules, final examinations or class meetings during final examination week must be held at the time and place listed for each course in the Final Examination Schedule. All classes are expected to have some instructional or evaluative activity during the final examination time. If an examination is given, with the department chairperson or school director and dean's permission, at some time other than scheduled, then it must still be available to one or more students at the officially scheduled time.

## **I. Student and Peer Evaluation**

A Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) is required in each course in each semester and will be conducted under the auspices of the Director pursuant to applicable University policies and procedures.

Probationary TT faculty members are required to undergo peer review of teaching during each year of the probationary period. NTT faculty members in their first three years of service are required to undergo annual peer reviews of teaching. See below for details on the conduct of these peer reviews.

## **J. Participation in University Activities**

Faculty members are expected on an equitable basis to participate in recruitment programs, graduation ceremonies and other activities which are appropriate to their role as a faculty member in the School.

## **K. Other Faculty Duties**

Faculty are required to advise students on academic matters. In order to assist in student advising, Faculty members should maintain current knowledge of University, College, and Department programs and requirements.

# **III. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA (& CRITERIA AND PROCESSES RELATING TO OTHER FACULTY PERSONNEL ACTIONS)**

## **A. Tenure Track (TT) Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion**

The School of Peace and Conflict Studies criteria for the evaluation of Faculty include an assumption that all Faculty members are committed to the University's missions of teaching, research and service. Two additional assumptions are that each Faculty member is dedicated to: the School's mission of public

outreach and applied practice; and to advancing the field of Peace and Conflict Studies while contributing to Kent State University's continued leadership in that field.

## **1. Reappointment of TT Faculty**

The policies and procedures for reappointment are included in the University policy and procedures regarding faculty reappointment (see, University Policy Register 3342-6-16). Each academic year, reappointment guidelines for faculty are distributed by the Office of the Provost. Probationary tenure-track (TT) faculty members are reviewed by the School's Ad Hoc RTP Committee.

The Director annually assigns a tenured member of the faculty to visit at least one class session of each probationary TT faculty member, interview students in the class, evaluate the course materials and syllabus, and subsequently discuss the course and the class session with the instructor. A written evaluation is submitted to the Director for placement in the TT faculty member's reappointment file.

Reappointment is a formal judgment—based upon the candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching, university citizenship, and public service—made annually as to whether a tenure-track faculty member should be appointed for an additional year. This process occurs in the Spring Semester of the first year of appointment for a new faculty member and in the Fall Semester in each subsequent year until a decision is made regarding tenure. The reappointment process is intended to assess and guide tenure-track faculty members in their development as they move toward the tenure and promotion decisions. Each year's reappointment review should take into account the candidate's previous reappointment evaluations and should be a candid analysis of the extent to which the candidate is meeting the School's expectations.

Because reappointment is closely related to the tenure and promotion decisions, each tenure-track faculty member undergoing an annual reappointment review should consult the relevant sections below for specific guidelines on the criteria to be utilized by the Ad Hoc Reappointment Committee and the format for compiling a reappointment file.

Specific concerns expressed by the Ad Hoc RTP Committee and/or the Director during this stage of the probationary period should be addressed by the candidate in subsequent reappointment reviews.

In the event that concerns about a candidate's performance are raised during the reappointment process, the Ad Hoc RTP Committee and the Director shall provide detailed comments and constructive suggestions. If concerns arise during a review that occurs after completion of three (3) full years in the probationary period, the Director, in consultation with the FAC, will advise and work with the candidate on a plan for realignment with the School's tenure and promotion expectations; however, the candidate is solely responsible for her/his success in implementing this plan.

## **2. Tolling**

From time to time, personal and/or family circumstances may arise that require a probationary faculty member to request that her/his probationary period be extended. Upon written request with rationale provided, a faculty member may be granted an extension of the probationary period, which has been traditionally called "tolling" or "stopping the tenure clock." The University policy and procedures governing modification of the faculty probationary period are included in the University Policy Register. (see University Policy Register 6-13)

### 3. Tenure and Promotion of TT Faculty

The policies and procedures for tenure are included in the University policy and procedures regarding faculty tenure (see, University Policy Register 3342-6-14) and the policies and procedures for promotion are included in the University policy and procedures regarding faculty promotion (see, University Policy Register 3342-6-15). Each academic year, tenure and promotion guidelines are distributed by the Office of the Provost.

A candidate for tenure will normally be reviewed during the sixth year of service, although years of credit toward tenure may be granted at the time of the initial appointment and specifically stated in the letter of appointment. A faculty member may apply for early tenure consideration, but the faculty member must be able to meet the criteria for promotion to the next rank. ***Tenure and promotion are related yet separate decisions***; nonetheless, the School normally expects to recommend tenure and promotion in the same year.

Materials reviewed for tenure for persons hired at the TT assistant professor rank shall consist primarily of those items generated since the initial hiring. Tenure considerations may include some consideration of relevant scholarly activities prior to arrival at Kent State University in order to establish research trajectory, but the emphasis must be on work accomplished while on the tenure track at Kent State. The vitae submitted in applying for the position shall be used as the baseline; materials already published or listed as forthcoming will be given less weight than those produced after the submitted vitae.

Tenure is the formal granting of continuous appointment as a faculty member in the School of Peace and Conflict Studies. Essentially, those faculty members involved in making a tenure decision are asking the question; “Is this candidate likely to continue and sustain, in the long term, a program of high-quality scholarship, teaching, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit and the mission of the university?” Notably, the granting of tenure includes a demonstrated record of achievement suggesting that the candidate can be expected to continue and sustain such a program over the long-term.

Promotion from TT Assistant to TT Associate Professor, on the other hand, is based solely on a candidate’s accomplishments completed while at Kent State, i.e., during the review period. Candidates for promotion to TT Associate Professor must meet all the qualifications for tenure but they must also show—as evidenced by the body of work presented in the promotion file—the potential for a career likely to impact their area of specialization and the field of Peace and Conflict Studies.

Greater standards exist regarding promotion to TT Full Professor than to TT Associate Professor, as detailed below. Promotion to Professor is the highest level of university achievement.

### 4. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of TT Faculty

A candidate for tenure and promotion must have the doctoral degree in Peace and Conflict Studies or an appropriate cognate field. Candidates for tenure shall present the necessary documents for consideration by the Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee. Specific guidelines for tenure and promotions files are provided below.

Tenure and Promotion to TT Associate Professor will be based on convincing documented evidence of the following achievements in what are mutually supportive and often overlapping areas (see Appendix One: Criteria for Promotion, for more details:

- Evidence of an independent program, or programs, of research creating a clear record of published peer-reviewed research scholarship in the candidate's own area of research and in the field of Peace and Conflict Studies
- Undertaking of engaged research (see below for a definition) as appropriate for the field of Peace and Conflict Studies and the candidate's particular research program
- Served as an effective teacher, including using applied and interactive pedagogies
- Provided adequate service
- Sustained effort to obtain significant extramural funding in terms of value and/or prestige

Promotion to TT Full Professor requires convincing documented evidence of a well-rounded record of significant and sustained accomplishments that include the following achievements in what are mutually supportive and often overlapping areas (see Appendix One: Criteria for Promotion, for more detail):

- a significant and sustained record of published, peer reviewed research in rigorous and well-regarded outlets that includes evidence of influence and impact on research scholarship in the candidate's area of specialization and in the field Peace and Conflict Studies
- Undertaking of engaged research (see below for a definition) as appropriate for the field of Peace and Conflict Studies and the candidate's particular research program
- Consistently effective teaching, including using applied and interactive pedagogies
- Notable extramural funding in terms of value and/or prestige, plus a sustained commitment to acquiring significant extramural funds
- Continuing service to the School, the University, and the profession of Peace and Conflict Studies as befits a senior scholar in the field
- The effective mentoring of students

## **5. Research Scholarship**

Not all research activities are equally meritorious. Both the quantity and the quality of research scholarship shall figure into the evaluation of the candidate's record. Published research scholarship carries far greater weight than non-published. Further, some published materials are more valuable than others.

Quality of research scholarship will be evaluated as a combination of the following characteristics: research that contributes to theory-building is given more weight than descriptive work; data-driven research is given more weight than descriptive work; the relative stringency of the review process that publications have undergone. Journals with strict refereeing processes and low acceptance rates are given more weight than those with less rigorous procedures and higher rates of acceptance. The prestige/visibility of the medium in which the work appears is also relevant; for example, university presses are generally given more weight than trade publishers.

Published research within the field of Peace and Conflict Studies and related cognate fields is valued. It is expected that candidates for tenure and promotion demonstrate a range of publication outlets, publishing

articles not only in specialized journals read only within their community of expertise but also articles in broader journals, including those recognized as serving the field of Peace and Conflict Studies.

In line with the broader traditions of research in the field of peace and conflict studies, the School also recognizes the value of ‘engaged research’ undertaken with, and for, a range of actors, including e.g. community groups in the US or abroad, local, national and international civil society organizations, local and national governments, educational institutions, think tanks, business and international organizations (e.g. UN, World Bank, European Union, African Union). Engaged research, as understood by the School, encompasses work with such actors to either expand their knowledge base, influence their constituents and stakeholders, reform policies and practices, influence others and promote dialogue, conflict resolution and/or peacebuilding within or between communities/organizations/societies etc. Engaged research may be conducted at a variety of levels from local to international. It may involve the researcher in one or more roles, including (but not limited to): convener, facilitator, mediator, trainer, educator, consultant, analyst, participant. The quality of an ER project is indicated by **some combination** of the following illustrative criteria:

- (i) the scale of the project (e.g. length of time, number of participants, type and amount of resources utilized/developed)
- (ii) the significance of the project for the relevant community or communities
- (iii) the appropriateness of the methods used in an ER process
- (iv) the extent to which the goals of an ER project have been achieved
- (v) the positive impact on direct participants
- (vi) the positive impact on any relevant wider communities
- (vii) the quality of any written, audio-visual, or other tangible outputs from the project

An ER project will not necessarily need to excel in all of the criteria to be judged as high quality. For example, a project of limited duration and few participants may nevertheless have a significance and level of impact that would still merit a high ranking.

Where engaged research forms part of a scholar’s research activity, this will be given due weight when considering the research profile of candidates for tenure and promotion, particularly where (i) candidates are able to clearly indicate how specific engaged research projects have directly or indirectly informed their broader program of research and publication; and (ii) *where feasible*, a candidate is able to supply testimonials indicating the importance and impact of the engaged research undertaken. The School also recognizes, that engaged research may sometimes give rise to outputs that may be subject to varying levels of confidentiality required by participants, ethical research standards, or legal obligations and therefore not publicly available. Where such confidentiality requirements permit, relevant outputs may be submitted on a confidential basis to the Director of the School and the Dean for consideration. The former will produce a brief written assessment of the general quality of this output in terms of its originality, rigor, and impact. This will be written in such a way that it does not violate any confidentiality requirements and will be made available to members of the School’s RTP Committee.

The School welcomes, encourages and values collaborative research work and co-authorships. Nonetheless, the record of all candidates for tenure and promotion would normally be expected to also include sole-authored peer-reviewed publications, particularly in the case of candidates for promotion to Associate or Full Professor. With respect to jointly authored works of scholarship and collaborative grant applications, the degree of the candidate’s contribution will be considered. Thus, candidates should



indicate the extent and nature of their contributions. The key requirement here is that candidates should be able to demonstrate their own contribution to the field through their accumulated publications.

“Early online” publication of journal articles shall count as published articles. A book contract is valued and may be considered as a component of an application for tenure, but does not count in nearly the same way as published material does. Publication of a book is defined as either “in press” – meaning that the manuscript has been peer-reviewed, revised, and is at least at the copy-editing stage – or “in hand”.

With respect to applications for extramural funding, the School expects applications for external funding from faculty members receiving start-up funds. It also encourages applications from all faculty members. All submitted proposals for extramural funding are meritorious; however, successful grant applications carry more weight.

In contrast to the above, a scholarly record of sporadic publications, publishing primarily in low-quality journals, no or low levels of extramural grant activity, minimal engagement in the profession, and weak external letters are evidence of deficiencies in a candidate’s record of research scholarship.

Primary evidence of research scholarship includes:

- Peer-reviewed (refereed) books, peer-reviewed journal articles, peer-reviewed book chapters, and peer-reviewed edited books. Review only by the editor/editors of a journal or other publication will not be sufficient to qualify as peer-reviewed.
- Publications undergoing anonymized peer review are more meritorious than other sorts of peer-review processes
- Seeking and/or securing grants, especially extramural funding
- Where relevant to the candidate’s research program, evidence of one or more engaged research projects including (i) the way these have informed a program of research and publication and (ii) *where feasible*, testimonials indicating the importance and impact of the engaged research project.

Additional evidence of scholarship includes:

- textbooks
- presentation of papers at professional meetings
- review essays
- encyclopedia/handbook chapters or entries
- book reviews
- research and technical reports which are distributed locally or informally
- organizing, conducting, and participating in workshops and panels
- reviewing manuscripts for journals and/or publishers
- reviewing grant proposals and/or reports for external granting agencies and foundations
- the production of training manuals and related materials

- op-eds and articles in newspapers, online platforms, and similar non-academic publications
- instructor's manuals and instructional software
- collegial recognitions of outstanding achievement, such as awards

#### Criteria for the Weighting and Grading of Publications

- A peer reviewed book chapter will be counted as equivalent to a peer reviewed journal article
- A multi-authored peer reviewed publication where the candidate has contributed 50% or more of the work will be counted as one peer reviewed publication.
- A peer reviewed publication where the candidate has contributed less than 50% of the work will be counted as a fraction of a peer reviewed publication (e.g., a 25% contribution will be treated as equivalent to 0.25 of a peer reviewed output).
- A peer reviewed publication of exceptional quality (assessed against three criteria: originality, rigor and significance (see below)) may count as equivalent to either 1.5 or 2 peer reviewed publications.
- Published outputs **other than** peer-reviewed publications and monographs (e.g., non-peer reviewed chapters, policy reports etc) will be evaluated by the RTP Committee on a sliding scale relative to the standard of one peer reviewed article (0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0). These will be assessed against three criteria: originality, rigor, and significance (see below). Thus, for example, three non-peer reviewed outputs graded at 0.4 will count as equivalent to 1.2 of a peer reviewed article.
- Edited books with an introduction written or co-authored by the editor will count as the equivalent of up to one peer reviewed publication, taking into account factors such as the reputation of the publisher and the rigor of the review process for contributing chapters. This recognizes the fact that there is a scholarly effort and contribution that goes into the production of an edited book over and above any other written contribution of the editor. Any additional chapters written by the editor will be evaluated as separate outputs in their own right. In cases where these chapters have not been peer reviewed, these will be graded on a scale of 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0. In cases where these chapters have been anonymously peer reviewed by independent reviewers they will be treated as equivalent to a peer reviewed publication.

#### Criteria for Judging the Quality of Published Outputs

- **Originality:** understood as the extent to which the output makes an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge in the field. Research outputs that demonstrate originality may do one or more of the following: produce and interpret new empirical findings or new material; engage with new and/or complex problems; develop innovative research methods, methodologies and analytical techniques; show imaginative and creative scope; provide new arguments and/or new forms of expression, formal innovations, interpretations and/or insights; collect and engage with novel types of data; and/or advance theory or the analysis of doctrine, policy or practice.
- **Significance:** understood as the extent to which the work has influenced, or has the capacity to influence, knowledge and scholarly thought, or the development and understanding of policy

and/or practice. Where relevant, the RTP Committee will take into account the types of evidence listed below. For recently published articles, where such evidence may not exist, the Committee will evaluate the significance of a publication based on its own expert evaluation of the output. It is also recognized that some sub-fields of Peace and Conflict Studies may not have the same critical mass of academics working in that area compared with more mainstream areas of the discipline. Consequently, relatively low citation numbers may not necessarily reflect the reach and significance of a publication within that specific sub-field. The RTP Committee's evaluation of such evidence will therefore be informed by its understanding of the nature of the sub-field a candidate is working in.

Examples of evidence that candidates may wish to provide in order to demonstrate significance includes (*but is not limited to*): journal impact factors; citation numbers for a specific article; panels at academic conferences on the publication itself or novel concepts, theories etc developed therein; references to the work in policy documents produced by governments, international organizations, businesses or NGOs; references to the publication in recognized textbooks and surveys of the field/sub-field; re-publication of the original article in another language/multiple languages; references in the media to the publication and/or ideas and evidence produced in the publication.

- Rigor: understood as the extent to which the work demonstrates intellectual coherence and integrity, and adopts robust and appropriate concepts, analyses, sources, theories and/or methodologies

#### Outputs in Languages Other than English and Translations of Original Publications

Publications written in languages other than English are as meritorious as publications in English. A non-English peer reviewed publication should be accompanied by a detailed summary (200-400 words per article/chapter), an English translation of the referees' comments and a translation of the whole article. In the first instance, translations of all relevant material may be undertaken using machine translation. However, it is recognized that machine translation may not always provide a full basis on which to make an informed judgement about a publication. In such cases, and particularly for non-peer reviewed scholarly outputs, the RTP committee may **either** request a full translation of the whole article **OR** request an external evaluation from a senior academic with the necessary linguistic expertise. Engaged research projects that include elements presented in languages other than English should include a detailed summary (200-400 words) of each relevant element and a machine translation of each relevant element. Testimonials in support of an ER project should also be translated into English using machine translation. Where relevant, the RTP Committee may **either** request full translations of some or all material provided as part of the record of an ER project **OR** request an external evaluation from an external senior academic with the necessary linguistic expertise.

In cases where an author's own publication is translated into another language by the publisher this will not be counted as a separate publication. However, as noted above, translation of a publication into one or more other languages will be taken into account by the RTP Committee when assessing its significance. In cases where the original author has translated their own work, this will be recognized as representing an intellectual effort over and above production of the original work, particularly where the translated work also introduces additional material not contained in the original publication. In such cases, the RTP committee will evaluate the **additional** intellectual effort and scholarly contribution of the second article and assess this specific element of the translated publication on the scale of 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0.

## Annual Evaluation of Published Outputs and ER Projects

The RTP committee's annual assessment of TT Faculty will include the allocation of a grade for all new publications and new and ongoing ER projects. These grades will form part of the annual feedback provided to TT Faculty, thus providing them with a clear indication of their progress towards meeting tenure requirements for both research and ER projects.

### Publications and ER Criteria for Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor

Evaluation of scholarly work will take into account the quality of outputs and their impact on the academic field/sub-field. For example, a high quality, paradigm shifting peer reviewed journal article may be deemed the equivalent of two peer reviewed publications. ***For all candidates, the overall contribution to, and impact on, the literature(s) in their field of expertise will be evaluated (taking into account their level of seniority) as well as the number of scholarly outputs. The figures below should therefore be read as guidelines to inform decisions on applications, rather than binding numerical requirements. Tenure and promotion are related yet separate decisions.*** The School normally expects to recommend tenure and promotion in the same year. However, in the case of candidates for tenure only, faculty members involved in making a tenure decision are asking the question; "Is this candidate likely to continue and sustain, in the long term, a program of high-quality scholarship, teaching, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit and the mission of the university?" Notably, the granting of tenure includes a demonstrated record of achievement suggesting that the candidate can be expected to continue and sustain such a program over the long-term. In the case of tenure only applications, up to the equivalent of two peer reviewed publications produced in the two years preceding a candidate's appointment at KSU can be included in considering whether a candidate meets the criteria set out below. This will not apply in applications for promotion.

A typical candidate for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor might be expected to have **produced:**

EITHER

- The equivalent of 6-8 peer-reviewed scholarly publications

OR

- A monograph with a reputable publisher, plus one peer-reviewed scholarly publication

OR

- The equivalent of 4-8 peer-reviewed publications, plus:
  - 2-3 satisfactory engaged research (ER) projects, or
  - 1-2 high-quality ER projects, or
  - One exceptional ER project judged in terms of scale, significance for the relevant communities and positive impact on those communities

Irrespective of the number of 'other' scholarly outputs and ER projects, candidates for Tenure/Associate Professor will be expected to produce **a minimum of 3-4 peer reviewed journal articles (depending on the quality of articles, as assessed by the Committee) OR a monograph and one peer reviewed scholarly publication.**

### Publications and ER Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Evaluation of scholarly work will take into account the quality of outputs and their impact on the academic field/sub-field. For example, an exceptionally high quality, paradigm shifting peer reviewed journal article may be deemed the equivalent of up to two peer reviewed publications. ***For all candidates, the overall contribution to, and impact on, the literature(s) in their field of expertise (taking into account their level of seniority) will be evaluated as well as the number of scholarly outputs. The figures below should therefore be read as guidelines to inform decisions on applications, rather than binding numerical requirements.*** However, a typical candidate for professor might be expected to have produced:

EITHER

- The equivalent of 6-8 peer-reviewed scholarly publications **since promotion to Associate Professor**

OR

- A monograph with a reputable publisher, plus one peer-reviewed scholarly publication

OR

- **Since promotion to Associate Professor:** the equivalent of 4-8 peer-reviewed publications, plus:
  - 2-3 satisfactory engaged research (ER) projects, or
  - 1-2 high-quality ER projects, or
  - One exceptional ER project judged in terms of scale, significance for the relevant communities and positive impact on those communities

### Illustrative Examples of Possible Routes to Meeting the Criteria

#### Example A

Output(s)	Grade
6-8 peer reviewed publications (each over 50% contribution)	6-8
Weak ER project	0
Total Grade	6-8

#### Example B

Output(s)	Grade
1 monograph	5-6
1 peer reviewed publication (over 50% contribution)	1-2

Output(s)	Grade
Weak ER project	0
Total Grade	6-8

## Example C

Output(s)	Grade
3-4 peer reviewed publications (over 50% contribution)	3-4
1 non-peer reviewed book chapter	1
One exceptional ER project	2-3
Total Grade	6-8

## Example D

Output(s)	Grade
1 exceptional peer reviewed publication graded at 2	2
2 peer reviewed publications graded at 1	2
1 non-peer reviewed book chapter	1
One exceptional ER project	2-3
Total Grade	7-8

## Example E

Output(s)	Grade
3-4 peer reviewed publications (over 50% contribution)	3-4
1 peer reviewed publication (30% contribution)	0.3
1 peer reviewed publications (30% contribution)	0.3
1 non-peer reviewed book chapter	1

Output(s)	Grade
1 non-peer reviewed book chapter	0.2
One policy report	0.2
Two high quality ER projects	1-2
Total Grade	6-8

## 6. Teaching

Evidence of effective teaching includes:

- peer reviews and evaluations of teaching
- student evaluations, and written comments from students
- course syllabi, examinations, and assignments
- course revisions and adjustments over time
- creative assignments, applied exercises in-class and out, simulations and other sorts of activities demonstrating interactive, participatory and cooperative pedagogies leading to applied knowledge and skills-development
- innovative adoption and effective utilization of new teaching technologies
- recognition of outstanding achievement, such as teaching awards
- publications on the act of teaching and on the development of new methods and materials and platforms for instruction
- attendance at education workshops/conferences etc, on pedagogy and instruction techniques
- supervision and mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students
- direction of and participation in undergraduate and graduate theses and doctoral dissertation committees
- seeking and securing professionally reviewed, instruction-related grants, especially extramural funding
- supporting the professional socialization of graduate students (e.g. presenting a joint paper at a conference or jointly organizing a panel)

The above list demonstrates that simply teaching a variety of classes is not, by itself, a credential toward tenure. The candidate should provide evidence bearing on the quality, creativity, extent and effectiveness of pedagogical efforts. Due to the applied nature of many courses in the School of Peace and Conflict Studies, poor teaching may result in the denial of tenure to a candidate who meets other criteria for tenure.

By contrast, a record of somewhat limited scholarship may be partially offset by evidence of exceptional teaching.

## **7. Service and Citizenship**

The components of service and citizenship for the School of Peace and Conflict Studies include:

- administrative service within the University, College, and School
- professional service through academic and professional associations, especially in the field of Peace and Conflict Studies

While service activity and university citizenship is expected and required, service of any sort or magnitude cannot be considered more important than a candidate's teaching and research scholarship responsibilities. Nonetheless, a faculty member's willingness to make contributions to the University, to the overall progress of the School are indicators of the faculty member's fitness for tenure or promotion.

Contributions as a university citizen include service to the School, the College, and the University through membership on committees and councils. The merits of university service should be evaluated as to whether or not the candidate played an active role on the committee listed, and the importance of the service to the mission of the unit served.

Other components of citizenship include active participation in School events, seminars, and workshops, taking part in faculty and student recruitment, and actively promoting the School's degrees, courses, and events.

Expectations in service and citizenship for promotion to Professor are higher than for promotion to Associate Professor.

## **8. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Files**

The candidate's file for reappointment, tenure and promotion is the primary means for conveying the activity and productivity of the candidate to the Ad Hoc Tenure Committee and to subsequent review bodies. The primary purpose underlying a well-structured tenure and promotion file is to provide a continuum of development throughout all reappointment review periods. Thus, the candidate for tenure and promotion is encouraged to build and maintain a file structured so as to allow a simple updating with each new annual review procedure. Generally speaking, files for promotion to full professor should follow the same basic guidelines below as files for tenure and promotion.

### *a) Narrative Statement of Accomplishments*

The candidate shall provide a narrative overview of her/his career, highlighting his/her accomplishments during the period under review. This is the first item in the file. Early in that narrative there should be a numerical listing of major accomplishments in order to provide a summary overview, i.e., a listing of numbers of the following: books, journal articles, edited books, book chapters, paper presentations at professional conferences, keynote and/or plenary presentations, citations, external and internal grant applications, book reviews, courses taught, and key indicators of teaching excellence. Other examples of accomplishments might include practitioner workshops and policy briefings. The statement should



provide detail on the scope of the research agenda including, where relevant, the relationship between specific engaged research projects and a candidate's program of research and publication. The statement should also address issues of trajectory.

*b) Curriculum Vita*

The curriculum vitae is the second item in the file. The CV should provide full citation information on each publication. It should also clearly differentiate between peer-reviewed publications and non-peer-reviewed publications, and between published and forthcoming and under review and in progress items. Where relevant, the CV should also indicate specific engaged research projects underway or completed.

*c) Research Scholarship Documentation Includes:*

Pdfs of publications, conference papers, grant proposals (transmittal form with budget and abstract, evidence of submission, and reviewers' comments if available), published reviews of candidate's books or articles, and any additional documentation deemed relevant, including (*where feasible*) relevant testimonials on the impact, quality and/or significance of engaged research projects. For peer-reviewed items, faculty should document the following where applicable: quality of the publication; acceptance or rejection rates; reputation and prestige of the publication outlet; targeted audience; impact of the item (e.g. course adoptions, citation levels, other evidence of influence on academic and/or practitioner communities). In the case of confidential reports, where the requirements of confidentiality permit, the arrangements indicated above should be followed.

*d) Teaching Documentation Includes:*

Student evaluations and student comments; course syllabi; examinations; exercises; assignments and handouts; peer reviews of teaching; evidence concerning supervision of theses and dissertations; evidence of service on student committees; evidence of extraordinary advising; and any additional documentation deemed relevant.

Ordinarily, the classroom teaching of non-tenured TT faculty will be reviewed through observation of a class session at least once per academic year by tenured TT faculty

*e) Citizenship and Service Documentation Includes:*

Evidence of committee, council, task force and working group memberships, and contribution levels to those entities; evidence of professional service through academic and professional associations and contribution levels; evidence of peer reviewing; and any additional documentation deemed relevant.

*f) Supplementary Activities Documentation:*

The candidate may add any documentation or evidence of additional activities which she or he may want the relevant reviewing bodies to view and which assist in establishing the contours and details of professional accomplishments in the period under review.

*g) Letters of Reference*

Outside letters of reference are required for tenure and promotion reviews. To assist this process, the candidate may submit the names of experts in her/his field who he or she considers capable of judging the candidate's work in an objective manner. The Director will also generate other possible outside reviewers to be contacted. The specific means for acquiring these letters are detailed in the University Policy

Register. The Director is responsible for meeting this requirement and for placing these letters in the candidate's file.

*h) File Submission*

The file should be submitted electronically, using the format, platform and interface in use at the university at the time the file is submitted. The candidate's file should be reviewed with the Director for completeness and accuracy prior to acceptance for review.

## **B. Renewal of Appointment and Performance Reviews of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty**

### **1. Annual Renewal of NTT Appointment**

Appointments for full-time non-tenure track (NTT) faculty are governed by the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement and are made annually. Renewal of appointment is contingent upon programmatic need, satisfactory performance of previously assigned responsibilities, and budgeted resources to support the position. Ordinarily, annual peer reviews of teaching will be conducted for NTT faculty in the first three years of appointment. See relevant section below regarding peer evaluations of teaching.

Pursuant to the NTT CBA (Article X, Section 5), SPCS will strive to include FTNTT Faculty members in the development and revision of the criteria applicable to the performance reviews of FTNTT Faculty and the renewal of FTNTT Faculty appointments; include FTNTT Faculty members on committees that conduct the performance reviews of FTNTT Faculty members; and use signed evaluation forms as part of the performance review process for FTNTT Faculty members.

### **2. Third-Year and Subsequent NTT Full Performance Review**

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for the non-tenure track faculty (NTT), provides for a Full Performance Review of full-time NTT faculty who are in their third year and the sixth year of consecutive employment. The period of performance to be reviewed is the three (3) full academic years of consecutive appointments including that portion of the third appointment which is subject to evaluation and assessment at the time of the review. In keeping with the Full designation, this review requires that each faculty member submit a file, the contents of which are described in Addendum B to the CBA.

The CBA also provides for a "simplified" Performance Review for faculty who are in their ninth or twelfth year of consecutive appointments. This "simplified" Performance Review requires submission of the documents described in the relevant section of the CBA.

In keeping with the NTT CBA, after fifteen (15) years of consecutive appointments, and every three (3) years thereafter, FTNTT Faculty members will undergo an "Administrative Review" by the School Director.

For FTNTT faculty undergoing Full or Simplified review, an Ad Hoc committee, which should include at least one FTNTT representative, will be formed to conduct the initial review and make recommendations to the director regarding renewal of appointment.

### **3. Promotion of NTT Faculty**

The promotion of FTNTT Faculty members is recognition of sustained contribution and distinguished service to the University. The criteria and procedure for promotion of FTNTT faculty is governed by the current NTT CBA.

Under Article X, Section 12 of the NTT CBA:

FTNTT Faculty members who have completed five (5) consecutive years of employment as a FTNTT Faculty member and one (1) successful Full Performance Review may apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Lecturer/Associate Professor, as applicable, concurrent with their second Full Performance Review, or any year thereafter. Normally, FTNTT Faculty members at the rank of Associate Lecturer/Associate Professor may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer/Professor, as applicable, in any year after five full years in rank as an Associate Lecturer/Associate Professor.

Guidelines for the submission of materials for promotion review and for the timely conduct of the promotion review process will be issued annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs. (see also, Addendum C, Guidelines and Procedures for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion.)

### **4. Peer Evaluations of Teaching**

Ordinarily, the classroom teaching of NTT faculty members who are in their first three years of service will be reviewed through observation of a class session at least once per academic year by either tenured TT faculty or by NTT faculty members who have completed at least three (3) consecutive years of employment and one (1) Full Performance Review.

These peer reviews shall be conducted in a collegial, constructive manner, including a post-classroom observation meeting between reviewer and instructor to share and discuss mutual perceptions of the session and the course, and a written report including issues related to classroom pedagogies and dynamics, course design and syllabus, and student evaluations.

### **5. Unsatisfactory Performance**

Unsatisfactory performance for NTT faculty is addressed pursuant to the criteria outlined in the NTT CBA regarding Appointments, Conditions, Renewals (see Article X of the NTT CBA).

## **IV. CRITERIA, PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, AND SCHOOL PROCEDURES RELATING TO FACULTY EXCELLENCE (MERIT) AWARDS FOR TT FACULTY**

Merit Awards are established pursuant to the applicable TT Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). In the School of Peace and Conflict Studies, merit will be awarded across the three categories accordingly: Research 40%; Teaching 30%; Service 30%.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee, i.e., all FT TT faculty members in the School, will award points to each faculty member for items submitted on their respective FEC forms. Based on the items listed and submitted on the FEC form, FEC will make a preliminary determination of the points to be awarded to each faculty member. This shall be completed no later than two months after the FEC forms are due.

All faculty members will be informed about these point allocations and will have the opportunity to appeal the FEC point allocations in writing. In addition, faculty members making written appeals may also appeal in person with FEC. When FEC has considered and ruled on any appeals, FEC will make determinations for merit allocations to be awarded to each faculty member.

These recommendations will then be provided to the Director who will make a determination of merit awards and will notify all faculty members of the determination. A faculty member will have the right to appeal the Director's preliminary determination. This appeal will be considered by FEC, which will make a recommendation on the merits of the appeal to the Director. The final determination on merit awards will be made by the Director, and these determinations will be forwarded to the Dean.

Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) criteria and forms are contained below.

## Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Criteria and Forms

### Assessment Criteria for Merit Awards and Post-tenure Application Teaching Load Determinations for School of Peace and Conflict Studies

Merit Awards for [Semester]  
(Due: [Due Date])

Faculty Member Name: \_\_\_\_\_

- This Box for FEC Use Only – Points Granted by FEC			
	Initially	On Appeal	Total
Research Scholarship	_____	_____	_____
Teaching	_____	_____	_____
Service and Practice	_____	_____	_____

#### General Information:

- Each TT faculty member in the School of Peace and Conflict Studies will complete this form at least annually, as requested by the Director or FAC.
- Completed forms and supporting documentation materials should be received **no later than [due date]**. Forms and material received after that date will be considered *only* if received *prior* to the FEC meeting to evaluate this material.
- Appeals may be made only over matters submitted on the original form; new items may not be added on appeal.
- In order to be considered for merit, the faculty member must submit this form with Research, Teaching, and Service sections completed and provide documentation for items.

- FEC will score each faculty member's contributions every year and FAC will subsequently apply the relevant scores for the relevant merit period in determining merit recommendations to the Director.
- FEC will endeavor to take into account the past practices of previous FECs.

Check the categories you are applying for merit in:

Teaching \_\_\_\_\_

Service \_\_\_\_\_

Research \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Max. Points Per Item Submitted</b>	<b>Number of Items Submitted</b>	<b>FEC Award</b>	<b>On Appeal</b>
<b>I. RESEARCH</b>				
Provide here full citations for each item listed and provide a copy of each item upon submission of the form.				
<b>A. Publications</b> Only materials published in the announced time period in the relevant CBA will be considered.				
1. Books.				
a. Scholarly book by university press (not edited)	50			
b. Scholarly book, non-university press (not edited)	45			
c. Textbook, original manuscript (books primarily designed for classroom use)	25			
d. Edited, peer-reviewed scholarly book, original manuscript (generally includes introduction and/or concluding chapter)	20			
e. Edited scholarly book, not peer-reviewed, original manuscript (generally includes introduction and/or concluding chapter)	15			
f. Book for popular, non-scholarly audiences	10			
g. Edited textbook mostly for classroom use, original manuscript (generally includes introduction and/or concluding chapter)	8			
h. Subsequent editions, with revisions	One-third of original points			
2. Journal Articles. Peer-reviewed print and electronic journals. Peer-reviewed means anonymously reviewed by one's scholarly peers. A case may be made, with evidence, for what tier a journal belongs in.				

<p>a. First Tier Journal Article. Journal of Peace Research, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Cooperation and Conflict.</p> <p>May also include the top, double-blind peer-reviewed journal or two from a cognate, full discipline, i.e., Sociology, Political Science, International Relations, History, Geography, Anthropology.</p> <p>Does not include top journal or two from cognate sub-disciplines or specialty areas, e.g., regional studies, peacekeeping, cultural sociology, security studies, development, social psychology, etc.</p>	25			
<p>b. Second Tier Journal Article. This is the great middle of double-blind peer-reviewed journals, where the majority of journals will belong.</p>	20			
<p>c. Third Tier Journal Article. These journals have some combination of the following characteristics: higher acceptance rates (or are not transparent about rates; less rigorous review procedures; more limited appeal; published by state professional associations or academic departments; low esteem; low citation rates; included in few to no indexes; irregular publication; short publication history).</p>	10			
3. Book Chapters.				
<p>a. Original book chapter and extended handbook chapter.</p>	12			
<p>b. Book chapter that originally appeared as journal article.</p>	4			
<p>c. Revised book chapter.</p>	3			
<p>4. Non-peer reviewed journal or other articles and essays of substantial length, e.g. 3,000+ words, not commentaries of op-ed or blog entry length.</p>	5			
<p>5. Review essay covering multiple books.</p>	3			
<p>6. Encyclopedia entry.</p>	2			
<p>7. Revised previously published encyclopedia entry.</p>	1			



8. Articles and op-ed length pieces in newspapers, magazines, and on high profile websites.	2			
9. Book review.	1			
10. Other publications.	tbd			
<b>B. Paper Presentations at Scholarly Conferences.</b> These are full, bona fide papers. Does not include outlines, talking points, Ppt slides, or a series of notes, even if the presentation was made at a “papers panel” at a professional association meeting. Provide paper and note if it has ever been presented before. Papers can only receive full FEC paper presentation points once. A second presentation of the paper (revised or not) must be noted as such and will receive ½ of the points for the category in which it was presented on the second occasion. Third and fourth presentations of the paper may only receive points in the colloquium categories below. Submit copies of papers.	Max. of 15 points			
1. Paper at a major Peace and Conflict Studies or other major disciplinary meeting, including but not limited to APSA, ISA, ASA, AHA, AGA.	6			
2. Paper at specialty meeting, area studies meeting, regional association meetings, PHS, PJSA, ACR, and invited paper at a symposium.	4			
3. Paper at a minor Peace and Conflict Studies association conference, a minor disciplinary or interdisciplinary meeting, e.g., state association meeting.	3			
4. External Colloquium.	2			
5. KSU Colloquium.	1			
6. Other.	tbd			
7. Round table participant or panel discussant at a scholarly gathering.	1			

<b>C. Community Presentations, Workshops, Conflict Interventions, Training Sessions. 10 hours equals 1 point. Provide description, documentation, and hours.</b>	Max. of 15 points			
<b>D. Other.</b>	tbd			
<b>E. Grants, funded and unfunded (Submit copies of all proposals).</b>				
1. External Funded Grants. All funded grants count toward the point system in the notes section below, irrespective of administrative overhead being included or not. The amount applicable to point system in the note section is dependent upon the portion awarded to the SPCS faculty member.	See grant notes below			
2. Internal Funded Grants. This does not include URCs Undergraduate Research Scholars Program, URCs Research Scholarly Activity Support Request, UTC's and URC's Conference Travel Grants, or UTC's Workshop Grants..				
3. KSU URC Research /Creative Activity Summer/AY Appointment.	3			
4. KSU UTC Summer Teaching Development Grant	3			
5. External unfunded grant applications.	2			
6. Internal (KSU) unfunded grant applications.	1			
<b>F. Contributions to the academic community.</b>				
1. Peer-reviewed scholarly journal editor.	15			
2. Guest editor for a peer-reviewed scholarly journal volume or special issue.	4			
3. Journal Editorial Board or equivalent.	1			
4. Officer of Professional Association or Section.	1			
5. Professional conference section organizer (e.g., organizer of multiple panel sessions).	2			

6. Peer review of article for scholarly journal (list journal, provide copies; do not include reviews as editor or associate editor of journal).	1 (6 pts. max)			
7. Peer review of book or edited book for publisher.	3 (6 pts. max)			
8. Reviewer for funding agency or government agency.	1 (6 pts. max)			
9. Outside peer reviewer for tenure and promotion cases at other institutions.	4 (8 pts. max)			
<b>G. Research-related Awards.</b>				
1. Awards for Scholarly, Professional, or Scientific Achievement.				
2. Winner of KSU Distinguished Scholar Award	10			
3. Finalist for KSU Distinguished Scholar Award	5			
4. Best book award from a professional association or section; lifetime achievement award from a professional association or section or university.	8			
5. Best article award from a professional association or section.	5			
6. Other scholarly awards.	tbd			
<b>F. Self-Development Activities for Improving Research Skills.</b> This includes internal (KSU) or external activities that involve a significant commitment of time, i.e., a minimum of five hours, and that are focused primarily upon the acquisition of new research skills. Provide documentation and hours expended. 10 hours equals 1 point.				
<b>Total for Section I—Research</b>				
<b>II. Teaching</b>				

<p>A. Student Evaluations of Instructor/Instruction.</p> <p>Data is provided to FEC by the School secretary. Scoring is based on the sum of questions 7-16, plus question #19. To be eligible for SEI points, a faculty member must be at or above the mean for the sum of questions 7-16 plus question #19 of SEIs (averaged across all courses taught by eligible TT faculty during the merit period). If the threshold is met, merit points will be awarded based on the faculty member's ranking..</p> <p>The faculty member with the highest score above the norm receives the full compliment (6) of SEI points, with other faculty members at above the norm receiving proportionate amounts (of 6) based on their scores.</p> <p>No SEI merit points for teaching will be awarded to faculty who do not perform above the 49 percentile. Faculty who don't make that threshold for SEI merit points, still receive teaching merit points in other categories, below</p>	<p>Max of pts. 6</p>			
<p>B. Development and teaching of a new course. This means a course not previously taught by the individual anywhere.</p>	<p>2 per course (max of 6 pts.)</p>			
<p>C. Innovation in teaching.</p> <p>This includes genuine innovations used for the first time; subsequent uses do not count. For example: technological; service learning; community outreach and applied practice projects; and others. Provide evidence, rationale, preparation hours and statement demonstrating first use.</p>	<p>5 hours equals 1 pt. Max of 5 pts.</p>			

<p>D. Self-Development Activities for Improving Teaching.</p> <p>This includes internal (KSU) or external activities that involve a significant commitment of time, i.e., a minimum of five hours, and that are focused primarily upon the acquisition of new teaching skills. Examples include: mini-courses at professional association meetings, summer institutes, conferences on teaching, collegial development of teaching activities, or auditing a course. Examples of activities not covered include attending two-hour long Center for Teaching and Learning presentations or training events, or panels or paper sessions on teaching at professional meetings, or attending lectures on teaching, etc.). Provide evidence and rationale and hours.</p>	<p>5 hours equals 1 pt. Max of 5 pts.</p>			
<p>E. Mentoring and Training of Students. Provide documentation.</p>	tbd			
<p>F. Dissertation Committee Chair or Co-chair (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	8			
<p>G. Dissertation Committee Member (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	4			
<p>H. Dissertation Committee Graduate Faculty Representative (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	2			
<p>I. Master's Thesis Advisor or Co-advisor (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	3			
<p>J. Master's Thesis Committee Member (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	1			
<p>K. Senior Honor's Thesis Advisor (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	3			
<p>L. Senior Honor's Thesis Co-advisor (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).</p>	2			
<p>M. Doctoral Comprehensive Exams Committee Member.</p>	1			

N. Senior Honor's Thesis Committee Member (Points awarded only once, upon completion. Provide documentation).	1			
O. Individual Investigation (Provide documentation).	1			
<b>Teaching-related Research and Publications. Provide documentation.</b>				
P. Textbook about teaching.	25			
Q. Edited textbook about teaching. Original manuscript, generally includes introduction and/or conclusion.	15			
R. Subsequent, revised editions of teaching-related books.	One-third of original points			
S. Peer-reviewed journal article.	20			
T. Journal article, non-peer reviewed.	5			
U. Book chapter.	15			
V. Training manual.	tbd			
<b>Paper Presentation on Teaching.</b> These are full, bona fide papers. Does not include outlines, talking points, Ppt slides, or a series of notes, even if the presentation was made at a "papers panel" at a professional association meeting. Provide paper and note if it has ever been presented before. Papers can only receive full FEC paper presentation points once. A second presentation of the paper (revised or not) must be noted as such and will receive ½ of the points for the category in which it was presented on the second occasion. Third and fourth presentations of the paper, may only receive points in the colloquium categories below, after which no points will be awarded. Submit copies of papers.	Max. of 15 pts.			
W. Paper at a major Peace and Conflict Studies or other major disciplinary meeting, including but not limited to APSA, ISA, ASA, AHA, AGA.	6			
X. Paper at specialty meeting, area studies, regional association meetings, invited paper at a symposium.	4			

Y. Paper at a minor Peace and Conflict Studies association conference, a minor disciplinary or interdisciplinary meeting, e.g., state association meeting.	3			
Z. Paper at an external colloquium.	2			
A1. Paper at a KSU Colloquium.	1			
B1. Round Table Participant or Panel Discussant at a Scholarly Gathering.	1			
C1. Other.	tbd			
<b>Teaching Awards.</b>				
D1. Ohio Professor of the Year.	12			
E1. Alumni Teaching Award (KSU).	10			
F1. A&S Student Advisory Council Award.	8			
G1. Finalist for Alumni Teaching Award.	5			
H1. Other Teaching Awards.	tbd			
<b>Teaching-related Grants.</b>				
I1. KSU Teaching-related Grants.				
J1. UTC Summer Development Grant Award.	4			
K1. Unfunded UTC Summer Development Grant Application.	1			
L1. Other.	tbd			
<b>Total for Section II—Teaching</b>				
<b>III. Service and Practice.</b> Provide documentation. List semesters and dates of service. ? Explain if release from teaching duties or financial remuneration is involved as points may be adjusted by FEC in such cases.?				
A. SPCS Curriculum Committee Chair.	7			
B. SPCS Search Committee Chair.	10			
C. SPCS Curriculum Committee Member.	3			
D. SPCS Search Committee Member.	5			
E. SPCS Major ad-hoc Committee Chair.	4			
F. SPCS Major ad-hoc Committee Member.	2			

G. SPCS Website and Social Media Coordinator.	3			
H. SPCS Administrative Accomplishments Exceeding Normal Expectations and Usual Compensations (provide detailed explanation with hours expended).	tbd			
I. POL Graduate Studies Committee Member.	3			
J. College Advisory Committee Member.	4			
K. Provost Tenure and Promotion Committee Member.	3			
L. Faculty Senate Member.	4			
M. AAUP Bargaining Team Member.	10			
N. AAUP Advisory Council Member.	3			
O. AAUP Major Committee Chair.	3			
P. AAUP Major Committee Member.	2			
Q. Faculty Senate Committee Member.	1			
R. Other service to School, College and University (Provide details and documentation, 10 hours per point, max of 5 points)				
S. Community Service and Outreach Activities Related to Scholarly Expertise (Activities, interventions, trainings, consulting, etc., in community-based organizations and venues related to one's professional expertise. May also included extensive media work related to scholarly expertise. Provide documentation and detailed explanation and number of hours. In general, 10 hours equals per point.	Max. of 30 pts.			
Total for Section III—Service and Practice				



## Grants Formula

All grant proposals must be submitted.

Number of Grants Awarded in Evaluation Period	Sub-total Points
1 <sup>st</sup> Grant	5 points
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grant	3 points
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grant	2 points
4 <sup>th</sup> Grant and beyond	1 point

In respect to magnitude of external grants awarded, add the following to the point subtotal for the specific grant:

- $2/10^{\text{th}}$  of a point (.20) for each \$1,000 for the first \$50,000 received. For example, a 25k grant receives 10 points ( $5+5=10$ ) and a 50k grant receives a total of 15 points ( $5+10=15$ ).
- $1/10^{\text{th}}$  of a point (.10) for each \$1,000 received for second 50k up to 100k. For example, a 100k grant receives 20 points ( $5+10+5=20$ ).
- $1/20^{\text{th}}$  of a point (.05) for each 1,000 between the 100,000 – 200,000 levels. For example, a 200k grant receives 20 points ( $5+10+5+5=20$ ).
- $1/50^{\text{th}}$  of a point (.02) for each 1,000 between the 200,000 - 400,000 levels. For example, a 400k grant receives 24 points ( $5+10+5+5+4=24$ ).
- Total points capped at 24, no matter how large the grant is above 400,000.
- In the case of co-PIs and co-grantees on a grant, the relevant figure for determining grant magnitude is the amount of the grant accruing to the SPCS faculty member.

## V. APPENDIX ONE: CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

### RESEARCH EXPECTATIONS

	<b>Publications and Engaged Research (ER)</b>	<b>Grants</b>	<b>Professional Activity</b>	<b>Reputation<sup>iii</sup></b>
<b>Full Professor</b>	<p>The equivalent of 6-8 peer reviewed scholarly publications since promotion to Associate Professor (AP)</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Since promotion to AP: A monograph with a reputable publisher plus the equivalent of one peer reviewed scholarly publication</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Since promotion to AP: the equivalent of 4-5 peer reviewed publications plus either 2-3 satisfactory engaged research projects, 1-2 high quality ER projects or 1 exceptional ER project.<sup>iv</sup></p>	<p>PI or co-PI on a significant externally awarded grant in terms of</p> <p><b>EITHER</b></p> <p>value (over \$100K)</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>a lower value award from a prestigious external funder.<sup>v</sup></p> <p>Plus a sustained effort to obtain significant extramural funds in terms of value and/or prestige</p>	<p>Typical examples include (but are not limited to): a number of editorships, sustained role as a senior officer in one or more professional organizations; member of an advisory board for a government, an international organization or a civil society organization, including clear evidence of the candidate's contribution to this board/organization; leader, convener and/or facilitator of peacebuilding initiatives</p>	<p><b>Very strong external letters (including, where relevant, exceptional testimonials linked to engaged research projects), evidence of substantial impact and influence on scholarship and/or practice (e.g., high citation counts, high caliber publications, prestigious awards, editorships, demonstrated ER project effectiveness)</b></p>
<b>Tenure/ Associate Professor</b>	<p>The equivalent of 6-8 peer reviewed scholarly publications</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>A monograph with a reputable publisher plus one peer reviewed scholarly publication</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>The equivalent of 4-5 peer reviewed publication plus 2-3 satisfactory engaged research projects, 1-2 high quality ER projects or 1 exceptional ER project</p>	<p>PI or Co-PI on an external grant</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>sustained effort to obtain significant extramural funds in terms of value and/or prestige</p>	<p>Typical examples include ad hoc journal reviews, presenting at meetings, serving on professional committees, working in peacebuilding initiatives</p>	<p><b>Strong external letters, some evidence of impact/recognition (e.g., citations, publication outlets and reviewing), and, where relevant, solid testimonials and/or other documented evidence on engaged research projects</b></p>

<b>Insufficient</b>	<b>Sporadic publications; and/or lack of evidence of an independent program of research and/or lack of quality publications plus no notable engaged research projects</b>	<b>Lack of sustained effort to obtain major extramural grants</b>	<b>No engagement in profession</b>	<b>Lackluster external letters/testimonials (including those linked to engaged research projects) minimal impact</b>
---------------------	---	---	------------------------------------	--

### TEACHING EXPECTATIONS

	<b>Classroom Instruction</b>	<b>Student Supervision</b>
Full Professor	Sustained record of good teaching plus evidence of curricular or pedagogical innovation (based on peer reviews from Ad Hoc RPT committee, student evaluations and other relevant evidence of effective teaching as indicated in the Handbook);	Exceptional mentorship as evidenced by productive students (excellent progress, publications) and enthusiastic evaluations by supervisees
Tenure/ Associate Profes	Solid evidence of good teaching (based on peer reviews from Ad Hoc RPT committee and student evaluations and other relevant evidence of effective teaching as indicated in the Handbook)	Has attracted graduate students, active and effective research supervision as evidenced by student progress and supervisee evaluations
Insufficient for Tenure or promo to Associate Prof	Consistent evidence of poor teaching performance	Consistent evidence of poor-quality mentorship and/or supervision

### CITIZENSHIP EXPECTATIONS

	<b>Service</b>
Professor	Extensive, high-quality service; leadership roles, outreach activities
Tenure/Associate Professor	Consistent and responsible service on departmental and/or University committees
Insufficient	Minimal and/or low-quality service

---

<sup>i</sup> For a definitive discussion of Publications and ER criteria see the RTP section of the Handbook, particularly sub-section 5.

<sup>ii</sup> Professional activity criteria will be weighed more heavily for promotion to Full than for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

<sup>iii</sup> Reputation is weighed much more heavily for promotion to Full than for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

<sup>iv</sup> The quality of an ER project is indicated by **some combination** of the following illustrative criteria: (i) the scale of the project (e.g. length of time, number of participants, type and amount of resources utilized/developed); (ii) the significance of the project for the relevant community or communities; (iii) the appropriateness of the methods used in an ER process; (iv) the extent to which the goals of an ER project have been achieved; (v) the positive impact on direct participants; (vi) the positive impact on any relevant wider communities; (vii) the quality of any written, audio-visual or other tangible outputs from the project. An ER project will not necessarily need to excel in all of the criteria to be judged as high quality. For example, a project of limited duration and a few participants may nevertheless have a significance and level of impact that would still merit a high ranking.

<sup>v</sup> Examples of prestigious external funders include (but are not limited to): national funding bodies either in the US or abroad (e.g. National Science Foundation, the Fulbright Commission, UK Research Councils); governments and government departments (e.g. US State Department); regional bodies (e.g. EU, African Union); international organizations (e.g. UN, World Bank, UNDP); recognized funding bodies such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Wilson Center, USIP, Carnegie, Ploughshares, MacArthur Foundation and Ford Foundation.