Kent State Stark Faculty Council Minutes
October 21, 2016

I. Chair Warren called the meeting to order at 2:03 PM.

II. Secretary Moneysmith called the roll and determined a quorum was present.

**Attendance by Constituency:**  I: Kim Garchar, Thomas Norton-Smith, Lindsay Starkey. II: Mitch McKenney, Dee Warren. III: Matt Lehnert. IV: Jayne Moneysmith, Paula Sato. V: Lucas Engelhardt, Deepraj Mukherjee, Deb Shelestak. VI: Greg Blundell, Beth Campbell, Eric Taylor.

**Ex-officio:** Dean Denise Seachrist, Assistant Dean Bathi Kasturiarachi.

**Excused:** Cindy Barb, Clarke Earley, Erin Hollenbaugh, Jay Sloan.

**Guests:** Rob Kairis, Gwendolyn Purifoye.

III. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve: Councilor Shelestak. Second: Councilor Garchar. The agenda was unanimously approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the September 16, 2016 meeting.

Motion to approve: Councilor Garchar. Second: Councilor Mukherjee. The minutes were unanimously approved with small changes.

V. Chair’s Report

A. **RCFAC.** RCFAC met on Friday, October 7. Chair Warren thanked Cabinet members for soliciting questions for Dr. Ritchey to be forwarded to Faculty Senate for their retreat; and thanked the faculty for providing those questions. Faculty provided good responses.

In his report to RCFAC, Dr. Ritchey focused on two main topics: KSU’s up-coming capital campaign, and the idea of coordinating non-faculty services among regional campuses.
According to Dr. Ritchey, the University has a goal of raising between $350 million and $500 million and would like to put some “faces” on the campaign. He said that President Warren challenged her administration to come up with “big ideas” and instructed them to do the same down the chain of command. Dr. Ritchey said when he met with regional campus deans he made the same challenge, “big ideas” in the form of faculty and/or community projects that could be pitched to potential donors. Chair Warren asked him what role RCFAC would play. Dr. Ritchey said he mainly was just informing RCFAC, but possibly our individual regional Faculty Councils could support our deans in this endeavor.

In regards to non-faculty services, Dr. Ritchey said that he has made an observation: some services are coordinated by Kent, such as advancement, and some are handled at the regional campus level, such as enrollment management. In his opinion, both are bad. There should be a middle ground that does not impede the autonomy of the campuses but also ensures that the regional campuses have the resources they need. He acknowledged that not all campuses might need this type of assistance and coordination, or to the same degree. Dr. Ritchey then returned to the enrollment management example, suggesting that maybe there should be a “David Garcia” (the individual who handles this at the Kent campus) who coordinates that service for the regional campuses.

VI. Dean’s Report

A. **Congratulatory Cookies.** In appreciation for everyone’s efforts that led to our record student enrollment of over 5,000, Dean Seachrist and Flash gave out cookies and thank you notes today to all faculty, staff, and student employees.

B. **Veterans Commons.** On November 10 the campus will dedicate the William G. Bittle Veterans Commons, named in honor of the former dean of the Stark Campus. The “after hours” library conference room has been converted to a space open to all veteran students, faculty, and staff. Donations covered much of the cost. The dedication ceremony will be open to the entire campus community.

C. **December Commencement.** Our December commencement is the same time that Dean Seachrist’s son is graduating with an MBA in a ceremony at the Kent Campus. After consulting with the administrative cabinet and the faculty cabinet, she invited Dr. Ritchey, VP for Kent State System Integration, to take her place in the Stark commencement ceremony. Students will get their photograph taken with Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi. Everyone else will retain the same role.

D. **Let’s Clear the Air.** Dean Seachrist distributed a flyer for Kent State’s campaign for nonsmoking campuses. The smoking ban will apply to all Kent State campuses and property, which means it also applies to Stark State because it is on our land. It also applies to all vendors and visitors to the campus. We will be working out the details on how to enforce this policy.

E. **House Bill 48.** House Bill 48 changes some aspects of the concealed carry law. Right now the law indicates that people who have a concealed carry permit can bring their gun to campus as long as it is kept locked in their car. Now each institution of higher learning’s Board of Trustees has to decide what to do, whether they will permit guns being carried into buildings. Faculty expressed concern about people potentially bringing weapons on campus.
F. **Inter-University Council of Ohio.** All the deans of the regional campuses in the state of Ohio will have the opportunity to talk to legislators in Columbus on November 15, to give them a better idea of the work that we do.

G. **College Credit Plus.** We are receiving recognition for our work on College Credit Plus. We brought representatives from the Ohio Department of Education and the State Legislature here to talk about College Credit Plus, along with representatives from high schools where we have established a successful program. Dean Seachrist praised Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi for his leadership of the CCP program.

H. **Attainment Goal.** Dean Seachrist explained that an initiative has come from the state of Ohio to address a talent gap that we face. There is a shortage of adults from age 25 to 64 with post-secondary credentials. Sixty-four percent of the jobs in Ohio will require post-secondary education by 2020. We can make the argument that we are an economic driver and can play a major role in this initiative. We should be thinking about new programming that will help us meet this need.

I. **Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education.** This Task Force is looking at all co-located campuses in the state and how they might share resources with the thought that doing so would save money. This issue last came up in 2004. At that time we made a successful argument that the two-year campuses should offer the two-year degrees, and the four-year campuses should offer the four-year degrees. The President of the Senate is talking about “shared governance” for co-located campuses. However, the term is not being used as the University typically uses it. We are willing to look at the possibility of sharing some services but not sharing governance.

J. **Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.** President Warren would like Kent State to be designated as an engaged campus. The paperwork to receive this classification is onerous. Stark may be asked to do a survey to show what we do to be engaged in the community. The next time we are eligible to apply will be for 2019. Once we have attained this designation we would have to be reaccredited every ten years. Representatives throughout the University will be on the committee working on this initiative.

K. **Student Surveys.** Our students will be participating in some national surveys, one for first-year students and seniors, and one for our sophomores and juniors.

L. **Encompass Magazine and Faculty Achievements.** Encompass always mentions faculty achievements, but those achievements tend to focus on conference presentations, and faculty do so much more. Dean Seachrist suspects that we are not going about gathering the information appropriately. She would like to receive faculty input on this issue.

VII. Assistant Dean’s Report

A. **Retention.** Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi indicated that in the coming months he will be meeting with faculty to explore strategies for improving retention. Increased enrollment leads to challenges in retention. Successful institutions have healthy retention that complements strong enrollment. At present, our retention is not where it should be. There are four pillars of success that he wants faculty to think about: communication skills,
experiential learning, business models and career discussions, and global awareness. His office will continue to support undergraduate research through URA Research, Student Travel, and Global Studies. He asked Councilors to encourage their students to connect with the Academic Success Center, Office of Global Initiatives, Student Life, and the Office of Multicultural Initiatives.

B. **Department Meetings.** Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi will be meeting with all departments this semester to understand their instructional and hiring needs.

C. **Upward Bound.** The Upward Bound Program on campus will run through this semester, through the Office of Multicultural Initiatives and Academic Affairs.

D. **College Credit Plus.** As Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi has reported previously, College Credit Plus is working well. His office is now evaluating plans for next year.

E. **CHW Certificate.** The campus is working with Gayle Walters from Access Health Stark County to bring the Community Health Workers Certificate program to campus. This program is more administrative than medical, with workers serving as a liaison for people who need help understanding and navigating the healthcare system.

F. **ESL Program.** The ESL program is going well. Today our Chinese students visited Amish country. They will end their stay here with a trip to Washington DC. We are hoping that all our work with these students will result in their improved command of English by the end of the semester.

G. **Grants.** The campus has been working on a number of grants, including the Choose Ohio First grant and the S-STEM grant.

H. **Scheduling.** Spring 2017 registration has begun. Today Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi sent out a message to a few coordinators asking them to take one final look at the schedule. The Fall 2017 schedule is getting built this month and early November. Coordinators are communicating with his office. The Summer 2017 schedule will be rolled out as well. All TT faculty are encouraged to teach as many V-1 (fully online) courses as possible so that we can staff our courses using Kent State Stark faculty.

I. **Instructional and Research Needs.** Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi indicated that he has been discussing a few new projects with Dean Seachrist. For example, a proposal has been submitted to create a behavioral lab to help business, HDFS, and psychology faculty in their research. We are working on plans to convert at least one room into an English classroom for writing courses. We will be converting the former geology lab into a room for computer technology.

VIII. Committee Reports

A. **PAAC.** Councilor Garchar indicated that PAAC is reviewing travel requests as they come in and is looking at ways to be more streamlined this fall.

Councilor Blundell asked if it is necessary to submit a travel request form if one is not requesting money. Councilor Garchar explained there is another link on the campus website that goes only to the deans that should be used in such cases. Assistant Dean
Kasturiarachi explained that if a faculty member misses classes and proper notification is not given, it can cause problems such as confusion for students. His office needs to know if a faculty member will not be in class. Councilor Taylor asked if the same procedure holds if taking students on a field trip that would necessitate missing other classes. Council Garchar indicated that the same link should be used. She indicated that she can send out a reminder to faculty about these types of situations.

B. **Committee II.** Councilor Starkey reported on the two charges Council gave Committee II on September 16, 2016. First, the committee was charged to rework the current Stark Campus Strategy Map to align with President Warren’s five strategic priorities. The committee was asked to submit this revision to Dean Seachrist by Monday, September 26 so that she could submit it to Dean Ritchey by September 30. Second, the committee was charged to work on creating a new Strategy Map as the current one will expire in 2017.

**Update on First Charge:** The committee submitted the revisions of the current Stark Campus Strategy Map to Dean Seachrist on September 22. Dean Seachrist sent the revised Strategy Map back to Councilor Starkey on September 30 with graphic enhancements and a few minor changes. Councilor Starkey circulated this revision to the committee and sent Dean Seachrist, Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi, and Chair Warren the committee’s comments on October 5. Faculty Council now needs to approve this revised Strategy Map. Councilor McKenney moved to approve the realigned strategy map, and Councilor Lehnert seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Councilor Starkey then explained that the committee would like to change the wording of the goal for 3.1 to read “1. Prioritize the cultural competency of students, faculty, and staff.” After discussion, councilors also recommended a change in the wording of the key priority under 1.1. Councilor Garchar moved to change the wording of the goal for 3.1 to read “1. Prioritize the cultural competency of students, faculty, and staff” and to change the wording of key priority 1.1 to “Continue to connect students to career opportunities.” Councilor Mukherjee seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Councilor Starkey would like to thank committee members Jayne, John, Olly, and Tanya for all of their hard work with the first charge, especially given the time constraints under which it was completed.

**Update on Second Charge:** Councilor Starkey explained that the committee has now begun to gather information to help them with the creation of a new Strategy Map. The committee has scheduled a meeting with Dean Seachrist and Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi for November 30 in order to hear what has already been done for this new Strategy Map and to hear their thoughts on it. She has also collected the last several campus Strategic Plans to provide some models on which the committee can base its work. The committee is in the process of scheduling a meeting to discuss other steps to take to gather information to help with the new Strategy Map.

Dean Seachrist thanked Councilor Starkey and the committee members for their work.

C. **Colloquium Committee.** Councilor McKenney reported that the committee has met and is planning the colloquium program for this year. They are trying to work in one colloquium this semester.
D. **Treasurer/Social Committee.** Councilor Sato reported that on October 11, with the approval of Faculty Council and with invaluable help from Greg Blundell, she opened a bank account with Huntington Bank for the KSU Stark Faculty Funds. The account has 2 sub-accounts, one for the Faculty Fund and one for the Coffee Fund. She ordered checks for each of the 2 sub-accounts. Each check requires the signature of the treasurer plus 1 officer. The 4 co-signatories this year are Faculty Council Treasurer (Paula Sato), Chair (Dee Warren), Vice-Chair (Kim Garchar), and Secretary (Jayne Moneysmith). Currently, Julie Spotts is working on putting a PayPal link on the Faculty Resources page. Councilor Sato then gave a detailed report on the bank account balances and the expenditures so far this semester.

Councilor Sato also indicated that the raffle for the Faculty Council Chair’s parking spot was going well, with $143 collected through September 28. Half of this money will go to Flash’s Food Pantry and half will be donated to Interfaith Campus Ministry to provide emergency funds for students. The drawing to use the parking spot in November will be held on October 26.

Snack Day will be held in the Main Hall Faculty Commons on Tuesday, October 25. Faculty from English, Modern Languages, and Sociology will provide the food. Stark Faculty will host a Staff Appreciation lunch for Student Services staff on Thursday, November 17, with food being set up in Main Hall Conference Room 4 and Campus Center Conference Room 45 from 11:00 to 2:00.

Two holiday events are being planned near the end of the semester. The annual holiday potluck will be held during finals week; details will be forthcoming. A holiday reception or dinner is tentatively scheduled for Friday, December 9. The date is on a Friday instead of Saturday as it has been in the past because costs are higher on a Saturday. Faculty have expressed a desire to keep the cost under $20 per person, but cost is still under negotiation.

Finally, the spring dinner is tentatively being planned for Saturday, May 6.

E. **Handbook Committee.** Chair Warren explained that although the members of the Handbook Committee were approved at the September Faculty Council meeting, the committee was not officially charged. Kim Garchar moved that the Handbook Committee be charged to do the following:

1. To realign the campus handbook in accordance with the University handbook.
2. To address the changes to merit in accordance with the 2015 TT CBA.
3. To address any inaccuracies in the handbook following the latest FTNTT CBA.

Councilor Moneysmith seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

As chair of the Handbook Committee, Councilor Norton-Smith reported that the work of the committee was going very well, due to the diligent work of all its members. Today the committee would like to bring forth two amendments.

First Councilor Norton-Smith introduced proposed amendments to Handbook Section VIII—“Faculty Excellence Awards.” The proposed changes are as follows:
1. Under the new Handbook organization, it is now Section IV.
   a. To avoid confusion with President Warren’s University Excellence Awards, we’ve been asked to replace “Faculty Excellence Awards” with “Merit” throughout the Handbook.

2. Because there will be merit awards in 2017-2018—and the Collective Bargaining Agreement mandates substantial changes in the structure of the awards requiring amendment of the Handbook with subsequent administrative approvals—the AAUP recommended making the changes now as we reorganize the Handbook.

   At Stark there used to be two merit categories—teaching/service and research—with 2/3rd of the pool used to recognize meritorious teaching/service and 1/3rd used to recognize meritorious research. Under the current CBA, there are three categories—teaching, research, and service—and at least 20% of the pool must be dedicated to each category.

   The Handbook Committee is suggesting 45% for teaching, 35% for research, and 20% for service—although this is not the Committee’s recommendation.

3. Finally, the AY 2014-15 Handbook Committee proposed “tweaking” the merit process in a report that was approved by Council in 2015. The decision then was to implement the recommendations at the time of the Handbook reorganization. Changes to the process coming from the recommendations:
   a. The median of scores—not the average—will be computed
   b. The Council Chair and Secretary—instead of just the Chair—shall submit the median ranked score for each category to the Dean
   c. The sentence, “Those appealing may request to present their reconsideration rationale to the Faculty Council” is added to item 7.b.

   A copy of the proposed amendment is appended to these minutes.

Councilor Blundell, also a member of the Handbook Committee, then introduced amendments to handbook Section VII regarding FTNTT faculty performance reviews, all of which have been made to reflect current policies and procedures. Much of the language is taken directly from the 2016 FTNTT Collective Bargaining Agreement. He indicated that the major content change is adding language that reflects the new category of Administrative Review for those who have served in their positions for 18 years or more (as noted in the 2016 FTNTT Collective Bargaining Agreement). The other changes primarily are updates to current terminology or current practices and changes to standardize language. A copy of all the proposed changes marked with track changes was distributed to Councilors to review and has been appended to these minutes.

Councilor Norton-Smith then explained the process for approving the two proposed amendments. In accordance with the requirements of the Stark campus handbook (Section XI - Handbook Modification, Amendment and Revision): “A vote of the proposed modifications will be conducted by Faculty Council, who must set a specific date for discussions of the proposed changes after all faculty have been made aware
of the changes and have had convenient access to the proposed changes to the handbook for a minimum of ten (10) days before the discussion and vote.” The fall all-faculty will be held in ten days, and that would furnish a convenient venue for discussing the proposed amendments with the faculty. Councilor Moneysmith moved to immediately distribute the proposed amendments to the faculty for review and to inform faculty that the proposed amendments will be discussed at the November 4th all-faculty meeting, with Council discussing and voting on them at the November 18th Faculty Council meeting. Councilor Garchar seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

E. **Technology Committee.** No report.

IX. **Old Business**

A. **Membership for *Ad hoc* Space Committee Recommendations.** Chair Warren indicated that she emailed faculty to ask for volunteers to serve on the committee, as agreed at the September 16th meeting, and shared the names she received. Councilor Moneysmith moved to approve the membership of the *Ad hoc* Space Committee with Ann Martinez as chair and Lisa Hallaman, Ran Li, and Lucas Engelhardt as members. Councilor Mukherjee seconded the motion. It was unanimously approved.

X. **New Business:** None

XI. **Announcements:** Maintenance will clean carpets in offices on Thursday nights, if everything has been picked up off the floor. Assistant Dean Kasturiarachi suggested putting a sign up on the office door if one wants one’s carpet cleaned.

XII. **Adjournment**

At 4:37 PM, Chair Warren adjourned the meeting.
SECTION IV -- **TENURE TRACK FACULTY EXCELLENCE-MERIT AWARDS**

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

**A. General Principles**

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

When **Faculty Excellence Merit** Awards are to be made, a pool for this purpose shall be established for Kent State University at Stark. The expectation is that **two-thirds (2/3) forty-five percent (45%)** of the pool will be used to support **Faculty Excellence Awards** recognizing contributions in *Teaching/Service*, including student advisement and efforts in support of student recruitment and retention activities, and including campus, university, professional, and appropriate community service; **and thirty-five percent (35%) one-third (1/3) of the pool will be used for to recognize** demonstrated productivity and substantiated achievement in *Research*, including appropriate and substantiated professional development; **and twenty percent (20%) of the pool will be used to recognize contributions in Service, including campus, university, professional, and appropriate community service.**

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

**B. Criteria for Determining Faculty Excellence Merit Awards**

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

**“Faculty Excellence Merit”** is demonstrated by **the following:**

1. **The evident performance by a faculty member in Teaching: and campus, university, professional, and appropriate community Service that is above and beyond time commitments and contributions usually expected of faculty members.**

2. **The evident performance by a faculty member in Research** (including creative productivity) above and beyond expectations of standard, acceptable faculty performance.

3. **The evident performance by a faculty member in campus, university, professional, and**
appropriate community Service that is above and beyond time commitments and contributions usually expected of faculty members.

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

(1) Being mindful of the significant variation in faculty roles and responsibilities, disciplines and departments, as well as college or school expectations, examples of expected or "baseline" faculty performance during the “merit period” may be evidenced by:

- Average classroom performance teaching 24 load hours/year as evaluated by student surveys;
- Regular attendance at office hours;
- Writing student recommendations;
- Some effort to remain current in pedagogy;
- Some participation in campus service activities, e.g., service on a campus, department, or university committee or two;
- Some effort to remain current in the area of expertise, e.g., a conference attendance or two.

(2) Being mindful of the significant variation in faculty roles and responsibilities, disciplines and departments, as well as college or school expectations, examples of meritorious faculty performance during the “merit period” may be evidenced by:

- Consistent above-average classroom performance as indicated by student surveys and/or peer reviews;
- Teaching independent studies or overload teaching;
- Assisting students with publications or presentations;
- Recruitment and retention activities;
- Classroom pedagogical and technological innovations;
- Teaching or service awards;
- Extensive, positive contributions of time and effort to campus, department, university, professional, and public service;
- Significant scholarly or creative contributions as determined by the faculty member’s discipline;
- Efforts in campus or university outreach;
- Bringing recognition to Kent State University at Stark.

C. Campus Procedures for Determining Faculty Excellence Merit Awards

1. Forms, deadlines, and instructions for application will be made available by the Campus Dean and the Faculty Council Chair when Faculty Excellence Merit Awards are to be made.

2. Tenured and tenure-track members of Faculty Council will carefully read each file, with each person forming his or her independent evaluation.

3. Tenured and tenure-track Council members will meet in executive session to consider each applicant’s file. This session is solely for the purpose of appraising each applicant’s record, asking questions of constituency members, and clarifying information. This session is not for the purpose of explicitly comparing the performances of colleagues in open discussion.
Each Council member is responsible for making those kinds of judgments independently after the meeting concludes. Council members will not be present for the discussion of their own files or for the discussions of the files submitted by their spouses or significant others.

4. Each Faculty Council member shall assign to each file a score between 0 (low) and 10 (high) in each category for which the faculty member has applied. Scores will be submitted electronically and will remain anonymous at every stage of the process. After the highest and lowest scores of each applicant have been discarded, the scores will be tallied and the **average** computed. Then all applicants will be ranked, according to the **average**-median score for each faculty member.

Council members are not allowed to assign scores to themselves nor to their spouses or significant others, so not everyone will have the same number of total votes. However, the median score should reflect the correct ranking.

The integrity and fairness of the process demands that the scoring by Council members be done without consultation with other Council members or non-Council members of the faculty.

5. The Faculty Council Chair and Secretary shall submit the **median** rank score for each category for each applicant, as well as the original data the medians were based upon, jointly submit the separate scores for each category to the Dean of the Stark Campus. The Chair and Secretary shall keep all the scores confidential.

6. The Dean of the Stark Campus will make a preliminary determination of the **Faculty Excellence Merit** Awards and notify individual faculty member, the Faculty Council, and the Provost. Faculty members who wish to know their discrete ranking in each category by the Dean or by Faculty Council may request that information from the Dean.

7. A faculty member shall have the right to request reconsideration of the preliminary determination. The procedure for making such a request is as follows:

   a. The request shall be made, in writing, to the Dean of the Stark Campus for transmission to the Faculty Council for its review and recommendation on reconsideration.

   b. A necessary condition for Faculty Council review of a written request for reconsideration is that the request must give an informed and substantive reason for reconsidering the preliminary determination. An informed reason is based upon at least as much information as was available to Faculty Council. Thus, the expectation is that any faculty member requesting reconsideration will have reviewed the documentation submitted by all applicants for **Faculty Excellence Merit** Awards who would be affected by a revision of the preliminary determination. A substantive reason discloses a significant misinterpretation or a real and verifiable error in the preliminary determination. Thus, disappointment about the size of an award alone is insufficient reason to request reconsideration. **Those appealing may request to present their reconsideration rationale to the Faculty Council.**

   c. After evaluating all requests for reconsideration, the Faculty Council will make a final recommendation to the Dean of the Stark Campus.

   d. The Dean of the Stark Campus will make a final determination of Faculty
Excellence Awards and notify affected individual faculty, the Faculty Council, and
the Provost
SECTION VII
FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

A. Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track (FTNTT) Faculty

According to Article X, Section 1. of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, FTNTT faculty members "are full-time faculty of Kent State University who are appointed annually to a limited term of employment with the University. Appointments and offers of employment in this role are made annually at the sole discretion of the University. The normal duration of appointment is nine months, encompassing a full academic year, excluding summer and intersession(s) following the conclusion of one (1) academic year and the inception of the next academic year." According to Article X, Section 3. of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, "While it is recognized that appointments for FTNTT Faculty members covered by this Agreement are made annually and that the term of each appointment is limited to a single academic year, a FTNTT Faculty member may be offered an appointment for a subsequent academic year if programmatic need, satisfaction with performance of previous responsibilities, and budgeted resources supporting the position continue in accord with the conditions and provisions of Section 2.A. of this Article and with the procedural expectations detailed in Section 2.B."

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

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

1. completion of one (1) successful Full Performance Review;
2. completion of more than one (1) successful Full Performance Review;
3. the University's commitment to affirmative action and its policies adopted there under;
4. quality of the bargaining unit member's contributions as documented with the accumulated record; or
5. the impact on the academic program or regional campus resulting from the release of the FTNTT Faculty member, which may be assessed by necessary credentials, experience, academic rank and competence to perform the instructional and/or other responsibilities of such a FTNTT Faculty member which are essential to a designated program(s)."
academic year, [an NTT faculty member] may be offered an appointment for a subsequent academic year if programmatic need, satisfaction with performance of previous responsibilities, and budgeted resources supporting the position continue.... [An NTT faculty member] who has received appointments for three consecutive academic years shall be subject to a Full Performance Review.”

In accordance with procedures and timelines established by the University, as annually distributed through the provost's office, a Stark Campus FTNTT candidate for review is responsible for developing and organizing a file presenting evidence supporting her or his continuing appointment. The file is then made available to the Stark Campus promotion, tenure, and reappointment performance review committee. Members of the committee are all tenured and promoted FTNTT members of faculty council plus all tenured full professors who are not members of faculty council. The file is read by all members of the committee and is the subject of candid discussion, except that no member shall be present while the committee discusses or votes on the case of a domestic partner or relative. After the discussion and vote, the faculty council chair summarizes the committee's vote and deliberations in a letter of recommendation to the dean of the Stark Campus. Votes in FTNTT performance reviews are "yes," “yes with concerns,” or “no.” A vote of "yes with concerns" is a positive vote, but it carries with it a note of concern. A simple majority of the promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee voting "yes" or "yes with concerns" represents a positive assessment of the candidate. After reviewing the materials and advisory recommendations, the dean of the Stark Campus will make a judgment regarding reappointment in view of the candidate’s past record, programmatic needs, and budgeted resources supporting the position. Each FTNTT faculty member is to be provided with a written summary of the outcome and conclusions of the review and an indication of whether an additional appointment may be anticipated and, if so, under what programmatic, budgetary and/or anticipated staffing or projected enrollment circumstances. FTNTT candidates for review should consult Article VI of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding appeal and grievance procedures.

B. Kent State University at Stark Criteria for FTNTT Faculty Three-Year Term Performance Review

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

The Full Performance Review file will normally include the following items:

- Past Performance Review letters, if any;
- A self-evaluation providing an assessment of the candidate’s teaching during the period under review, as well as the candidate’s performance of other responsibilities, if any;
- An up-to-date curriculum vitae;
- The syllabi for courses taught during the period under review;
- The Evaluation Summaries of Student Surveys of Instruction (SSI) for all courses taught during the period under review. SSI summaries include both numerical data and student written comments; and
- One peer teaching review each year during the period under review.

At the candidate’s discretion, the Full Performance Review file may include other materials that will clarify and/or enhance her or his record of excellent teaching, including but not limited to:

- Samples of examinations, assignments, study guides, and/or other course materials;
- Evidence that the candidate has remained current in the pedagogical theory of her or his discipline;
- Details of innovations in teaching, e.g., service learning or the use of learning technologies;
- Documentation of teaching awards or nominations;
- An account of scholarly or professional activity necessary to maintain professional standing in the discipline; and
- Assessments of other contributions beyond the contractual expectations for non-tenure track faculty members.

Evaluation Process Overview

Each year the performance review process necessarily has new FTNTT candidates and new performance review, promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee members who may be unfamiliar with the process and how to operationalize the criteria in reviews. This section provides a guide to how this can be done—without prescribing how it must be done—in order to facilitate evaluation consistency and to clarify expectations as committee recommendations are made to the Stark Campus dean.

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

- A poorly organized or incomplete file, e.g., files lacking peer teaching evaluations when appropriate;
• SSI scores on various dimensions of a candidate’s performance evidencing a recurring problem, e.g., showing disrespect to students or being unavailable for student consultation;

• A recurring kind of student written complaint left unaddressed in the self-evaluation, e.g., "It took weeks to get our papers back";

• Poorly crafted syllabi evidencing an inadequate number or kind of evaluations of student learning; and

• Evidence that the candidate’s courses are insufficiently rigorous.

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

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

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

The Simplified Performance Review file will be electronically submitted, and will normally include the following items:

• A narrative of up to five pages in which the candidate describes her or his professional activities during the past three years;

• An up-to-date curriculum vitae; and

• The summaries of Student Surveys of Instruction (SSI) for all courses taught during the period under review. SSI summaries include both numerical data and student written comments.

At the candidate’s discretion, the Simplified Review file may include other materials that will clarify and/or enhance her or his record of continuing excellent teaching, including but not limited to:

• Past Performance Review letters, if any;

• A self-evaluation of the candidate’s teaching performance during the past three years;

• Recent peer teaching reviews;
• Samples of syllabi, examinations, assignments, study guides, and/or other course materials;

• Evidence that the candidate has remained current in the pedagogical theory of her or his discipline;

• Details of innovations in teaching, e.g., service learning or the use of learning technologies;

• Documentation of teaching awards or nominations;

• An account of scholarly or professional activity necessary to maintain professional standing in the discipline; and

• Assessments of other contributions beyond the contractual expectations for non-tenure track faculty members.

Evaluation Process Overview

Each year the performance review process necessarily has new candidates and new promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee members who may be unfamiliar with the process and how to operationalize the criteria in reviews. This section provides a guide to how this can be done—without prescribing how it must be done—in order to facilitate evaluation consistency and to clarify expectations as committee recommendations are made to the Stark Campus dean.

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

• A poorly organized or incomplete file;

• SSI scores on various dimensions of a candidate’s performance evidencing a recurring problem, e.g., showing disrespect to students or being unavailable for student consultation; and

• A recurring kind of student written complaint left unaddressed in the self-evaluation, e.g., “It took weeks to get our papers back.”

FTNTT candidates undergoing a simplified performance review are strongly encouraged to acknowledge these facts as they prepare their files and to explain fully why they think their teaching performance should be considered excellent or satisfactory.
According to Article X, Section 9. A. of the Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, “[a]fter eighteen (18) years of consecutive appointments, and every three (3) years thereafter, FTNTT Faculty members shall be reviewed by their academic unit administrator. This administrative performance review will follow the format, procedures and timelines established by the University, as annually distributed through the Office of Faculty Affairs. To complete this review, the academic unit administrator will schedule a meeting with the FTNTT Faculty member who will submit, prior to the meeting, a current vitae and a narrative of 1-3 pages in which the FTNTT Faculty member describes her/his professional activities during the past three (3) years prior to the meeting. A FTNTT Faculty member who successfully completes this review is eligible for a three (3) year term of annually renewable appointments which is conditional from year to year only upon continued satisfaction with demonstrated performance, continued programmatic and staffing need within the academic unit, and continued budgetary resources supporting the position.”

According to Article X, Section 9. B. of the Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, “At the conclusion of this review and after consultation with the Kent State Stark Dean, if applicable, the academic unit administrator will provide the FTNTT Faculty member with a written summary of its outcome and conclusions and an indication of whether an additional appointment may be anticipated and, if so, under what programmatic, budgetary and/or anticipated staffing or projected enrollment circumstances.

1. In the event that an additional appointment is not indicated, the academic unit administrator will include in the written summary provided to the FTNTT Faculty member an explanation of whether lack of adequate satisfaction with performance or the absence of anticipated continuing programmatic need or budgeted resources to support the position is the reason.

2. The FTNTT Faculty member may, if desired, seek review of the decision by the established Faculty Advisory Committee or Faculty Council of a regional campus and by the College Dean or his/her designee, if applicable, as provided for in Article VII, Section 1. of this Agreement.

3. An additional appointment immediately subsequent to the completion of this administrative performance review normally is expected to be part of a three-year term of renewable annual appointments as defined in Section 6 above, provided that continuing programmatic need and budgeted resources supporting the position can be anticipated for the term in question.

4. In the unusual case when a FTNTT Faculty member is approved for a three-year term of annually renewable appointments, as defined in Section 6 above, and the unit administrator determines that a subsequent review is needed due to performance concerns, the academic unit administrator will include a performance plan and timeline for this subsequent review in the written summary of the review provided to the FTNTT Faculty member as described in B.1. above of this Section 9.”
SECTION IV -- TENURE TRACK FACULTY EXCELLENCE-MERIT AWARDS

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

A. General Principles

In conformity with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, two-three broadly-defined areas of demonstrated faculty excellence, consistent with the mission of Kent State University at Stark, are to be recognized through Faculty ExcellenceMerit Awards: (1) Teaching/Service and (2) Research, and (3) Service.

When Faculty ExcellenceMerit Awards are to be made, a pool for this purpose shall be established for Kent State University at Stark. The expectation is that two-thirds (2/3) forty-five percent (45%) of the pool will be used to support Faculty Excellence Awards recognizing contributions in Teaching/Service, including student advisement and efforts in support of student recruitment and retention activities, and including campus, university, professional, and appropriate community service; and thirty-five percent (35%) one-third (1/3) of the pool will be used for to recognize demonstrated productivity and substantiated achievement in Research, including appropriate and substantiated professional development; and twenty percent (20%) of the pool will be used to recognize contributions in Service, including campus, university, professional, and appropriate community service.

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

B. Criteria for Determining Faculty ExcellenceMerit Awards

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

“Faculty ExcellenceMerit” is demonstrated by the following:

1. The evident performance by a faculty member in Teaching and campus, university, professional, and appropriate community Service that is above and beyond time commitments and contributions usually expected of faculty members;

2. The evident performance by a faculty member in Research (including creative productivity) above and beyond expectations of standard, acceptable faculty performance;

3. The evident performance by a faculty member in campus, university, professional, and
In determining the extent to which the performance, contributions, or achievements of a faculty member satisfy these guiding criteria for "Faculty Excellence Merit," it is useful to consider some examples of (1) expected or "baseline" faculty performance, and (2) meritorious faculty performance.

(1) Being mindful of the significant variation in faculty roles and responsibilities, disciplines and departments, as well as college or school expectations, examples of expected or "baseline" faculty performance during the "merit period" may be evidenced by:

- Average classroom performance teaching 24 load hours/year as evaluated by student surveys;
- Regular attendance at office hours;
- Writing student recommendations;
- Some effort to remain current in pedagogy;
- Some participation in campus service activities, e.g., service on a campus, department, or university committee or two;
- Some effort to remain current in the area of expertise, e.g., a conference attendance or two.

(2) Being mindful of the significant variation in faculty roles and responsibilities, disciplines and departments, as well as college or school expectations, examples of meritorious faculty performance during the "merit period" may be evidenced by:

- Consistent above-average classroom performance as indicated by student surveys and/or peer reviews;
- Teaching independent studies or overload teaching;
- Assisting students with publications or presentations;
- Recruitment and retention activities;
- Classroom pedagogical and technological innovations;
- Teaching or service awards;
- Extensive, positive contributions of time and effort to campus, department, university, professional, and public service;
- Significant scholarly or creative contributions as determined by the faculty member’s discipline;
- Efforts in campus or university outreach;
- Bringing recognition to Kent State University at Stark.

C. Campus Procedures for Determining Faculty Excellence Merit Awards

1. Forms, deadlines, and instructions for application will be made available by the Campus Dean and the Faculty Council Chair when Faculty Excellence Merit Awards are to be made.

2. Tenured and tenure-track members of Faculty Council will carefully read each file, with each person forming his or her independent evaluation.

3. Tenured and tenure-track Council members will meet in executive session to consider each applicant’s file. This session is solely for the purpose of appraising each applicant’s record, asking questions of constituency members, and clarifying information. This session is not for the purpose of explicitly comparing the performances of colleagues in open discussion.
Each Council member is responsible for making those kinds of judgments independently after the meeting concludes. Council members will not be present for the discussion of their own files or for the discussions of the files submitted by their spouses or significant others.

4. Each Faculty Council member shall assign to each file a score between 0 (low) and 10 (high) in each category for which the faculty member has applied. Scores will be submitted electronically and will remain anonymous at every stage of the process. **After the highest and lowest scores of each applicant have been discarded, the scores will be tallied and the average computed. The scores will be tallied and the median computed.** Then all applicants will be ranked, according to the average-median score for each faculty member.

Council members are not allowed to assign scores to themselves nor to their spouses or significant others, so not everyone will have the same number of total votes. However, the median score should reflect the correct ranking.

The integrity and fairness of the process demands that the scoring by Council members be done without consultation with other Council members or non-Council members of the faculty.

5. The Faculty Council Chair and Secretary shall submit the median rank score for each category for each applicant, as well as the original data the medians were based upon, jointly submit the separate scores for each category to the Dean of the Stark Campus. The Chair and Secretary shall keep all the scores confidential.

6. The Dean of the Stark Campus will make a preliminary determination of the Faculty Excellence Merit Awards and notify individual faculty member, the Faculty Council, and the Provost. Faculty members who wish to know their discrete ranking in each category by the Dean or by Faculty Council may request that information from the Dean.

7. A faculty member shall have the right to request reconsideration of the preliminary determination. The procedure for making such a request is as follows:

   a. The request shall be made, in writing, to the Dean of the Stark Campus for transmission to the Faculty Council for its review and recommendation on reconsideration.

   b. A necessary condition for Faculty Council review of a written request for reconsideration is that the request must give an informed and substantive reason for reconsidering the preliminary determination. An informed reason is based upon at least as much information as was available to Faculty Council. Thus, the expectation is that any faculty member requesting reconsideration will have reviewed the documentation submitted by all applicants for Faculty Excellence Merit Awards who would be affected by a revision of the preliminary determination. A substantive reason discloses a significant misinterpretation or a real and verifiable error in the preliminary determination. Thus, disappointment about the size of an award alone is insufficient reason to request reconsideration. **Those appealing may request to present their reconsideration rationale to the Faculty Council.**

   c. After evaluating all requests for reconsideration, the Faculty Council will make a final recommendation to the Dean of the Stark Campus.

   d. The Dean of the Stark Campus will make a final determination of Faculty
Excellence Awards and notify affected individual faculty, the Faculty Council, and the Provost.
SECTION VII
FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

A. Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track (FTNTT) Faculty

According to Article X, Section 1. of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, FTNTT faculty members are full-time faculty of Kent State University who are appointed annually to a limited term of employment with the University. Appointments and offers of employment in this role are made annually at the sole discretion of the University.

The normal duration of appointment is nine months, encompassing a full academic year, excluding summer and intersession(s) following the conclusion of one (1) academic year and the inception of the next academic year.” According to Article X, Section 3. of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, “While it is recognized that appointments for FTNTT Faculty members covered by this Agreement are made annually and that the term of each appointment is limited to a single academic year, a FTNTT Faculty member may be offered an appointment for a subsequent academic year if programmatic need, satisfaction with performance of previous responsibilities, and budgeted resources supporting the position continue in accord with the conditions and provisions of Section 2.A. of this Article and with the procedural expectations detailed in Section 2.B.”

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

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

1. completion of one (1) successful Full Performance Review;
2. completion of more than one (1) successful Full Performance Review;
3. the University’s commitment to affirmative action and its policies adopted there under;
4. quality of the bargaining unit member’s contributions as documented with the accumulated record; or
5. the impact on the academic program or regional campus resulting from the release of the FTNTT Faculty member, which may be assessed by necessary credentials, experience, academic rank and competence to perform the instructional and/or other responsibilities of such a FTNTT Faculty member which are essential to a designated program(s).
academic year, [an NTT faculty member] may be offered an appointment for a subsequent academic year if programmatic need, satisfaction with performance of previous responsibilities, and budgeted resources supporting the position continue.... [An NTT faculty member] who has received appointments for three consecutive academic years shall be subject to a Full Performance Review.”

In accordance with procedures and timelines established by the University, as annually distributed through the provost’s office, a Stark Campus FTNTT candidate for review is responsible for developing and organizing a file presenting evidence supporting her or his continuing appointment. The file is then made available to the Stark Campus promotion, tenure, and reappointment performance review committee. Members of the committee are all tenured and promoted FTNTT members of faculty council plus all tenured full professors who are not members of faculty council. The file is read by all members of the committee and is the subject of candid discussion, except that no member shall be present while the committee discusses or votes on the case of a domestic partner or relative. After the discussion and vote, the faculty council chair summarizes the committee’s vote and deliberations in a letter of recommendation to the dean of the Stark Campus. Votes in FTNTT performance reviews are "yes," “yes with concerns,” or “no.” A vote of "yes with concerns" is a positive vote, but it carries with it a note of concern. A simple majority of the promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee voting "yes" or "yes with concerns" represents a positive assessment of the candidate. After reviewing the materials and advisory recommendations, the dean of the Stark Campus will make a judgment regarding reappointment in view of the candidate’s past record, programmatic needs, and budgeted resources supporting the position. Each FTNTT faculty member is to be provided with a written summary of the outcome and conclusions of the review and an indication of whether an additional appointment may be anticipated and, if so, under what programmatic, budgetary and/or anticipated staffing or projected enrollment circumstances. FTNTT candidates for review should consult Article VI of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding appeal and grievance procedures.

B. Kent State University at Stark Criteria for FTNTT Faculty Three-Year Term Performance Review

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

The Full Performance Review file will normally include the following items:

- Past Performance Review letters, if any;

- A self-evaluation providing an assessment of the candidate’s teaching during the period under review, as well as the candidate’s performance of other responsibilities, if any;
• An up-to-date curriculum vitae;

• The syllabi for courses taught during the period under review;

• The Evaluation Summaries of Student Surveys of Instruction (SSI) for all courses taught during the period under review. SSI summaries include both numerical data and student written comments; and

• One peer teaching review each year during the period under review.

At the candidate’s discretion, the Full Performance Review file may include other materials that will clarify and/or enhance her or his record of excellent teaching, including but not limited to:

• Samples of examinations, assignments, study guides, and/or other course materials;

• Evidence that the candidate has remained current in the pedagogical theory of her or his discipline;

• Details of innovations in teaching, e.g., service learning or the use of learning technologies;

• Documentation of teaching awards or nominations;

• An account of scholarly or professional activity necessary to maintain professional standing in the discipline; and

• Assessments of other contributions beyond the contractual expectations for non-tenure track faculty members.

Evaluation Process Overview

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

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

• A poorly organized or incomplete file, e.g., files lacking peer teaching evaluations when appropriate;
• SSI scores on various dimensions of a candidate’s performance evidencing a recurring problem, e.g., showing disrespect to students or being unavailable for student consultation;

• A recurring kind of student written complaint left unaddressed in the self-evaluation, e.g., “It took weeks to get our papers back”;

• Poorly crafted syllabi evidencing an inadequate number or kind of evaluations of student learning; and

• Evidence that the candidate’s courses are insufficiently rigorous.

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

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

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

The Simplified Performance Review file will be electronically submitted, and will normally include the following items:

• A narrative of up to five pages in which the candidate describes her or his professional activities during the past three years;

• An up-to-date curriculum vitae; and

• The summaries of Student Surveys of Instruction (SSI) for all courses taught during the period under review. SSI summaries include both numerical data and student written comments.

At the candidate's discretion, the Simplified Review file may include other materials that will clarify and/or enhance her or his record of continuing excellent teaching, including but not limited to:

• Past Performance Review letters, if any;

• A self-evaluation of the candidate’s teaching performance during the past three years;

• Recent peer teaching reviews;
• Samples of syllabi, examinations, assignments, study guides, and/or other course materials;

• Evidence that the candidate has remained current in the pedagogical theory of her or his discipline;

• Details of innovations in teaching, e.g., service learning or the use of learning technologies;

• Documentation of teaching awards or nominations;

• An account of scholarly or professional activity necessary to maintain professional standing in the discipline; and

• Assessments of other contributions beyond the contractual expectations for non-tenure track faculty members.

Evaluation Process Overview

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

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

• A poorly organized or incomplete file;

• SSI scores on various dimensions of a candidate’s performance evidencing a recurring problem, e.g., showing disrespect to students or being unavailable for student consultation; and

• A recurring kind of student written complaint left unaddressed in the self-evaluation, e.g., “It took weeks to get our papers back.”

FTNTT candidates undergoing a simplified performance review are strongly encouraged to acknowledge these facts as they prepare their files and to explain fully why they think their teaching performance should be considered excellent or satisfactory.
According to Article X, Section 9. A. of the Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, “[a]fter eighteen (18) years of consecutive appointments, and every three (3) years thereafter, FTNTT Faculty members shall be reviewed by their academic unit administrator. This administrative performance review will follow the format, procedures and timelines established by the University, as annually distributed through the Office of Faculty Affairs. To complete this review, the academic unit administrator will schedule a meeting with the FTNTT Faculty member who will submit, prior to the meeting, a current vitae and a narrative of 1-3 pages in which the FTNTT Faculty member describes her/his professional activities during the past three (3) years prior to the meeting. A FTNTT Faculty member who successfully completes this review is eligible for a three (3) year term of annually renewable appointments which is conditionable 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.”

According to Article X, Section 9. B. of the Full-time Non-tenure Track Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, “At the conclusion of this review and after consultation with the Kent State Stark Dean, if applicable, the academic unit administrator will provide the FTNTT Faculty member with a written summary of its outcome and conclusions and an indication of whether an additional appointment may be anticipated and, if so, under what programmatic, budgetary and/or anticipated staffing or projected enrollment circumstances.

1. In the event that an additional appointment is not indicated, the academic unit administrator will include in the written summary provided to the FTNTT Faculty member an explanation of whether lack of adequate satisfaction with performance or the absence of anticipated continuing programmatic need or budgeted resources to support the position is the reason.

2. The FTNTT Faculty member may, if desired, seek review of the decision by the established Faculty Advisory Committee or Faculty Council of a regional campus and by the College Dean or his/her designee, if applicable, as provided for in Article VII, Section 1. of this Agreement.

3. An additional appointment immediately subsequent to the completion of this administrative performance review normally is expected to be part of a three-year term of renewable annual appointments as defined in Section 6 above, provided that continuing programmatic need and budgeted resources supporting the position can be anticipated for the term in question.

4. In the unusual case when a FTNTT Faculty member is approved for a three-year term of annually renewable appointments, as defined in Section 6 above, and the unit administrator determines that a subsequent review is needed due to performance concerns, the academic unit administrator will include a performance plan and timeline for this subsequent review in the written summary of the review provided to the FTNTT Faculty member as described in B.1. above of this Section 9.”