Table of Contents

I. Matters of School Governance and Related Procedures
II. Teaching Assignments, Workload, Workload Equivalences, and Related Procedures
III. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria; Processes Relating to Personnel Actions
IV. Performance Expectations; Merit Criteria
V. Other School Guidelines
I. MATTERS OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND RELATED PROCEDURES

A. Terms and Principles

1. **Faculty of the Whole**: The term “faculty of the whole” shall refer to all individuals who are tenure-track or non-tenure-track; the faculty of the whole may also be referred to as “all faculty.”

2. **Faculty**: “The term "Faculty" shall mean all regular full-time, tenure-track teaching personnel with rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor,” as defined by the Office of Academic Personnel.

3. **Tenure Track Faculty**: Tenure Track Faculty refers to “full-time faculty of academic rank who hold tenured or tenure-track appointments at the University” and may be referred to as “TT Faculty”, “members of the TT Faculty”, and “TT Faculty members”, as defined by Article 1, Section I:H of the Tenure Track Collective Bargaining Agreement (hereafter TTCBA).

4. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty**: Non-Tenure Track Faculty refers to those “full-time faculty of academic rank who hold non-tenure track appointments at the University and who, therefore, are members of the bargaining unit as defined in Article II of this Agreement” and may be referred to herein as "FTNTT Faculty," "members of the FTNTT Faculty," and "FTNTT Faculty members,” as defined by Article I, Section I:H in the Non-Tenure Track Collective Bargaining Agreement (hereafter NTTCBA).

5. **Part-time Term Semester Faculty, or Adjunct Faculty**, are hired on a semester or academic year basis to teach specific courses or set of courses,” as defined by the Office of Academic Personnel.

6. **Equity**: The Alice E. Casey Foundation defines equity “as ‘the state, quality or ideal of being just, impartial, and fair.” 1 Equity is a structural outcome, produced and sustained by policy, procedure, and process.

7. **Inclusion**: Inclusion is defined as “authentically bringing traditionally excluded individuals and/or groups into processes, activities, and decision and policy-making in a way that shares power.” 2 Inclusion is both an outcome and a process and occurs via formal and informal structures.

---

1 Equity vs. Equality and Other Racial Justice Definitions. Alice. E. Casey Foundation. [https://www.aecf.org/blog/racial-justice-definitions](https://www.aecf.org/blog/racial-justice-definitions)

B. **Mission and Purpose**

The School of Multidisciplinary Social Sciences and Humanities (hereinafter the School) at Kent State University serves as an academic home for innovative approaches to complex questions in the social sciences and humanities. Embracing multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and methodological flexibility and diversity, the School provides a richly dynamic space for all faculty and students: one in which voices from varying vantage points and academic traditions contribute and speak to and challenge one another with difficult questions, and in pursuit of solutions too complex for any single discipline to answer.

Driven by inquiry free to move outside and beyond discrete disciplinary boundaries, the School embraces the responsibilities of engaged, collaborative scholarship, integrative and applied learning, diverse expertise consciously and deliberately brought together to feed novel research and instruction.

The commitment to such collaborative diversity is lived through School structures. Research advisory committees, working groups, reading groups, and other collaborations are designed to create constellations of disciplinary work, fostering new ways of understanding the complex human condition. Each configuration may be unique, and the School is designed to support and provide structure to that diversity.

The School is furthermore determined to grow our community — student, staff, and all faculty — through recruitment and retention measures seeking diversity and inclusion, and will reach out to underserved and structurally marginalized populations with intention. Our community should be an extension of, and deeply embedded within, the much broader community. As a School, we acknowledge the cost of prejudices built into systems that not only prevent participation but thwart the pursuit of knowledge. We aim to break through structures that obstruct access and participation for anyone; we aim to actively address habits that sustain marginalization and enact remedies. We aim to recognize diverse pathways of achievement and success. The School is committed to student success and to implementing fresh strategies to eliminate institutional barriers that prevent access, academic persistence, and graduation. We acknowledge that these require meaningful and proactive service on our part, and as a School we actively value this service.

As an academic unit committed to understanding “the complex human condition,” we are also a unit committed to bettering the human condition. To that end, we value the well-being of all of our faculty, our staff, and our students and prioritize well-being as a fundamental component of constructive research, instruction, service, and learning. We recognize this unit as a community and recognize the School itself as an inherently shared space. Through cooperation and collaboration we not only create but continually cultivate, a living space within which we can best envision, undertake, and share our work. With respect and by design, we strive to tend to that space — and to the personnel, their individual and collective endeavors — and to the potential for engagement within that space for real-time education, conversation, and forward motion. Critically, we foster within our space a sense of belonging for all staff, students, and
faculty. We work towards meaningful and durable diversity, inclusion, equity, and a growing tradition of policies, processes and praxis that achieve genuinely equitable outcomes.

The School is committed to continual reflection on our polices, processes, and practices as we work to ensure our collective well-being, pursue equity, serve our students, be diligent in inclusivity, and contribute to a shared body of knowledge through our research and instruction.

C. Structure and Organization

1. Administrative and Service Positions

   a. Director:
   The Director serves as the academic administrator of the School. As such the Director serves as the chief advocate for the School and conduit of information between the University Administration and the School whole of the faculty, staff, and students.

   The Director is responsible for ensuring implementation of and adherence to all policy within this Handbook, the TT and NTT CBAs, and the University Policy Register.

   The School Director is responsible for facilitating and supporting a healthy workplace climate where equity, diversity, transparency, individual well-being, and collective well-being are paramount. It is understood that the commitment of all members of the School to these core principles is foundational to the professional success of our students, our staff, the School faculty of the whole, and our unit as a whole.

   The School Director is responsible for ensuring adequate and prompt feedback to student concerns raised regarding courses and university policy implementation within the School.

   The Director serves as an ex-officio member of all School committees.

   The Director will provide intentional leadership in valuing, protecting, and expanding diversity, inclusion, and equity within the School. The Director will ensure that the principles of diversity, inclusion, and equity are demonstrably integrated within the recruitment of students, staff, and faculty to, the operation of, the hiring into, and retention within the School.

   The Director will be selected and reviewed in accordance with TT CBA policy.

   At the completion of service (be in the end of a defined term or mid-term), a Director may return to the Faculty. Upon the announcement of the Director’s intention to return to the faculty, the FAC shall undertake a review of the Director and a salary adjustment. It is understood that the primary role of the Director is administrative, as defined in the University Policy Register 2-03.1(3.g): “A department or dependent school shall be headed by a chair or director who shall have primary responsibility for all curricular, budgetary, and personnel actions of the unit….“ It is also understood that in taking this position, a faculty person is removed from the salary processes outlined in the CBA, but temporarily so, and is returning to that position. Therefore, the Director will submit to the FAC to facilitate the salary review a narrative letter and updated CV, as well as any relevant supporting documents, that indicate the following: (a) whether the Director fulfilled all obligations as listed in the Unit Handbook and University Policy Register 2-03.1(3.g); (b) whether the Director contributed in meritorious ways to teaching, service, and/or research above and beyond the expectations of the role of Director as outlined in policies noted above; (c) whether the Director contributed to the well-being and/or development of the unit, the College, the University, and/or their field over their term. The FAC will consider all evidence and make a determination regarding salary adjustment based upon these factors.
SMSSH recommends that should FAC consider the Director’s service to have met the University Policy description and contributions to be satisfactory the salary adjustment be at minimum 10% of the Director stipend per year of service, and that this sum be added to the faculty base pay. For instance, a Director stepping down after four years in the position would receive a base pay adjustment = (4)(.10*stipend).

Directors completing four years of service will be scheduled for one research semester (a research with no teaching and minimal service) immediately following their term, provided all teaching needs can be met. This is unrelated to, cannot be replaced by, and does not compete with, FPIL schedules or FPIL eligibility.

University Policy Register 6-12 provides guidance on FPIL. SMSSH Directors stepping down from their administrative position will be eligible to apply for Faculty Professional Improvement Leave (FPIL, or sabbatical) in accordance with the 7-year cycle set with their letter of offer. If an eligibility window is missed while serving as Director, the former Director may apply for FPIL during the next application cycle.

b. Undergraduate Coordinator:
The Undergraduate Coordinator is selected by the Director, in consultation with Faculty Advisory Committee (hereafter FAC; see section I.C.2). The Undergraduate Coordinator chairs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; coordinates undergraduate recruitment, retention, and belonging efforts; represents the School on the College Curriculum Committee; and serves as an advising resource for undergraduate students in School academic programs.

c. Master of Liberal Studies (LSM) Coordinator:
The Master of Liberal Studies Coordinator is selected by the Director, in consultation with FAC. The coordinator advises all LSM as they work through their graduate work. The Coordinator may assist students in course selection and may guide advisory committees. The coordinator assists with recruitment, retention, and student success with specific attention towards inclusion, equity, and belonging.

d. Representative to College Advisory Committee (CAC):
The School representative to the CAC is elected by the FAC, preferably during the spring semester, to begin in the fall semester.

e. Program Coordinator:
A Program Coordinator is selected by the Director, in consultation with the relevant faculty (FTNTT or TT) as well as the School FAC. The Program Coordinator is responsible for the requisite administrative work overseeing a certificate, minor, or major curricular program. This may include but is not limited to, course scheduling recommendations to be provided to the UG Coordinator and Director; curriculum updates and reforms deemed appropriate to the program’s health and success; recruitment and retention efforts that sustain and grow the program; and advising for students enrolled in the program(s).

f. Assistant to the Director:
An Assistant to the Director may be selected by the Director, in consultation with FAC, to provide support for Director obligations and projects.
g. Other Administrative Positions:
The Director may appoint faculty (FTNTT or TT) to other administrative positions, in consultation with FAC.

2. Committees
All of the committees within the School are advisory and recommendatory to the Chair. All committee composition, role, and process will be in accordance with university policy. All committees will have a minimum membership of three provided this is both possible given personnel and in compliance with governing university policy.

a. Faculty Committee
All full-time faculty, whether NTT or TT, are members of the Faculty Committee. Meetings not pertaining to personnel matters are open meetings; the student representative, to be selected from student members of the SAC, is non-voting member welcome to participate in non-personnel matters. The Director will meet with the Faculty Committee at least once per semester, in accordance with the TT CBA (VI. Section 2.B). Voting on committee business can take place via email and/or in-person, and may take place in hybrid fashion.

b. Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)
All TT members and as many NTT members as the TT CBA will allow, will serve as the FAC, to be elected in the spring semester for the following academic year. FAC will serve in advisory capacity to the School Director. In accordance with the CBA, the FAC will be in open communication with the Faculty in full, providing minutes from all meetings in timely fashion, communicating issues of import, and gathering feedback where appropriate.

FAC will elect from its members (a) member(s) (as defined by the College handbook) to represent the School on the College Advisory Committee (CAC). At least one representative to CAC must be a tenured member of the School’s Faculty, as outlined in the CBA (VI. Section 3.C).

c. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) is responsible for reviewing and offering recommendations on curriculum updates for all courses to the Director; undergraduate certificate, minor, and major programs within the School. It is recommended that the committee be comprised of one representative from each minor and/or major program; in accordance with the TT CBA (VI. Section 2.c) tenure track faculty members will serve as a majority on the UCC. The School faculty of the whole will elect the maximum number permitted of NTT faculty to the UCC. The UCC will be chaired by the Undergraduate Coordinator; the School Director is an ex-officio member (see TT CBA VI. Section 2.C). Program Coordinators must approve curriculum changes prior to consideration by UCC. Curriculum matters shall be reviewed with deference to the Program Coordinators as experts in the field. All UCC votes are advisory to the Director.
d. Undergraduate Student Advisory Board
The USAB serves as the representative body of all students enrolled in programs and courses in the School. The USAB will meet with the Director of the SMSSH to discuss issues related to student success. Topics may include but are not limited to: course offerings; event ideas or scheduling; mentoring and peer support; and student organization activities related to degree programs. The Director of the SMSSH will schedule USAB meetings at least once per semester; student members may request additional meetings in order to bring concerns, feedback, or ideas to the committee as appropriate. Applications will be accepted from students across the School, and Program Coordinators can recommend that students apply. The Director will select members from applicants, maintaining a diverse population including representation from each program when possible.

e. Student Academic Complaint Committee
The University Policy Register (Chapter 4-02.3) requires that “[e]ach academic unit shall establish a standing student academic complaint committee which shall be composed of departmental faculty and at least one student.” In the School, the SACC shall consist of the FAC as well as one undergraduate student and one graduate student. The SACC will elect a chair from among its members at the beginning of each fall semester. The Committee shall proceed in accordance with the policies and processes outlined in the Policy Register.

f. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee
The policies and procedures which govern the School's Ad Hoc Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee are included in University Policy. Procedural and operational guidelines for this committee are provided annually by the Office of the Provost. This committee reviews materials relevant to the professional performance of Faculty who are candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion in rank, and to make recommendations to the Director on each of these personnel decisions. The recommendations of this committee and the Director, together with the materials assembled for the committees, are forwarded to the Dean of the College. The ad hoc RTP Committee consists of all tenured Full Professors and the tenured members of the FAC, and is Chaired by the School Director.

g. Additional School Committees
Additional, ad-hoc committees may be established, charged, and populated by the Director of the School as needed. The Director will consult with FAC in the creation of such committees.

3. Faculty Roles

a. Graduate Faculty Status
Graduate Faculty Status enables individuals to serve as instructors and research advisors to graduate students. The University Policy Register (6-15.1) defines qualifications, processes, and roles regarding Graduate Faculty Status. In accordance with this policy and with the practices
outlined by Graduate Studies, all faculty may apply for Graduate Faculty Status by submitting a request to the School Director. Requests will be reviewed by the unit graduate faculty and submitted to the Dean.

Graduate Faculty Status shall be conferred by SMSSH in accordance with University Policy for those faculty who meet the qualifications as outlined in University Policy 6-15.1, and whose “scholarly, creative, or professional activities … over the last five years” reflective of any of the following:

i. An on-going and active research agenda, demonstrated through data collection, data analysis, publications, conference presentations, working papers, or other research-related work;

ii. Contributions to the development of the field, demonstrated through providing peer reviews, mentorship of undergraduate and graduate research, organizing panels or research workshops or output, or other sorts of reviews or contributions to research productivity;

iii. Service to the field, demonstrated through organization or administration of conference sections, service to field conferences or organizations;

iv. Other contributions to the development of the field

b. Faculty Affiliates
The multidisciplinary programs inside the School demands often benefit greatly from the expertise of diverse discipline specialists. Faculty Affiliates may offer courses meeting the needs of one or more of the School programs, mentor student research, or collaborate with School faculty (NTT or TT) on research, grants, or special projects. Individuals who wish to establish Faculty Affiliate status with the School should submit an up-to-date CV, a letter of interest, and a proposal regarding collaboration or instructional contributions to the Director of the School. The Director will consult FAC and appropriate, program-specific individuals in determining whether to confer Faculty Affiliate status.

c. Employment Outside of Kent State University
Faculty members, FTNTT or TT, may engage in professional activities outside the university provided the activities do not interfere with the member’s teaching, research, or service responsibilities to the School, Campus, College, or University (See, University Policy Register 3342-6-24). These activities must not compete with nor pose a conflict of interest with University activity or the member’s employment with the University and must be approved in advance by the Chair and the Dean. Each academic year, each faculty member, FTNTT or TT, must disclose and seek approval for all outside employment or other outside activities 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)

4. The Workplace

a. Recruitment and Hiring
The School is committed to inclusivity, diversity, and equity in the processes of recruitment and hiring. To that end, all faculty members and search committee members in particular will re-evaluate hiring criteria and processes on a regular basis to ensure that stated qualifications and rubrics reflect the goals of diversity and inclusion and that metrics are equitable in practice and in outcome. The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will be consulted in evaluating and updating materials to ensure the use of best practices.

Regarding tenure-track positions, the School views the offer of a Faculty position as a first step in the tenure process. Only those candidates for whom tenure can reasonably be expected to be achieved shall be considered for hire. Faculty members within the School will commit to mentoring and advising candidates, to providing useful and constructive evaluation and feedback on all evaluation ballots, and to ensure access to all university professional development resources.

b. Mentoring
The Director will ensure that the School Mentoring Plan is reviewed regularly and updated to reflect best practices in mentoring. The Director shall also ensure the School adheres to the Mentoring Plan with all incoming faculty, FTNTT or TT, and that its implementation is constructive, consistent, and conducive to the mentee’s well-being and professional development.

c. Climate
The workplace climate within the School will be defined by a commitment to each of the following: equity, diversity, inclusion, transparency, individual well-being, and collective well-being. These principles best serve the professional success of our students, our staff, our faculty, and our unit as a whole. The School encourages, fosters and promotes learning and growth that expands our understanding and application of these principles.

d. Policy on Non-Exploitation
Members of the School shall not exploit individuals. Therefore, members of the School should not exercise evaluative authority over any individual with whom they have a romantic or sexual relationships. We recognize that such situations may leave individuals vulnerable to manipulation, may create the appearance of or opportunities for favoritism and/or exploitation, and thus are to be avoided. (Statement adapted from the ASA and ACJS Code of Ethic statements). In the event that a person enters into a romantic or sexual relationship that is covered by the above policy it is their responsibility to disclose the relationship to the School
Director and decisions should be made to ensure prevention of exploitation, consistent with University policy.

e. Faculty Code of Ethics
All members of the School are expected to maintain the highest of standards as teachers, scholars, and colleagues. The School subscribes to the Faculty Code of Ethics (UPR 2342-6-05 and UPR 3342-6-55).

f. Grievance Procedures
Kent State University and the School encourage all faculty to resolve conflicts and grievances at the local level utilizing informal methods when possible.

All faculty grievances that are not directly related to the terms or conditions of employment and are not academic appeals are appropriately addressed within the Department, whenever possible. The Chair and/or relevant faculty members, FTNTT or TT, will initiate an informal dialogue with all parties involved in a dispute and strive to reach a resolution agreeable to all parties.

Informal resolution to conflict and grievance should be pursued first through the School Director. The Director may seek consult from other FTNTT or TT faculty, colleagues, or other administrators in pursuing resolution. Should informal resolution not be achieved, individuals may utilize the formal grievance procedures as outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreements (Article VII of either the Tenure Track or the Non-Tenure Track CBA).

g. Handbook Revision
The implementation, modification, amendment, and revision of this Handbook are governed by the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements. The School faculty of the whole will review and update this Handbook as needed, but at least every five (5) years. In these scheduled reviews, the Director and an ad hoc committee shall conduct the review and present recommendations to the FAC for approval.

In addition to the scheduled reviews, suggestions for modifications or amendments to the Handbook may be initiated at any time by the Director or by any FTNTT or TT faculty member. Proposed amendments are subject to discussion, revision, and recommendation by the FAC. Recommendations receiving approval of the faculty of the whole by majority vote will be taken by the Director to the Dean. All modifications, amendments and revisions of the Handbook require the approval of the Dean. 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.
II. WORKLOAD
(See TT CBA Article IX.2)

A. Workload and Equivalences

All full-time tenured and tenure-track Faculty 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 breakdown for each individual 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 equivalencies.

Workload Statements: The Director shall provide each FTNTT and TT faculty member with a statement of their workload each semester. The statement should be provided 30 days prior to the start of the relevant semester, in accordance with the CBA. This statement identifies the workload hour distribution for the upcoming semester.

Workload Summaries: Each tenure-track faculty member will submit a workload summary report at the close of spring semester. “This report is to identify and update the Faculty member's efforts, accomplishments, scholarly contributions, ongoing professional activities, service and interests during that academic year. These reports will become an ongoing record of each Faculty member's professional activities providing information related to grant activities, collaborative scholarship and teaching activities. The purpose of this report is to document the workload, including utilization of the specified workload equivalencies, for the academic year. This report may be used in planning future workload equivalencies” (see TT CBA IX.2.D). Additionally, all faculty holding positions with workload equivalency offloads will submit a single-page summary of the previous year, including but not limited to: assessment of goals and objectives met; assessment of fulfillment of the service role; acknowledgement of non-routine contributions made during the course of the year.

Workload Plan: Faculty planning to hold a position with workload equivalency in the upcoming year will submit a one-page plan of intended plans and objectives within 45 days to prior to the start of the relevant academic year. This should include goals and objectives for the upcoming year; identification of responsibilities associated with the service role; and intentions regarding any non-routine contributions one hopes to make in the upcoming year.

Workload Summaries and Plans will be utilized to reflect upon and determine collaboratively the appropriate workload equivalencies for the upcoming year. Faculty members intending to assume service roles with assigned workload equivalences for an upcoming year will collaborate with the Director to identify an equivalent representative of and commensurate to the service role.
FAC may be consulted to reach consensus and to ensure shared support for the approach to workload.

The School recognizes that for many of these positions the nature of services, depth of services, and intangible and often invisible labor involved are not easily quantified and yet must be recognized and valued. The determination of workload inside of the SMSSH will engage the complexity of service and commitment to the work being done.

The School is committed to structurally supporting both strong and consistent scholarship as well as superb pedagogy. Tenure-track faculty will receive a two-course (six-hour) equivalency per semester during the pre-tenure, probationary years. Tenured faculty will receive a two-course (six-hour) equivalency per semester in order to rehabilitate or maintain their on-going research agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Role</th>
<th>Load Equivalent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Undergraduate Coordinator</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>semester</td>
<td>See I.C.1.b above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>semester</td>
<td>See I.C.1.e above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM Coordinator</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>semester</td>
<td>See I.C.1.c above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the Director</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>semester</td>
<td>See I.C.1.f above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Advisory Council (CAC)</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Service to College-Level RTP Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Process Lead</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Semester of review; additional semester with Director discretion*</td>
<td>Leading accreditation assessment and working with external team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Contributions</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>This may include extraordinary contributions (which are extraordinarily time consuming) to advising, research or internship oversight, or service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The standard workload equivalent for these positions is 3 credit hours. However, the Director, in collaboration with the faculty member holding the position for an upcoming academic year and the FAC, may determine an equivalency anywhere between 1-3 credit hours where appropriate.
Strong and consistent scholarship and superb pedagogy are realistic expectations only when service to the School, College, University, and community are structurally appreciated and recognized within assigned workload. The School aims to assign workloads which reflect the value of aforementioned service. All faculty will receive workload equivalencies in accordance with the Workload Equivalences Table herein and the relevant CBA, as assigned by the Director in consultation with FAC and approved by the Dean. The Director may also consider and assign additional workload equivalencies in consultation with FAC and in accordance with the relevant CBA. All faculty wishing to suggest and request equivalencies for service outside of the table should submit their requests in writing to the Director at least 60 days prior to the relevant academic semester.

The School is dedicated to student support and student success, to quality research productivity, and to the well-being of our community. Therefore, overloads (working beyond the relevant CBA or contract-defined credit hour workload) are strongly discouraged. Overloads and “banking” of hours may be done in rare circumstances when in the interest of students and the FTNTT and TT faculty, with the approval of the Director. Overloads and banking requires documentation, signed by the FTNTT or TT faculty person and the Director, acknowledging that banked hours can only be reclaimed via course equivalencies when in the interest of students and FTNTT and TT faculty and with approval of the Director. Furthermore, the School encourages faculty to create and implement, and supports faculty in the creation and implementation of, healthy boundaries such that their work is indeed commensurate to their workload statement.

B. Course Scheduling
All course scheduling and assignments will proceed in accordance with the TT CBA.

1. **Fall and Spring Semesters**
Program coordinators will submit to the Undergraduate Coordinator proposed schedules one month prior to the university-established first opportunity for entering courses. Course schedules will be based on identification of degree completion requirements; evaluation of the distribution of course offerings; and consideration for the complementarity of and mutual support across programs. Course assignments will be made based on teaching expertise and experience, research expertise, teaching interests, as well as an appreciation of the value of service contributions. The final course schedule requires the approval of the Director, and course scheduling is the responsibility of the School.

2. **Summer Sessions**
The School recognizes that summer course offerings are often critical for degree completion and offer important opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning. To that end, Program coordinators may submit proposals for summer course offerings and course assignments to the Undergraduate Coordinator during the Fall semester for consideration. The final course schedule requires the approval of the Director.
The Director will request of the College support for the summer session course offerings and administrative work necessary for program delivery and accreditation.

C. Additional Faculty Contributions

1. Advising and Office Hours
Among the principle support mechanisms we can provide to our students is advising. This is not only a key element of student success, it is also a mentoring mechanism through which we encourage student research, and thereby the production of understanding and knowledge. All faculty are expected to provide constructive, knowledgeable advice as students pursue field expertise, advising on course selection, and guidance on professional and career pursuits. All faculty are expected to remain up-to-date on program requirements as well as university advising procedures.

In accordance with the University Policy Register (3342-6-18.101), all faculty are required to hold five (5) office hours per week. These scheduled hours should be reported to the School secretary at the start of each semester to be posted in the School lobby. They should also be made available to students via syllabi and other course communications. Additional or some portion of hours may be held remotely to accommodate student and the individual FTNTT or TT faculty needs, in accordance with University policy.

2. Final Examinations
All faculty will administer final exams in accordance with the university final exam schedule and related policies. Accommodations will be made in accordance with university policy and School commitments to equity, inclusion, and belonging.

3. Community of Care and Inclusion
Studies rooted in fundamental sociological principles indicate that fostering a sense of community and inclusion and acceptance within that community enhances student success (see Nunn 2021). The School is committed to fostering respect and inclusion in our classrooms, in our administrative spaces, in our informal and formal structures, and in our mentoring and advising of students. All faculty will share with one another, learn from and lean on one another, and implement tools recognized as successful in fostering equity and inclusion in their classrooms and consciously work to avoid undermining the lived experience of these principles for students, all faculty, and staff. Finally, the School will work to advocate for skill acquisition for all faculty, seeking to provide resources to learn, share out, and implement tools to improve the community of care and sense of belonging.

4. Accommodations
Equity is the securing of just, fair, and inclusive outcomes through intentional policy, process, and procedure. The School recognizes that this is distinct from “equality,” where policy, process, and procedure made provide for individuals to “have the same” supports and thereby create inequitable outcomes due to other contextual factors. The School is committed to equity and
inclusion, and will work through policy as well as formal and informal processes and procedures to ensure this for our students, staff, and all fellow faculty.

All faculty will respect and adhere to University policy regarding student privacy, and extend respect for student privacy whenever possible. Student grades and academic performance, health and personal well-being, and family matters are to be considered private matters.

All faculty will adhere to the Student Accessibility Services guidelines and accommodations provided therein. Accommodations documented with SAS will be supported, protected, provided without prejudice or complaint. The School knows that this is critical for student success as well as a shared sense of community and belonging.

5. **Syllabi**
All faculty will provide all enrolled students with a course syllabus, and update it accordingly over the course of a semester. The syllabus will be provided in mean and mode that makes it accessible to all students.

6. **Participation in the Life of the University**
The School is committed to the authentic and holistic well-being of our university community and understands that this should not be achieved at the expense of the well-being of any members. We know that the expertise and engagement of faculty, whether FTNTT or TT, often enhances student and community events, and likewise that student and community events are often beneficial for the FTNTT or TT faculty member. We know that communal celebrations — convocation, graduation, and other ceremonies — as well as communal experiences are expressions of our sense of community and belonging and build us as a whole. Therefore, where it is realistic, fulfilling, and where it contributes to the university community as well as to the whole person of the FTNTT or TT faculty member, all faculty are encouraged to participate in community and campus programming and events.

III. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. **Tenure-Track Faculty**

1. **Introduction**

The processes of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion are intended to foster intellectual curiosity, pedagogical innovation, and communal growth—in other words, high-quality research, teaching, and service. To do so, the processes of facilitating and achieving these milestones must be designed such that they (1) are mutual, involving commitment of both the unit and the Faculty member, and (2) resolve the tension that sometimes exists between clarity and flexibility in terms of requirements; evaluators need to know and follow the criteria, and Faculty members need to
know what is expected of them. Yet no two candidates should be expected to follow exactly the same path to reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

We seek to meet these requirements in two ways: first, by making the responsibilities of the unit both clear and meaningful, and second, by utilizing annual, collaborative agreements with each Faculty member to detail expectations and requirements. Each year, in a process described below, the Faculty member and the School will mutually chart a path toward the coming year’s objectives and toward the larger goal of tenure and/or promotion. Each individual’s successive strategic plan will learn from and build on the previous one, thereby constructing a clear, individually-tailored, School-supported map leading to the larger professional goal.

From time to time, personal and/or family circumstances may arise that require an untenured Faculty member to need to request that their probationary period be extended, a process which is sometimes referred to as “tolling” or “stopping the tenure clock.” Kent State University provides for this, and the School similarly encourages pre-tenure Faculty to understand and utilize this procedure when appropriate. Upon request, a Faculty member may be granted an extension of the probationary period. The University policy and procedures governing modification of the Faculty probationary period is included in the University Policy Register (see University Policy Register 3342-6-13).

2. The Faculty Strategic Plan
For Faculty who are candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the School will utilize an annual progress and reflection tool, the “Faculty Strategic Plan” (FSP). For Faculty in their pre-tenure term, the annual Faculty Strategic Plan and accompanying rubric will serve as the reappointment evaluation tool, and ultimately the tool for evaluating promotion and tenure. For post-tenure Faculty, the Faculty Strategic Plan will be referred to and updated on an annual basis to maintain an evolution towards promotion to full. Faculty beyond full are encouraged to continue to use process as a mutual support tool in their professional growth.

The FSP will be an iterative creation, drafted initially by the candidate. The statement will identify the research, teaching, and service objectives of the candidate for the upcoming year. Those objectives will be placed within the context of long-term professional goals (for pre-tenure Faculty, these will be tenure and promotion; for associate professors, this will be promotion to full; for full professors, this may be defined by the candidate). The Strategic Plan should identify goals (short and long term), as well as specific action steps to be taken towards each goal and an estimated timeline. Beginning with the second FSP, Faculty will include a reflection and evaluation of their achievements given the previous FSP goals, as well as a plan for the subsequent year, and should demonstrate some evolution or continuity from what has been achieved to what is planned.

Below are the (a) criteria for tenure, promotion, and reappointment; (b) the content and evidence to be provided in the FSP, which will speak to the criteria, and (c) the FSP evaluation process.
3. **Criteria**

The qualifications for reappointment are outlined in the University Policy Register Policy 6.16-A. The Policy Register makes note of the “Affirmation Principle” (6.16-D): “The principle to affirm at reappointment review is, ‘Given the years of service to date and the number of years until mandatory tenure review, it is reasonable to expect that the probationary Faculty member will eventually undergo a successful tenure review.’”

The qualifications for tenure as identified in the University Policy Register as found in Policy 6.16-D.1:

“The granting of tenure is a decision that plays a crucial role in determining the quality of university faculty and the national and international status of the university. 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?" The awarding of tenure must be based on convincing documented evidence that the faculty member has achieved a significant body of scholarship, excellence as a teacher, and has provided effective service. The candidate must also be expected to continue and sustain, over the long term, a program of high quality scholarship, teaching, and service relevant to the mission of the candidate's academic unit(s) and to the mission of the university.”

The qualifications for promotion are specified in the University Policy Register in Policy 6.15. “Promotion shall be viewed as recognition of a faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service. For the purposes of this policy, "scholarship" is broadly defined to include research, scholarly and creative work. For the purposes of this policy "service" is broadly defined to include administrative service to the university, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university.” (6.15-A).

As a research institution, Kent State University and the School are committed to research productivity and substantive contributions to science. Tenure-track and tenured Faculty are expected to conduct new research, publish peer-review work, and produce other scholarly output. These expectations shall be both mutually agreed upon and explicit in each FSP statement. The FSP will be designed such that, if expectations are met, the Faculty person’s work does in fact achieve “a significant body of scholarship,” "excellence in teaching," and “adequate service” within the pre-tenure period.

Kent State University and the School are committed to equity in the practice and recognition of scholarship. Compelling evidence of inequitable practices in the assessment and production of scholarship is fully acknowledged by the School. We know that decades of structural racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, and other forms of discrimination have resulted in metrics that reflect bias processes and structures rather than individual achievement. Therefore, quantitative
measures like journal rankings cannot be viewed as “objective”; rather, the processes of review, acceptance, and publication must be viewed as inherently flawed processes that may reflect structural biases rather than objective assessment of merit. The School shall actively avoid reliance upon such metrics, shall avoid incorporating these into the FSP, and shall utilize the existing FSP and rubric in assessing a candidate’s trajectory towards tenure and promotion. Each FSP shall include a statement on steps explicitly and intentionally taken to ensure equity in the plan and rubric.

Kent State University and the School are also committed to student success. Faculty are expected to provide excellence in teaching, pursue meaningful and engaging pedagogical practices, and work to ensure a sense of belonging in their classrooms. Each FSP will be designed to ensure that, if expectations are met, the Faculty person’s work does in fact demonstrate “excellence in teaching.”

It is of note that marginalization is of detriment to our student body and university community. Those rare occasions where a student(s) file(s) a report (with SACC, Title IX, the Dean, or other officiating office) regarding misogyny, racism, transphobia, homophobia, antisemitism, Islamophobia, or other identity-based marginalization in the classroom are to be recognized and taken seriously in considerations of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The School recognizes such behavior, particularly if uncorrected and persistent, as egregious and counter to the values, mission, and objectives of our School and the broader University. A candidate may be denied reappointment, tenure, or promotion in cases of sufficient severity or persistence.

Kent State University and the School rely upon the constructive contributions and service of our Faculty. Faculty are expected to contribute effective service in pursuit of the mission of the University and the School.

The School acknowledges that reappointment, tenure, and promotion are structures created by academia which both recognize and incentivize academic activity. The evaluation system utilized in this process, by its nature, incentivizes the actions and decisions that secure reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and disincentivizes actions and decisions that, while valuable and laudable, take time away from the RTP requirements and qualifications. In evaluating the reappointment, tenure, and promotion of Faculty, the School acknowledges that “time” is a finite resource and that Faculty are called upon to carefully allot this resource across three objectives: research, instruction, and service. It is incumbent upon the School to recognize that Faculty in their pre-tenure term need to allot time differently than senior Faculty, and should be expected (and asked) to carry less service than more senior Faculty.

Faculty who have been assessed as having reasonably fulfilled their annual strategic plan goals will by definition have demonstrated a trajectory reasonably expected to continue and achieve national or international prominence within the field. Faculty standing for promotion to full will be evaluated based on the objectives set forth in their Candidacy for Full strategic plan.
Candidates who have successfully met those objectives will by definition have demonstrated prominence in their field.

4. **Strategic Plan Content:**

The strategic plan should be both an evaluation of whether goals were met in the previous year, if so how and why, and if not, how and what the future trajectory looks like, as well as a plan for the upcoming year. The strategic plan should be organized in to three sections, research, teaching, and service and within each section should include goals, actions steps for each goal, and metrics or evidence for each action step.

a. **Research**

Regarding research, the annual plan will speak to (a) completed projects, (b) on-going projects, and (c) actively planned projects. With each element of the plan, the Faculty should identify what elements of the previous year’s plan was completed and the process leading up to that product; work that is in-progress and where the work stands in terms of what has been accomplished, what is currently being done, and what plans are in place to ensure completion; projects that are in the planning stage and the preparations that are and are being made, including anticipated grant applications, data collection, and so on.

Specific questions that the strategic plan might answer include the following (note that these are potential questions and this is not an exhaustive list):

- What progress has been and has yet to be made on various drafts?
- What grant efforts have been made or are planned for the upcoming year?
- What conference presentations were made or are scheduled?
- What scholarly networking was accomplished or proved beneficial?

Note that the plan should be both reflective as well as forward looking.

The following are items or efforts that may be included in the FSP as evidence of a body of scholarship. This is not an exhaustive list and a candidate is not expected to pursue all nor some specific subset of this.

- Peer-reviewed publications (articles, book chapters, books, trade reports)
- Monographs
- Conference papers
- Edited books
- Public Scholarship
- Trade publications
- Grant applications
- Data collection, analysis
- Book proposals; negotiations for a book contract; book contract
- Article manuscripts submitted for review, or in R&R process
• Invited/proposed book chapters in pre-publication phases
• Invited/proposed trade papers in pre-publication phases
• Conference paper, panel, roundtable, grant proposals
• Collected, cleaned, and/or analyzed data
• Grant application
• Oversight of student research
• Other products not included in this list that bear evidence related to the Faculty strategic plan

Frequent, shorter-term projects do not carry more weight in consideration of an “Faculty strategic plan” than less-frequent and longer-term projects. There is no methodological preference or weight given to one versus another approach to data collection nor analysis.

The following are processes or components of processes to be included in reporting and assessing an Faculty strategic plan:

• Drafting iterations of manuscripts
• Submitting abstracts, proposals, round table or panel proposals, for conferences
• Identification of grants to support on-going or future work
• Drafting or submitting grant applications for future work
• Identification of, contact with, or networking to establish potential collaborators
• Collecting, cleaning, coding, analyzing data
• Drafting proposals for books, edited volumes, special-issue journals
• Specific steps, documented with evidence, taken towards any of the products noted above

Historiographies and book projects by their nature require significant dedication of time and effort over longer segments of one’s career. Research focusing on more controversial and/or more contemporary questions may evolve over time, pushing anticipated production schedules further in to the future. The planning and execution of field work is often incredibly time consuming, and analysis of qualitative data often equally so. Multiple, less-time consuming processes do not carry more weight than less-frequent and more time-consuming processes.

i) Evidence of Established Reputation the Field
• Cited work
• References to or use of work in collective endeavors (eg panels, mini/conferences)
• Invited book chapter, conference paper, contribution to journal
• Invited talk
• Invited panelist
• Invited reviewer, manuscript, proposal, grant, fellowship application
• Other invitations for scholarly or policy-related work based on expertise
• Other invitations to review work in the field
• Fulbright application reviewer/grant reviewer
• Graduate students (or other scholars) seeking collaboration or mentorship
• Awards or recognitions for contributions to the field
• Leadership positions for regional, national, or international field organizations or for conferences, for instance section heads

b. Teaching
Regarding teaching, the annual plan should speak to any intentionality in pedagogical evolution; successes in the classroom or in oversight of student research; and plans in forthcoming teaching projects.

Specific questions that the strategic plan might answer include the following (Note that these are potential questions and this is not an exhaustive list):

- What new or revised courses were recently taught, or are on the calendar?
- What workshops or trainings were attended?
- What work was undertaken, or will be undertaken, to improve instruction?
- What evidence might one celebrate of where previous efforts have come to fruition?

Note that the plan should be both reflective as well as forward looking.

The following are items or efforts that may be included in the FSP as evidence of excellence in instruction. This is not an exhaustive list and a candidate is not expected to pursue all nor some specific subset of this.

- Quantitative course evaluations
- Narrative course evaluations
- Emails or other communiques from students regarding instruction
- Teaching awards or other formal recognitions
- Teaching innovation (including, but not limited to, creation of new curriculum; integration of new pedagogical tools; participation in pedagogical workshops or skill acquisition)
- Advising student research (at any level)
- Other work not included in this list that bears evidence related to the Faculty strategic plan

c. Service
Regarding service, the annual plan should review service contributions made to the School, the University, academia more broadly, or to the community. The candidate may also want to speak to specific knowledge or experience gained or specific contributions they have made through their service.

Specific questions that the strategic plan might answer include the following (Note that these are potential questions and this is not an exhaustive list):

- What projects did one undertake or contribute to, in order to achieve what outcomes, and why?
What types of service contributions have been made, and in what capacity or by what means? What types of service contributions are intended for the upcoming year? How have various service experiences contributed to professional development or community development?

Note that the plan should be both reflective as well as forward looking.

The following are items or efforts that may be included in the FSP as evidence of effective service. This is not an exhaustive list and a candidate is not expected to pursue all nor some specific subset of this.

- Committee service to the School, College, or University
- Serving as Program Coordinator
- Event coordination, participation, or leadership
- Marketing, recruitment, or retention work
- Community outreach
- Fundraising efforts
- Participation or leadership in public discourse
- Community service related to the expertise or professional development goals of the Faculty person
- Other service not included in this list that bears evidence related to the Faculty strategic plan

5. **Responsibilities and Obligations, Strategic Plan**

   a. **Responsibilities of the School**

   i) The School is responsible for advocating for the successful execution of each Faculty member’s strategic plan.

   ii) The School is responsible for recognizing that research agendas evolve, shift, and grow and for respecting that this process should be driven by a candidate’s interests, expertise, and contributions. The School shall not introduce new metrics, expectations, or concerns as a candidate approaches tenure, particularly such that they deviate from the trajectory already established. The RTP committee shall recognize obstacles beyond the control of a candidate (global pandemics, illness, shifting fields, among others).

   iii) Members of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Unit Director will utilize the existing Faculty strategic plan agreement and accompanying rubric to evaluate and acknowledge the candidate’s progress. The School will not introduce new metrics or expectations in an existing agreement. Members of the RTP committee may not give preference or weight to components outside of what is noted in the existing Faculty strategic plan.
iv) The Director and RTP committee will ensure that an assessment of equity in the FSP will be made each year, and be intentional and purposeful in ensuring that metrics reflecting inequitable practices will not be relied upon.

v) The Director and RTP committee will review the strategic plan and progress as a whole, rather than each section (research, teaching, and service) as autonomous efforts.

vi) The Ad Hoc Committee, Director, and colleagues will recognize and respect the time commitments Faculty must make to research and remain cognizant of the Faculty strategic plan in requesting or proposing additional contributions to the unit. If, in the view of the Ad Hoc committee, the FSP is not being met due to service obligations steps must be taken by the committee to provide recommendations as to where the candidate’s service burden can be alleviated; identify ways in which senior Faculty can provide service to alleviate the burden on junior Faculty; or where the expectations of the FSP should be modified in order to make space for service, if that is the appropriate outcome and does not undermine a successful path to tenure.

vii) Historically marginalized populations often conduct “invisible labor,” contributing more service, and service that is often unseen by many, as a result of the structural bias that produced underrepresentation. The Unit Director and the RTP committee are obligated to work with intentionality to see and appreciate this labor and ensure that there are not associated costs in terms of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

viii) Members of the Ad Hoc Committee shall respect and defer to the substantive expertise of the Faculty person. Members of the RTP committee may not speak to substantive matters of the research objective. RTP members may only, in co-designing the research objective, provide guidance and feedback on product and processes as outlined in the lists above.

b. Responsibilities of the Candidate

i) Each Faculty person is responsible for advocating for their strategic plan with the RTP committee and unit Director. Ensuring that the Faculty strategic plan as designed per annum reflects the intellectual and professional pursuits of the candidate, is based on a time line that is realistic and respectful of the well-being of the candidate, and will build towards a tenure/promotion file demonstrating contributions to the field is critical for ensuring Faculty success in the tenure and promotion process.

ii) The School strongly supports the well-being, multi-faceted service, and diverse pursuits of our Faculty. We know that expertise in multidisciplinary pursuits often leads to scholarly service, or public service research, and we encourage and support these. It is the responsibility of the candidate to integrate service in ways appropriate to their professional goals.
iii) It is the responsibility of individual Faculty members to use the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process to reflect upon their previous year in a holistic way, and consider well-being, multi-faceted service, and diversity of pursuits in their self-assessment and plans for the subsequent Faculty strategic plan.

6. **Responsibilities and Obligations, Reappointment**

Each year, Faculty in their pre-tenure term will stand for reappointment. In preparation for the evaluation meeting,

a. **The School Director will:**
   i) Identify one (preferably tenured) member of the Faculty to observe the instructional work of the candidate.
   ii) Ensure that the peer review and accompanying instructional materials are uploaded into each candidate’s portfolio.
   iii) Distribute each candidate’s FSP to the RTP committee at least two weeks prior to the scheduled evaluation.
   iv) Ensure that all committee members have access to the candidate’s portfolio materials.
   v) Ensure that the candidate is familiar with the upcoming schedule and process.

b. **Members of the Ad Hoc RTP Committee will:**
   i) Review each candidate’s current FSP, along with previous FSPs and evaluations.
   ii) Review the University timeline and policies for the review process.
   iii) Review the SMSSSH Faculty Handbook section on RTP policies.
   iv) Review each candidate’s portfolio, including the peer review teaching assessment and accompanying instructional materials.

**Following the meeting of the Ad Hoc committee,**

c. **Each member of the committee will:**
   i) Utilize the agreed-upon rubric from one year prior to assess progress in the mutually agreed upon Faculty strategic plan.
   ii) Submit a written ballot the vote and any accompanying comments. Members will vote “yes,” “yes, with reservations,” or “no.”
   iii) Identify alignment of progress with the existing FSP; those casting a “no” or “yes, with reservations” vote are expected to identify specifically where the candidate’s performance did not meet the previously-approved FSP, and to identify specific steps the candidate can take moving forward to align progress with the newly drafted FSP.
   iv) **Voting Requirements:** A simple majority of the reappointment committee members will constitute an endorsement to the School Director for reappointment. A vote of “yes with reservations” counts as a positive vote to reappoint the pre-tenure Faculty member, though simultaneously indicates
concerns regarding the progress of the candidate in terms of meeting the FSP in the short term and the tenure requirements in the longer-term.

d. **The School Director will:**
   i) Independently assess the accomplishments of each candidate and forward their recommendation and the committee's recommendation to the Dean.
   ii) Acknowledge alignment of committee member ballots with the provisions of this Handbook, as well as address any discrepancies.
   iii) Inform each candidate of the committee's recommendation and provide a copy of their own recommendation to the Dean.
   iv) Notify any candidate not being reappointed according to the schedule established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. For Faculty members whose appointment is in the Regional Campuses, recommendations on reappointment from the Chair are forwarded to the Dean and the appropriate Regional Campus Dean.
   v) Encourage the candidate to take note of the written comments associated with any “yes, with reservations” and/or “no” votes and address these concerns with intentionality with actions over the next academic year and in preparation of future review portfolios.

7. **Responsibilities and Obligations, Tenure**

In preparation for a tenure review and decision:

a. **The School Director will:**
   i) Identify one (preferably tenured) member of the Faculty to observe the instructional work of the candidate for this final pre-tenure term.
   ii) Ensure that the peer review and accompanying instructional materials are uploaded into each candidate’s portfolio.
   iii) Distribute all of a candidate’s FSPs to the RTP committee at least two weeks prior to the scheduled evaluation.
   iv) Ensure that all committee members have access to the candidate’s portfolio materials.
   v) Ensure that the candidate is familiar with the upcoming schedule and process.
   vi) Encourage the tenure applicant to submit with the portfolio a summary of the evolution of FSPs over the pre-tenure term, demonstrating responsiveness to colleague feedback over time and the ways in which productivity has aligned with the FSPs and their evolution.

b. **Members of the Ad Hoc RTP Committee will:**
   i) Review the collection of FSPs for each candidate.
   ii) Review their own previous evaluations for each candidate.
   iii) Review the University timeline and policies for the review process.
   iv) Review the SMSSSH Faculty Handbook section on RTP policies.
v) Review each candidate’s portfolio, including the peer review teaching assessment and accompanying instructional materials.

Following the meeting of the Ad Hoc committee:

c. The Committee members will:
   i) submit a written ballot the vote and any accompanying comments. Members will vote “yes” or “no.”
   ii) identify alignment of progress with the cumulative FSPs. Ballots are expected to specifically utilize the rubric accompanying the FSP.
   iii) A simple majority of the reappointment committee members will constitute an endorsement to the School Director for reappointment.

   d. The School Director will:
      i) Independently assess the accomplishments of the candidate and forward their recommendation and the committee's recommendation to the Dean.
      ii) Inform each candidate of the committee's recommendation and provides a copy of their own recommendation to the Dean.
      iii) Notify the candidate according to the schedule established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

8. Responsibilities and Obligations, Promotion

In preparation for a promotion review and decision,

   a. The School Director will
      i) Identify one (preferably tenured) member of the Faculty to observe the instructional work of the candidate if the candidate is completing the pre-tenure term.
      ii) Ensure that the peer review and any related instructional materials are uploaded into each candidate’s portfolio.
      iii) Distribute all of a candidate’s FSPs to the RTP committee at least two weeks prior to the scheduled evaluation.
      iv) Ensure that all committee members have access to the candidate’s portfolio materials.
      v) Ensure that the candidate is familiar with the upcoming schedule and process.
      vi) Encourage the promotion applicant to submit with the portfolio a summary of the evolution of FSPs over the pre-tenure term, demonstrating responsiveness to colleague feedback over time and the ways in which productivity has aligned with the FSPs and their evolution.

   b. Members of the Ad Hoc RTP Committee will:
      i) Review the collection of FSPs for each candidate.
      ii) Review their own previous evaluations for each candidate.
iii) Review the University timeline and policies for the review process.
iv) Review the SMSSH Faculty Handbook section on RTP policies.
v) Review each candidate’s portfolio, including the peer review teaching assessment and accompanying instructional materials.

Following the meeting of the Ad Hoc committee,

c. Each member of the committee will
   i) Submit a written ballot the vote and any accompanying comments. Members will vote “yes” or “no.”
   ii) Identify alignment of progress with the cumulative FSPs. Ballots are expected to specifically utilize the rubric accompanying the FSP.
   iii) A simple majority of the RTP committee members will constitute an endorsement to the School Director for promotion.

d. The School Director will:
   i) Independently assess the accomplishments of the candidate and forward their recommendation and the committee's recommendation to the Dean.
   ii) Inform each candidate of the committee's recommendation and provides a copy of their own recommendation to the Dean.
   iii) Notify the candidate according to the schedule established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The candidate will then work with the Ad Hoc Committee for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion and the Director to craft from the initial draft a mutually-agreed-upon set of short-term and long-term objectives for the upcoming year. The RTP committee will suggest revisions in accordance with the ballots and evaluation of the committee. The committee shall provide specific expectations and steps to take if concerns were raised (and particularly if ballots suggest “reservations” or lack of support for reappointment). The candidate will take these revisions under advisement in conversation with the Director and RTP committee. A mutually-agreed upon FSP will serve as the evaluative document for the following year. The School recognizes that the Faculty strategic plan is likely to evolve over time as projects change, move through the pipeline, take new shape, or shift off of or move up on the priority list. We strongly encourage Faculty members to evolve as scholars, and support pursuit of work that is most fulfilling and most aligned with their growth and expertise, and to communicate that evolution in their narrative to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Disagreements between the Ad Hoc committee, Director, and candidate on developing a new plan which are unresolved can be taken to the Faculty member’s mentoring team for resolution. The candidate, the Ad Hoc Committee members, and the Director will strive to create consensus around the *substantive goals of the candidate* and tenure expectations of the University. Where consensus cannot be reached even after consultation with the mentorship team, a majority vote of
the RTP committee, Director, mentors, and candidate will decide. In the event of a tie vote, the Director will make the final decision.

B. Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty:

1. Introduction

Full-time, non-tenure-track (FTNTT) faculty are a crucial and valued part of the intellectual community of the School and Kent State University. The administrative and/or instructional work of FTNTT often contributes in significant ways not only to the successful delivery of programs but to the success of our students. The School recognizes these contributions.

The workload, renewal, and promotion of FTNTT faculty is governed by the NTT CBA, and in particular Articles IX and X. School practice and policy defers to that Agreement.

“FTNTT Faculty members will be assigned full-time instructional and/or other responsibilities specific to the track of the assignment, as defined in Article X, Section 2.B.2. of this Agreement for the academic year in accord with the University policy regarding faculty teaching load which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1971 and revised in 1979 and which is incorporated in the University Policy Register at 3342-6-18. FTNTT Faculty members will be assigned instructional and/or other responsibilities as specified in their letters of appointment. Assigned full-time workload for all FTNTT Faculty members shall total fifteen (15) credit hours per semester or thirty (30) credit hours for the academic year. The Board of Trustees expressly reserves to itself the sole and exclusive jurisdiction over any modification of the above referenced policy.” (Article IX.1A)

Furthermore,

“It is agreed and mutually recognized that, because the nature of work differs among departments, schools, colleges and campuses, itemization of workload is not identical among FTNTT Faculty members. Within the context of the above referenced policy, each unit administrator, along with the appropriate faculty advisory committee, shall specify which assignments appropriate to the instructional and/or other responsibilities of FTNTT Faculty members within the academic unit/campus shall constitute a full-time workload assignment of the fifteen (15) credits per semester/thirty (30) credits per academic year.” (Article IX.1C)

In order to recognize the individualized nature of FTNTT contributions, and to ensure review, renewal, and promotion evaluation based upon the respective workload, FTNTT faculty in the School will submit for their review, renewal, and promotion portfolio a narrative that reflects instruction and service in proportion to the semesterly Workload Statements of the period under review. The narrative should reflect contributions that align with the distribution of workload across instruction and service, and communicate to the review committee, Director, and Dean “accomplishments” in the requisite areas.

2. Criteria and Evidence
a. Teaching
The following are items or efforts that may be included in the narrative as evidence of accomplishments in teaching. This is not an exhaustive list and a candidate is not expected to pursue all nor some specific subset of this.

- Peer teaching evaluations
- Quantitative course evaluations
- Narrative course evaluations
- Emails or other communiques from students regarding instruction
- Teaching awards or other formal recognitions
- Teaching innovation (including, but not limited to, creation of new curriculum; integration of new pedagogical tools; participation in pedagogical workshops or skill acquisition)
- Advising student research
- Other work not included in this list that bears evidence related to the FTNTT faculty instructional accomplishments

b. Service
The following are items or efforts that may be included in the narrative as evidence of accomplishments in service.* This is not an exhaustive list and a FTNTT candidate may not be required nor expected to contribute to service. The workload statement must be consulted and should align with this list.

- Committee service to the School, College, or University
- Program co-ordinatorship
- Event coordination, participation, or leadership
- Marketing, recruitment, or retention work
- Community outreach
- Fundraising efforts
- Participation or leadership in public discourse
- Community service related to the expertise or professional development goals of the FTNTT faculty person
- Other service not included in this list that bears evidence related to the FTNTT faculty accomplishment

*Regarding promotion of FTNTT, the NTT CBA (Addendum C, 1.G) states:
“Evidence of significant and continuous accomplishments in Performance, Professional Development, and Professional and Creative Activity is required for promotion. Accomplishments and/or contributions in the area of University Citizenship are neither required nor expected, except as to the extent such accomplishments and/or contributions are appropriate to the FTNTT Faculty member’s track and/or workload assignments, but will, when they exist, contribute to the bargaining unit member’s overall record of accomplishments.”

It is of note that marginalization is of detriment to our student body and university community. Those rare occasions where a student(s) file(s) a report (with SACC, Title IX, the Dean, or other
officiating office) regarding misogyny, racism, transphobia, homophobia, antisemitism, Islamophobia, or other identity-based marginalization in the classroom are to be recognized and taken seriously in considerations of renewal, tenure, and promotion. The School recognizes such behavior, particularly if uncorrected and persistent, as egregious and counter to the values, mission, and objectives of our School and the broader University, and may constitute unsatisfactory performance. A candidate may be denied renewal or promotion in cases of sufficient severity or persistence.

3. **Responsibilities and Obligations**

The processes and timelines for renewal and promotion of FTNTT are governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and the School will act in compliance with all procedures therein. Additionally,

**a. The Director will:**
   i) Identify one (preferably tenured) member of the FTNTT faculty to observe the instructional work of the candidate.
   ii) Ensure that the peer review and accompanying instructional materials are uploaded into each candidate's portfolio.
   iii) Ensuring that all Workload Statements for any period under review are included in the portfolio for committee review at least two weeks prior to the scheduled evaluation
   iv) Ensure that all committee members have access to the candidate’s portfolio materials.
   v) Ensure that the candidate is familiar with the upcoming schedule and process.

**b. Members of the Ad Hoc Review Committee will**
   i) Review each candidate’s Workload Statements in conjunction with the narrative.
   ii) Review the University timeline and policies for the review process.
   iii) Review the SMSSH Faculty Handbook section on FTNTT Review, Renewal, and Promotion policies.
   iv) Review each candidate’s portfolio, including the peer review teaching assessment and accompanying instructional materials.
   v) Submit a ballot within the designated timeframe.

**Following the meeting of the Ad Hoc committee,**

**c. Each member of the committee will:**
   i) utilize the workload statement to identify expectations of the candidate's distribution of responsibilities.
   ii) submit a written ballot the vote and any accompanying comments. Members will vote “yes” or “no.”
iii) identify alignment of accomplishment with the workload statement; those casting a “no” vote are expected to identify specifically where the candidate’s performance did not meet expectations.

A simple majority of the Ad Hoc committee members will constitute an endorsement to the School Director for renewal.

**d. The School Director will**

i) Independently assess the accomplishments of each candidate and forward their recommendation and the committee's recommendation to the Dean.

ii) Inform each candidate of the committee's recommendation and provide a copy of their own recommendation to the Dean.

iii) Notify any candidate not being renewed according to the schedule established in the NTT Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**IV. Merit**

(See TT CBA Article XII.4)

The current Tenure Track Collective Bargaining Agreement details the policy regarding Merit Awards.

The School, in accordance with that Collective Bargaining Agreement, will assign merit-based awards across the required areas as follows: research or creative activity (33.3%), teaching (33.3%), and service (33.3%).

In accordance with the TT CBA (XII.4), the Director will establish in consultation with FAC an ad hoc committee responsible for recommendation of merit-based awards. The committee will be established on an annual basis in order to recommend awards “in each of the three (3) categories” for the period under review.

Faculty applying for merit must be eligible by the standards outlined in the TT CBA. In order to be considered for a merit award, Faculty members will submit the following to the Faculty Excellence Committee by a deadline established by the unit Director:

1. An updated CV.
2. One narrative of at most 500 words for each of the three categories (that is, three narratives; one for creative activity, one for teaching, and one for service), wherein the applicant reports their meritorious contributions over the period under review and assesses that work as “superlative,” “excellent,” or “very good.”

*Superlative: “of highest quality or degree”*
*Excellent: “extremely good, outstanding”*
*Very Good: “of [very] high or acceptable quality, standard or level.”*  
(Oxford Dictionary)
The Faculty Excellence Committee (all FT TT faculty) will meet to review the submitted materials and assign merit applicants to one of three groups: Superlative; Excellent; Very Good. At least one Faculty member must be in each of the three groups. The committee will submit their recommendations to the Director, who will determine the ranking. The Director will then distribute the rankings to all Faculty who applied for merit.

All merit applicants will have two weeks to submit a written appeal of the Director’s decision. Appeals will be considered by the Faculty Excellence Committee, which will forward recommendations to the Director. Final decisions, made by the Director, will be communicated to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Merit will be distributed across recipients in accordance with the below equation.

Where:

\[ N = \text{the total number of Faculty} \]
\[ n = \text{the total number of Faculty in a specific ranked category} \]
\[ X = \text{the total dollars of merit available for distribution} \]

Those ranked as “superlative” will receive:

\[ \text{Superlative} = \frac{X + 1}{N} n_{\text{superlative}} \]

Those ranked as “excellent” will receive:

\[ \text{Excellent} = \frac{X}{N} \]

Those ranked as “very good” will receive:

\[ \text{Very Good} = \frac{X - 1}{N} n_{\text{very good}} \]