**Agenda for Faculty Senate meeting at 3:30 pm in KSUC 300 on Monday 25th January 2016**

1. **Acceptance of Minutes**

16th November, 2015

7th December, 2015

**Old Business**

1. ***External Letters*** – Roxanne Donovan.

***Motion:*** The Faculty Senate recommends that the number of external letters required for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor be reduced from five to three.

***Rationale:***

1. The SPSU and KSU Faculty Senates both recommended three letters for promotion to full after carefully considering what would work best for faculty and administration in the consolidated KSU.

2. The number of letters feasible and/or required to make a strong case for promotion varies from discipline to discipline and department to department. Setting the university requirement at three instead of five allows departments more flexibility in determining if additional letters are necessary.

3. Meeting the five-letter requirement will be burdensome for chairs and those faculty seeking promotion given that between 10 to 15 requests will need to be made to increase the likelihood that five letters are completed by the deadline.

4. Five letters focused exclusively on research appears to prioritize scholarship which is inconsistent with KSU’s designation as a regional comprehensive university.

1. ***Adult Learning Committee*** – Sandra Pierquet

**Vote on Acceptance of following By Laws**

**Adult Learning Committee**

**Kennesaw State University**

**(Approved 14 October 2015 – Amended 16 November 2015)**

**PURPOSE:**

The Adult Learning Committee serves as an advocate for and facilitator of adult learning programs and prior learning assessment on the KSU campus. The Committee reports to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. Kennesaw State University is a member of the University System of Georgia’s Adult Learning Consortium and provides representation on the Regents’ Academic Committee on Adult Learning. As such, the Adult Learning Committee shares the responsibility to join a strong, proactive Consortium of institutions to establish policies, test innovative practices, share adult learning resources, and lead System directions, sustain the Consortium’s efforts through integration of adult-focused policies and practices at the institutional and System level, and increase momentum by selectively adding member institutions to the Consortium. Each Participating Institution shall commit to active participation as evidenced by funding for attendance at ALC meetings and other support, such as professional development and institutional leadership. Item #1 on the USG Adult Learning Consortium Working Principles and Agreements is the establishment of a campus-wide adult learning committee. The KSU ALC is the voice that speaks for Adult Learning programs, much as the academic departments speak for their majors. Its goal is to develop and maintain a unified, integrated, and effective adult learning and prior learning assessment program. The committee is advisory and submits proposals to the Office of the Provost and VPAA.

**CHARGE and DEFINITION:**

The purpose of the ALC is to serve as an advisory review body to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs on the following matters related to Adult Learning and Prior Learning Assessment:

1. Ongoing activities and initiatives of the USG Adult Learning Consortium
2. Recommendations for the establishment of KSU adult learning and prior learning assessment programs
3. Serve as initial respondents to policy and procedural questions; and,
4. Establishing methods and means for assessment of ongoing activities

Recommendations will be made to the Office of the Provost/VPAA, who will review potential implementation, make further referrals, and provide feedback to the Standing Committee.

1. **COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP AND STRUCTURE:**

**Membership:** The committee is chaired by KSU’s representative to the Regents Academic Committee on Adult Learning and co-chaired by the remaining members of KSU’s Adult Learning Consortium’s executive committee. Membership is comprised of a representative from each of the degree granting colleges, graduate college, shared governance bodies, as well as representatives from functional area units in Student Affairs and Enrollment Services. College representatives are those faculty/administrators who coordinate adult learning and prior learning assessment in their respective colleges and function as liaisons between those colleges and the committee.

**Voting members** include college representatives (10) selected as follows:

Architecture and Construction Management (volunteer), Arts (appointed), Business (appointed), Computing and Software Engineering (volunteer), Education (volunteer), Engineering and Engineering Technology (volunteer), Health and Human services (elected), Humanities and Social Sciences (elected), Science and Mathematics (volunteer), and University College (volunteer); as well as a representative of the Graduate Policy Curriculum Committee (elected).

**Non-voting** **members** include representatives from functional area units (4) selected as indicated:

Student Affairs (appointed), Enrollment Services (volunteer), Registrar (appointed), and the University Prior Learning Assessment Coordinator; and

Shared Governance representatives (2): faculty senate (elected) and chairs and directors assembly (elected)

* 1. Chair: Will formally serve as the head of the committee.
		1. The Chair is broadly responsible for the following:
			1. Convene and preside over meetings to assure timely review of proposals by the committee
			2. Establish agenda items for each meeting
			3. Work closely with the executive committee members the on preparation of minutes, proposals, and reports
			4. Operate as the primary liaison between the committee and the Provost/VPAA
	2. Vice Chairs (2): Serve in an administrative support role to the Chair; Serve as Acting Chair in the absence of the Chair during committee meeting and events;
	3. Membership: Beginning academic year 2016-2017, committee membership will be for the term of two academic years with 50% of existing membership moving through re-election/appointment processes. Members may be re-appointed/re-elected per college bylaws for subsequent terms.
1. **MEETINGS:**
	1. Committee meetings will be held during the Fall and Spring semesters of each Academic Year and organized monthly as needed:
		1. The committee will meet at the start of Fall Semester with the Associate Vice President of Technology Enhanced Learning to be charged with duties for the academic year
		2. At the completion of the Spring Semester all outstanding items should be resolved and/or reinstated as a new item for the next academic year.
	2. A quorum will be established with 2/3 attendance of the voting membership
	3. Voting actions will require the establishment of a quorum. Voting actions may be held electronically for matters needing immediate attention or in the absence of a quorum at the called meeting. Approvals must receive a 2/3 majority of the voting membership.
	4. Frequency of committee meetings will be between 3 to 4 scheduled meetings per semester; Sub-committee meetings will be scheduled and maintained on an as-needed basis
	5. Summer Semesters will be utilized as a break period
	6. Minutes will be taken during every meeting to ensure historic references, record keeping, and guidance for future meetings and events. Typically, the assistant to the Chair will maintain and take all minutes.
2. **MEMBERSHIP OBLIGATIONS:**
	1. Members of the committee are expected to attend and participate in called meetings and to participate in sub-committee tasks as needed
3. **AMENDMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS:**
	1. **Amendments and modification can be made to the bylaws through the voting processes outlined above by voting members of the committee.** Amendments and modifications must receive a 2/3 majority vote of the voting membership.

**New Business**

1. ***Third Year review and PTR*** – Ron Matson

**Proposed Changes in Third Year & 6th Year Reviews to Pre-Tenure Review and Post-tenure Review only (RHM 06Nov15)**

1. **Proposal:**
2. Change “Third-year Review” to “Pre-tenure Review”
3. Eliminate ‘Third-year Review” and “6th year review” for non-tenure track faculty and only have Post-Tenure Review for tenured faculty.
4. **Rationale**
5. This change will make KSU’s review process exactly match the BoR requirements found in [Section 8.3.5.1](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.5_evaluation_of_personnel) and [Section 8.3.5.4](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.5_evaluation_of_personnel) of the BoR Policy Manual and [Section 4.7](http://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C691) of the BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook (i.e., BoR does not require any 3rd or 6th year review for non-tenure track faculty).
6. It will reduce the number of portfolios that need to be evaluated by various committees and administrators.
7. Eliminates the need for new faculty brought in as tenured associate professors to undergo a 3rd year review given that they have already gone through some sort of tenure review.
8. **Proposed Changes in the KSU Faculty Handbook (from pdf version of the** [**2015-2016 KSU Faculty Handbook**](http://www.kennesaw.edu/handbooks/faculty/)**):**
9. Page 67:

Performance evaluation of a faculty member is required at KSU. Reviews and evaluations occur regularly in the following ways in accordance with the governing policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures established by Kennesaw State University and its colleges and departments:

* Detailed annual review of faculty performance;
* ~~Third-year~~ Pre-tenure review for tenure-track and tenured faculty;
	+ Progress for tenure and the optional promotion (for tenure-track assistant and associate professors), and for tenure (for tenure-track professors);
	+ Progress for the optional promotion (for tenured assistant and associate professors);
* Review for tenure by the sixth year for tenure-track faculty with professorial rank;
* Post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty with professorial rank after every five years in the sixth year;
* Reviews for elective promotion for tenured faculty in the professorial rank (optional);
* ~~Third-year review of progress for lecturers and senior lecturers;~~
	+ ~~Progress for promotion to senior lecturer for lecturers;~~
	+ ~~Progress for sixth year review for senior lecturers;~~
* ~~Review for promotion to senior lecturer for lecturers in the sixth year.~~
* ~~Sixth-year reviews of senior lecturers;~~
* ~~Third-year review of progress for non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank, including clinical and research faculty;~~
	+ ~~Progress for the optional promotion (for non-tenure track assistant and associate professors) and sixth year review (for non-tenure track professors);~~
* ~~Review for elective promotion for non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank, including clinical and research faculty (optional);~~
* ~~Sixth year reviews of non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank, including clinical and research faculty.~~
1. Page 78-79

Due to its long-term implications, the granting of tenure constitutes a significant decision and, therefore, requires a thorough review process that includes the judgments and recommendations of the faculty member’s teaching and administrative faculty colleagues. The entire process has two major parts: the pre-tenure review and the tenure review. The timing of these two parts depends upon several factors that are determined at the initial employment in the professorial ranks, which will be explained below. It is important to note that the number used to designate the year of review for tenure (and used similarly for promotion) indicates the year that the review process takes place. Because this review process starts at the beginning of the academic year, only the documentation of the fully completed years of service up until that point will be reviewed. Thus, a ~~third year~~ pre-tenure review in the third year considers only two years of service, and a tenure review in the sixth year considers only five years of service.

 **~~Third Year Review~~ Pre-tenure Review**

The first of the two parts of the tenure review process is a pre-tenure review that takes place in the third year of a tenure-track faculty member’s appointment. All tenure-track and tenured faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure must receive a ~~third year~~ pre-tenure review during their third year of appointment to that tenure-track or tenured position. For tenure-track faculty, the purpose of this ~~third year~~ pre-tenure review is to assist faculty members in determining whether they are making appropriate progress toward tenure and to assess the individual’s current readiness toward tenure (for tenure-track professors), tenure and the option of promotion (for tenure-track assistant and associate professors). The ~~third year~~ pre-tenure review does not constitute a tenure, post-tenure, and/or promotion decision, but rather, provides feedback to the faculty member as to his or her strengths and weaknesses. At each level of the review, a summary letter will be produced that describes in detail how the faculty member is progressing toward meeting or not meeting the expectations for tenure, post-tenure, and/or promotion (as appropriate). The letter will also include specific suggestions for maintaining and enhancing further preparations for a successful tenure decision in the future. These ~~third-year~~ pre-tenure review letters and the descriptive assessments they contain become part of the individual’s portfolio for the later review.

**Tenure Review**

The second major part of the process is the review at the end of the probationary period that leads to a tenure decision. All tenure-track faculty must be reviewed for tenure. The length of the probationary period over which this review is to occur depends upon several factors. For faculty who enter KSU at the assistant professor rank or above, the probationary period is five to six years, with a mandatory review for tenure being conducted in the sixth year, if tenure has not already been given. However, faculty may be granted years of credit toward tenure for work experience prior to coming to KSU ([BoR Policy Manual 8.3.7.4](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/policy/); [Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, 4.4.1](http://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/handbook/C687/#p4.4.1_probationary_credit_toward_tenure)). This credit will be noted in writing before the faculty member is employed and can range from one to three years, with the latter figure being reserved for rare cases of exceptional service elsewhere, such as administrative work. Any, all, or none of the granted credit can be applied toward tenure, at the discretion of the individual faculty member. If applied toward tenure, this credit plus the number of years of service at KSU must match the minimum probationary period of five years, and the tenure portfolio will include evidence from this credited time and must include evidence of relevant work experience prior to employment at KSU. The amount of the probationary period spent at KSU must be continuous unless the interruption is for a leave of absence or for part-time service, which must not, in either case, exceed two years. A faculty member who is granted two or three years of credit toward tenure may replace the ~~third year of review~~ pre-tenure review with a tenure review in the second year in the position (if taking three years of credit toward tenure) or in the third year of the position (if taking two years of credit toward tenure).

1. Pages 90-91

~~Senior lecturers will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. Lecturers will submit portfolios for performance reviews beyond the department chair every six years after the promotion review. In addition, senior lecturers and lecturers will have an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment in that position. For lecturers, this third year performance review will provide feedback for progress towards the promotion to senior lecturer in the sixth year. For senior lecturers, this third year performance review will provide feedback for the sixth year review. During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. A successful review for promotion to senior lecturer in the sixth year restarts the six-year performance review cycle. The same committee structure that is used for third year review of tenured and tenure-track faculty will be used for the third and six year performance reviews of lecturers and senior lecturers; third and sixth year reviews stop at the level of the dean~~.

 Lecturers and senior lecturers must prepare a portfolio for promotion consideration, ~~for third year and sixth year performance reviews~~. A lecturer’s and senior lecturer’s portfolio contents will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure-track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion; however, a lecturer or senior lecturer’s portfolio will consist of only Binder 1 as stipulated in Section 3.7 (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents) with the addition of samples of teaching evaluations that demonstrate highly effective teaching and student learning. (Department guidelines should give specifics regarding student evaluations to be submitted and may allow for an additional binder, if deemed necessary.)

1. Page 93 - 98

Departments and colleges with non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank must incorporate into their guidelines the criteria for ~~the third year review,~~ promotion, and ~~sixth year~~ review for these faculty. As indicated in Section 5, I (Introduction), establishment and revision to guidelines must be approved by the full-time permanent faculty in the department or college, as appropriate, the department chair (for department guidelines), the College Review Committee, the dean, and Provost/VPAA.

~~Non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. In addition, there is an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment in that position. This third year performance review will provide feedback for an optional promotion review and for the required sixth year review (for assistant and associate professors) and for the required sixth year review (for professors). During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. During the sixth year review, there is an assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of the faculty member’s performance in the context of his or her individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) achieving expectations in sixth year review, or 2) not achieving expectations in sixth year review.~~ The criteria for the optional promotion review are based on criteria established for non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank for the beginning level of the next higher rank as articulated in department, college, and university guidelines. A successful review for the optional promotion restarts the six-year performance review cycle. The same committee structure that is used for third-year review and promotion review of tenured and tenure-track faculty will be used for the third year, promotion, and six-year review of non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank; third and sixth-year reviews stop at the level of the dean.

Non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank must prepare a portfolio for the optional promotion consideration ~~and the required third year and sixth year performance reviews~~. The portfolio contents will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion, see Section 3.7 (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents). There is no limit on the number and size of the binders for third year and for promotion reviews. ~~There is only one binder for sixth year reviews.~~

A department must receive approval from the dean and Provost/VPAA to become a clinical faculty appointment and promotion department. Departments and colleges with approval for clinical faculty must incorporate into their guidelines the criteria for the ~~third year review,~~ promotion~~, and sixth year~~ review of clinical faculty. As indicated in Section 5, I (Introduction), establishment and revision to guidelines must be approved by the full-time permanent faculty in the department or college, as appropriate, the department chair (for department guidelines), the College Review Committee, the dean, and Provost/VPAA.

~~Clinical faculty will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. In addition, there is an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment in that position. This third year performance review will provide feedback for an optional promotion review and for the required sixth year review (for assistant and associate professors) and for the required sixth year review (for professors). During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. During the sixth year review, there is an assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of the faculty member’s performance in the context of his or her individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) achieving expectations in sixth year review, or 2) not achieving expectations in sixth year review.~~ The criteria for the optional promotion review are based on criteria established for clinical faculty for the beginning level of the next higher rank as articulated in department, college, and university guidelines~~. A successful review for the optional promotion restarts the six-year performance review cycle.~~ The same committee structure that is used ~~for third-year review and~~ promotion review of tenured and tenure track faculty will be used for the third year, promotion, and six-year review of clinical faculty; third and sixth-year reviews stop at the level of the dean.

Clinical faculty must prepare a portfolio for the optional promotion consideration ~~and the required third year and sixth year performance~~ review~~s~~. The clinical faculty’s portfolio contents will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion, see Section 3.7 (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents). There is no limit on the number and size of the binders for third year and for promotion reviews. There is only one binder for sixth year reviews.

1. Pages 101-102

~~Librarian faculty will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. In addition, there is an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment in that position. This third year performance review will provide feedback for an optional promotion review and for the required sixth year review (for assistant and associate professors) and for the required sixth year review (for professors). During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. During the sixth year review, there is an assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of the faculty member’s performance in the context of his or her individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) achieving expectations in sixth year review, or 2) not achieving expectations in sixth year review.~~ The criteria for the optional promotion review are based on criteria established for librarian faculty for the beginning level of the next higher rank as articulated in department, college, and university guidelines. A successful review for the optional promotion restarts the six-year performance review cycle. The same committee structure that is used ~~for third-year review and~~ promotion review of tenured and tenure track faculty will be used for the ~~third year,~~ promotion, and six-year review of librarian faculty; third and sixth-year reviews stop at the level of the dean.

Librarian faculty must prepare a portfolio for the optional promotion consideration ~~and the required third year and sixth year performance reviews~~. The librarian faculty’s portfolio contents will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion, see Section 3.7 (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents). There is no limit on the number and size of the binders for third year and for promotion reviews. There is only one binder for sixth year reviews.

1. Page 103-105

A department must receive approval from the dean and Provost/VPAA to become a Research faculty appointment and promotion department. Departments and colleges with approval for Research faculty must incorporate into their guidelines the criteria for the ~~third year review,~~ promotion~~, and sixth year~~ review of Research faculty. As indicated in Section 5, I (Introduction), establishment and revision to guidelines must be approved by the full-time permanent faculty in the department or college, as appropriate, the department chair (for department guidelines), the College Review Committee, the dean, and Provost/VPAA.

~~Research faculty will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. In addition, there is an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment in that position. This third year performance review will provide feedback for an optional promotion review and for the required sixth year review (for assistant and associate professors) and for the required sixth year review (for professors). During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. During the sixth year review, there is an assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of the faculty member’s performance in the context of his or her individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) achieving expectations in sixth year review, or 2) not achieving expectations in sixth year review.~~ The criteria for the optional promotion review are based on criteria established for Research faculty for the beginning level of the next higher rank as articulated in department, college, and university guidelines. ~~A successful review for the optional promotion restarts the six-year performance review cycle.~~ The same committee structure that is used for ~~third-year review and~~ promotion review of tenured and tenure track faculty will be used for the ~~third year,~~ promotion~~, and six-year~~ review of Research faculty; third and sixth-year reviews stop at the level of the dean.

Research faculty must prepare a portfolio for the optional promotion consideration ~~and the required third year and sixth year performance reviews~~. The Research faculty’s portfolio contents will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion, see Section 3.7 (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents). There is no limit on the number and size of the binders for third year and for promotion reviews. There is only one binder for sixth year reviews.

1. Page 108-109

~~Academic professionals of all ranks will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. In addition, there is an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment in that position. This third year performance review will provide feedback for an optional promotion review and for the required sixth year review (for academic professionals and academic professional associates) and for the required sixth year review (for senior academic professionals). During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. During the sixth year review, there is an assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of the academic associate’s performance in the context of his or her individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) achieving expectations in sixth year review, or 2) not achieving expectations in sixth year review.~~ The criteria for the optional promotion review are based on criteria established for academic professionals for the beginning level of the next higher rank as articulated in department, college, and university guidelines. A successful review for the optional promotion restarts the six-year performance review cycle. The same committee structure that is used for ~~third-year review and~~ promotion review of tenured and tenure track faculty will be used for the ~~third year,~~ promotion~~, and six-year~~ review of academic professionals; third and sixth-year reviews stop at the level of the dean.

Academic professionals must prepare a portfolio for the optional promotion consideration ~~and the required third year and sixth year performance reviews~~. The Academic Professional’s portfolio contents will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion, see Section 3.7 (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents). There is no limit on the number and size of the binders for third year and for promotion reviews. There is only one binder for sixth year reviews.

1. Page 111

ARDs, FPAs, and any additional comments, such as response letters, must be submitted with document material for all T&P reviews, including ~~third-year~~ pre-tenure reviews.

1. Pages 114-115

**Third-Year Review**

For non-administrative faculty, the review of ~~third-year~~ pre-tenure portfolios begins with the Department Review Committee, proceeding in turn to the department chair and the dean. The ~~third-year~~ pre-tenure review portfolio of a department chair is reviewed by the Department Review Committee, followed by the College Review Committee, and then the dean. The ~~third-year~~ pre-tenure review for other academic administrators (deans, other college-level administrators, and administrators above the level of dean) will mirror the first three levels of review for the tenure and promotion process.

1. Page 117

**Portfolio Guidelines and Contents**

All faculty members who are considered for tenure, promotion, ~~third-year progress~~ pre-tenure, or post-tenure review must prepare a portfolio for consideration by all involved in the formal review process. On an annual basis (usually at the time of contract renewal), the Office of Academic Affairs will notify all faculty of the dates of their next eligible and their next required reviews.

Failure by a faculty member to submit the documentation required for tenure, promotion, ~~third-year progress~~ pre-tenure, or post-tenure review shall be considered by the review committee as not achieving expectations. In this case, a faculty development plan will be developed by the candidate and the department chair. The plan must include a requirement to submit materials for post-tenure review the following year. If, after one year, the tenured faculty member has not

1. Page 119

Vitae should be formatted to clearly demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty members’ accomplishments, especially to those beyond the department. An example of a vitae template can be found on the Academic Affairs webpage.

* Annual Review Materials (including ARDs and FPAs).
* Faculty up for tenure and/or promotion should include all annual review documents and supporting materials since their ~~last third-year~~ pre-tenure, tenure and/or promotion review.
* Faculty up for ~~third-year~~ pre-tenure review should include all annual review materials since their start date at KSU.
* Departmental guidelines (Administrative Faculty should include the guidelines from the department of their faculty appointment).
* ~~Third-year review~~ Pre-tenure review letters ~~(for tenure (at all faculty ranks) and for promotion (from lecturer to senior lecturer))~~.
* Response letters from previous levels of review.
1. Page 122

|  |
| --- |
| **For ~~Third-Year~~ Pre-Tenure, ~~or Pre-Promotion~~ Reviews~~, Third-Year Reviews (For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, , and All Faculty with Professorial Rank) and Sixth Year Reviews (for Senior Lecturers and Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Rank, including Clinical Faculty)~~** |
| **Mid-September**  | Submit Portfolio to Department Office |
| **Mid-September to Mid-October**  | Department Review Committee review (see note) |
| **Mid-October to Early November** | Department Chair Review (see note) (Department Chair review can begin earlier, but no Chair decision should be made before the end of the optional faculty response deadline to the Department review)  |
| **Early November** | Portfolio is Transferred to Dean’s Office by Department Chair  |
| **Early November to Early December** | College Dean Review (see note) |

|  |
| --- |
| **For Post-Tenure Review (for Tenured Faculty)** |
| **Early October**  | Teaching Faculty Submit Portfolio to Dean’s Office  |
| **Early-October to Early November**  | College PTR Committee Reviews Teaching Faculty (see note)  |
| **Mid-November to Early January**  | College Dean Reviews Teaching Faculty (see note)  |

The exact dates for the tenure and promotion, ~~third year~~ pre-tenure, and post-tenure review schedules can be found on the Academic Affairs webpage at <https://web.kennesaw.edu/academicaffairs/>.

NOTE: Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the candidate has the right to respond to the committee’s or administrator’s decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The reviewer (committee or administrator) does not respond to this letter.

1. Page 160

In all cases in which an approved leave of absence is based on FMLA (the Family Medical Leave Act) or for educational/professional purposes, the faculty member’s ~~third-year~~ ~~pre-tenure~~/tenure/post-tenure review ~~(or third-year/promotion/sixth-year review for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers)~~ clock will automatically be stopped for one academic year if the leave of absence is for one semester or more. The faculty member must make a request to the Provost within 14 days of the beginning of the leave that the ~~third-year~~ ~~pre-tenure~~/tenure/post-tenure review ~~(or third-year/promotion/sixth-year review for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers)~~ clock be delayed for one academic year for an approved leave of absence due to FMLA or for educational/professional purposes lasting less than one semester.

1. ***Grievance procedure*** – Ron Matson

**4.4.3. KSU Faculty Conflict Resolution Procedures (from 2015-2016 Faculty Handbook) – (06 January16)**

**I. Overview**

Kennesaw State University is committed to the prompt and fair resolution of the concerns of the

faculty. The Faculty Conflict Resolution Procedures described below have been formulated to help members of the Faculty resolve interpersonal workplace disagreements. No person’s status with Kennesaw State University will be adversely affected in any way as a result of using these conflict resolution procedures. Any attempt to retaliate against a person for participating in conflict resolution under these procedures will be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination. These procedures do not in any way restrict the right of aggrieved Parties to seek resolution of their grievances, either through the courts, or through agencies of the State or Federal government

**II. Informal Procedures for Resolving Conflict**

While informal resolutions are not required, all faculty are strongly encouraged to work through conflicts informally beginning with the person with whom they have differences. As necessary, a faculty member may also informally resolve conflicts by contacting their immediate supervisor. The supervisor should then arrange a meeting with the faculty member, and all concerned should make a good faith effort to resolve the problem. Good faith efforts to informally resolve the conflict may include conferring with University administrators to evaluate and assist with the informal resolution of the conflict.

If the faculty member’s conflict is with his/her first line supervisor or some other person that the faculty member does not wish to approach directly, the faculty member may talk with their next line supervisor or the Office of the Ombudsman. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to meet with the Office of the Ombudsman as soon as possible for assistance in seeking an informal resolution to their conflict.

If the conflict cannot be resolved through the efforts outlined above, then a faculty member may pursue a formal grievance review and resolution as described below.

**III. Formal Procedures for Resolving Grievances**

A grievance is a written complaint. A grievance review will be available to handle claims that a person has been harmed by any action that violates the policies of either Kennesaw State University or the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. These procedures assure that any faculty member within the University community who has a complaint will have access to an internal process that provides fairness to all Parties involved and that has as its objective the resolution of the conflict.

These procedures are not intended to discourage faculty from attempting to resolve a conflict themselves through discussion with the involved parties. These procedures should not be interpreted as a means to eliminate or weaken first-level supervisory or administrative roles of individuals or to prevent them from attempting immediate and impartial resolution of conflicts that develop within their areas of responsibility.

 Except when conduct is alleged to violate established policies and procedures, a grievance review will not be available to dispute claims about:

* promotion and tenure decisions (See Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook Policy 3.5 – General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review),
* performance evaluations (See Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook Policy 3.7 – Faculty Review Process),
* hiring decisions (See Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook Policy 4.1.5 – Filling Vacant Faculty Positions and Faculty Search and Screening Process),
* changes to administrative appointments (See KSU Faculty Handbook Section 1.1)
* administrative changes to student grades,
* salary decisions (See Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook Policy 4.2 – Compensation & Benefits),
* transfers or reassignments (See Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook Policy 4.1.7 – Redirection and Reassignment of Filled Faculty Positions),
* removal of a faculty member or non-renewal of a contract of a non-tenured faculty (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 4.1.9; BoR Policy 8.3.9.1, 8.3.9.2, 8.3.9.3)
* termination or layoff because of financial exigency or program modification (Board of Regents Policies, 8.5.2 – Layoffs or Terminations; 8.3.7.10 – Termination/Layoff of Tenured Personnel due to Program Modification) ,
* investigations or decisions reached under Kennesaw State University’s Title IX/Sexual Misconduct or Non-Discrimination Policy, and
* normal supervisory counseling (for example, chair discussing classroom management issues with a faculty; dean discussing handling of personnel issues) .
* Scholarly misconduct (KSU University Handbook 5.2.3).

**Formal Grievance Resolution**

In general, all formal grievances should be reviewed at a minimum of two levels if possible, within the complainant’s college/unit including the head of the academic or administrative unit or his/her designee. If the respondent (individual against whom complaint is brought) is the faculty member’s immediate supervisor, then the review process will start at the next administrative level below the level of the Provost. If two levels of review are not possible, then the grievance is reviewed by the AVP for Faculty prior to submission to the Grievance Oversight Committee (see “Routing of Formal Grievance Complaint Form” and flowchart below). A complainant (aggrieved faculty member) must file a formal written grievance using the Grievance Form, by the last day of the next semester (fall and spring semesters only) of the event that has given rise to the grievance. Within 21 calendar days of receipt of the grievance, the complainant’s immediate supervisor must investigate and provide a written response to the complainant’s grievance including sources of information used to make a decision. The investigation may include:

1. meeting with complainant, respondent (and any other necessary parties to develop an understanding of the grievance,
2. reviewing appropriate written policies and procedures, and
3. consulting with the appropriate University administrators, as needed, for advice and clarification of any policies or procedures.

The complainant will have 10 calendar days from the date of the decision letter to appeal to the next level within the complainant’s employment unit. The next level supervisor will review the grievance, investigate and provide a written response within 21 calendar days. The investigation may include:

1. meeting with complainant, respondent and any other necessary parties to develop an understanding of the grievance,
2. reviewing appropriate written policies and procedures, and
3. consulting with the appropriate University administrators, as needed, for advice and clarification of any policies or procedures.

 If a complainant wishes to appeal after completion of the employment unit’s review of the matter, a petition for review (the completed Grievance Form) must be submitted to the Grievance Oversight Committee through the Associate Vice President for Faculty within 10 calendar days of the date of the final decision letter of the head of the academic or administrative unit or his/her designee. A copy of the petition for review will be provided to the respondent(s).

To ensure that the petition clearly identifies pertinent issues, the Grievance Form must be completed in its entirety which will include the following:

1. Name of complainant and complainant’s job title
2. Name(s) of the respondent(s)
3. The nature of the problem or complaint; all relevant documentation must be included at this time;
4. The communication that has taken place between the complainant and the respondent (informal resolution);
5. The communication that has taken place between the complainant and his or her academic department head, supervisor and/or second level supervisor concerning the matter;
6. Responses from supervisor(s);
7. The reason the complainant disagrees with that response;
8. The complainant's suggestion for proper resolution of the matter;
9. Identification of any witnesses who may have relevant information regarding the complaint; and
10. Signature of complainant and date.

The Associate Vice President for Faculty will refer the grievance to the Grievance Oversight Committee within 15 calendar days of receipt of the petition for review. The Chair of the Grievance Oversight Committee will schedule a meeting to review the petition for review within 10 calendar days, unless reasonable cause is documented to the parties as to why it should take longer than the prescribed time frame.

The respondent will have an opportunity to identify witnesses and provide documents to the Grievance Oversight Committee. A copy of the documents will be provided to the complainant.

A complainant who wishes to address the Grievance Oversight Committee orally must make the request in the written petition. If no oral presentation is requested, the review will be based upon the written record. The Grievance Oversight Committee has the right to call a hearing if they deem necessary. If a hearing is called, it must be conducted within 21 calendar days, unless reasonable cause is documented to the parties as to why it should take longer than the prescribed time frame.

When a hearing is called, the following procedures will apply:

1. The Grievance Oversight Committee chair will notify complainant and respondent of the date, time, and place of the hearing.

2. The hearing will be recorded via audio recording. Tapes and records of the hearings may be subject to disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act. Archives will be kept in Faculty Affairs.

3. The petition will be heard by members of the Grievance Oversight Committee.

4. Members of the Grievance Oversight Committee will be excused from service on a particular case under the following circumstances:

1. If they have a personal or professional relationship with any party to the case which would prejudice them from rendering an objective judgment in the case.
2. If the case involves a student, faculty member or staff member in the same department or unit as a member of the Grievance Oversight Committee.
3. In the event a committee member is excused from service on a particular case, the Faculty Senate, Chairs’ and Directors Assembly, or Deans’ Council will select an alternate from the appropriate constituency to serve on the committee for that case.

5. If an oral hearing is to be held, the complainant making the appeal shall present first in the hearing; respondent(s) shall present after the complainant.

6. The respondent against which the appeal is directed will be afforded the opportunity to attend and participate orally in the hearing if one is granted.

7. The Grievance Oversight Committee has the discretion to limit the presentation time of all parties.

8. Attorneys are not authorized to participate in hearings before the Grievance Oversight Committee. A faculty member has the right to an advisor, other than an attorney, of his/her own choosing to assist and advise the faculty member. The advisor is for advice and moral support. He or she is not a witness and will not make statements to the Grievance Oversight Committee or present evidence at the hearing. The Grievance Oversight Committee, after consultation with the University’s Division of Legal Affairs, may authorize attorneys to participate in the hearing if it appears that the hearing will in any way involve, or relate to, an indictment of, or the existence of any criminal charge against any party. If requesting authorization for an attorney to serve as an advisor, the complainant or respondent must submit a separate written request to the Grievance Oversight Committee at the time of submission of the petition to the Grievance Coordinator. This request should include the reasons why the complainant feels an attorney’s participation is appropriate.

9. The Grievance Oversight Committee may invite witnesses identified by either party or any other witnesses that they deem necessary to participate by meeting with the Grievance Oversight Committee; if they prefer they may respond in writing to the Grievance Committee's request for information.

10. The Grievance Oversight Committee has the discretion to accept any additional information from either party as they deem necessary, and to request additional information from other university sources.

11. If an oral hearing is to be held, the chair of the Grievance Oversight Committee will choose the option that the complainant and respondent appear (a) separately, or (b) together. Parties will not be permitted to cross-examine each other during the hearing. Formal legal rules of evidence do not apply in the hearing.

12. The complainant has the burden of proving by the preponderance of the evidence that he/she has been wronged. If, at the conclusion of a review, the Grievance Oversight Committee is unable to reach a decision, the complainant fails to carry this burden and the finding should be in the respondent’s favor.

**Grievance Oversight Committee Findings**

When the Grievance Oversight Committee has received the information it deems necessary to render a recommendation in a case, it will determine by majority vote what the Grievance Oversight Committee’s findings and recommendations will be. Absent good cause, the findings and recommendations must be transmitted to the Provost, complainant and respondent(s), complainant and respondent’s supervisor, within 14 calendar days of the conclusion of the hearing or committee meeting.

**Decision of the Provost**

Within 21 calendar days, the Provost, or his/her designee, will review the Grievance Oversight Committee’s findings and render a written decision to resolve the formal grievance. The provost has the discretion to conduct further investigation. The complainant or respondent may appeal the Provost’s (or designee’s) decision to the President within 10 calendar days. The findings must be transmitted to the complainant, respondent(s), complainant and respondent’s supervisor, Chair of Grievance Oversight Committee.

**Decision of the President**

If the complainant or respondent appeals, the President or his/her designee will review the Provost’s decision and Grievance Oversight Committee’s findings in rendering Kennesaw State University’s final decision. The president or her/his designee has the discretion to conduct further investigation into the complainant’s grievance. The President will normally furnish a decision to the complainant and respondent, complainant and respondent’s supervisor, Chair of Grievance Oversight Committee, and Provost within 30 calendar days after receiving the Provost’s decision and Grievance Oversight Committee’s findings. If the President’s review of a case requires longer than 30 days, the President will notify the parties of the delay.

**Discretionary Review by Board of Regents**

Pursuant to Board of Regents Policy 8.6, a faculty member aggrieved by the President’s final decision in the matter may apply to the Board’s Office of Legal Affairs (“Legal Affairs”) for a review of the decision. Review of the decision is not a matter of right, but is within the sound discretion of Legal Affairs. If granted, the discretionary review shall be limited to the record from the institutional appeal process. Any petition to Legal Affairs must be submitted in writing to Legal Affairs within a period of 20 calendar days following the decision of the President. Legal Affairs will determine whether the application for review shall be granted.

**IV. Amendment Process**

These Conflict Resolution Procedures can be altered and/or amended only if presented in writing to the Faculty Senate and University Council and approved by an affirmative vote of the majority of the Senate. The Grievance Oversight Committee has the responsibility of reviewing these procedures and recommending appropriate changes. No amendment or alteration will be in effect until it has been approved by the President.

**V.**  **Formation of Grievance Oversight Committee**

Grievance Oversight Committee (ad hoc, called as needed) — assigned to the Faculty Senate and advisory to the Faculty Senate and the Provost/VPAA

***Membership:***

1. TF 6: three faculty senate representatives, and three alternates elected by the Faculty Senate.

2. AD 4: two chairs, one principal and an alternate elected by the Chairs and Directors Assembly; two deans or assistant deans, one principal and one alternate elected by the Deans Council.

1. This route is used when both the complainant and respondent are teaching faculty. The chair and dean to whom the form is submitted is/are the chair and dean of the complainant.
2. This route is used when: a) the complainant is a teaching faculty and respondent is an assistant/associate chair or department chair/school director or vice versa; b) the complainant is an assistant/associate chair and the respondent is a department chair/school director or vice versa; or c) when both the complainant and respondent are chairs/school directors. The dean to whom the form is submitted is the dean of the complainant.
3. This route is used when: a) the complainant is a teaching faculty and respondent is an assistant/associate dean or dean, or vice versa; b) the complainant is a chair and the respondent is a dean or vice versa; c) when the complainant is an assistant/associate dean and the respondent is a dean or vice versa; or d) when both the complainant and respondent are deans.

VI. Flow Chart
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***6. Stipends and Overload Compensation Guidelines*** – Ron Matson

**4.2.4 Stipend and Overload Compensation Guidelines**

**RHM; 30Sept15**

* + - 1. **Stipends** area fixed amount of additional money for performing a specific non-teaching task; paid regularly; a stipend is a payment in addition to the base pay for an assignment which is not part of the employee’s ongoing faculty appointment, but which is part of the normal workload, i.e. within the assigned percent of full time. A stipend is used to separate the portion of compensation paid to an employee for the effort and responsibility related to a special assignment. If the special assignment ends, the stipend is removed and the salary will revert to the salary for the ongoing teaching faculty appointment.
1. **Administrative Stipend –** For faculty administrators who have a workload where 50% or more of their workload is defined as “administrative”; these faculty will receive 9- or 12-month administrative contracts/ administrative stipends serving in the role as an administrator. Given when a faculty member is asked to perform administrative duties that are outside the scope of the faculty member’s position. PTR clock stops for the duration of the assignment; faculty receiving administrative stipends are not eligible for teaching faculty awards nor may they serve on University/College/Department committees as teaching faculty.

The BoR Academic & Student Affairs Handbook: [Section 4.3.5](http://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/handbook/C682/#p4.3.5_salary_conversion_guidelines_for_fiscal_and_academic_year_faculty_app) states: “*When a faculty member on an academic year contract is given a fiscal year administrative appointment, institutions should pay the faculty member an administrative stipend based on the job description and responsibilities related to their administrative role. The administrative stipend should be identified separately from the base salary amount in the faculty member’s contract and the contact should specify that the stipend will no longer be available when the administrative appointment ends.*”

Positionsin which faculty are eligible to receive administrative contracts and an administrative stipend include: Department/School Chairs/Directors; Assistant/Associate Deans, Deans; Assistant/Associate/Directors of Academic Units (e.g., CETL, Siegel Institute); Assistant/Associate/Vice Presidents; Assistant/Associate/Vice/Senior Vice Provosts; Provost; Special Assistant to President/Provost; Others per President/Provost

1. **Non-Administrative Stipend** - For non-administrators; workload is less than 50% administrative in nature; these faculty will not receive administrative contracts but will remain on a 9- or 12-month teaching faculty contract. PTR clock does not stop. Faculty receiving non-administrative stipends are eligible for teaching faculty awards and may serve on University/College/Department committees as teaching faculty.

Positions in which faculty may be eligible to receive non-administrative stipends include but are not limited to: Assistant/Associate Department Chairs; Program coordinators and others as determined by the Dean and/or Department Chair/School Director.

Stipends for 9-month faculty can be paid in the summer by putting the stipend amount on the summer payroll. Stipends count towards the 33.33% earning maximum for summer pay.

* + - 1. **Overloads** are a temporary amendment to contract for additional teaching, research or service responsibilities; defined as those activities in excess of activities expected as part of the defined workload formula. Full-time faculty at Kennesaw State University may be requested to perform service in excess of full-time effort for institutional-funded activities. Per BoR Policy ([Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.10](http://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C698?highlight=Overloads)): “*Under certain circumstances, qualified teaching faculty and administrative faculty may be called upon to take on additional teaching, research, or service responsibilities at the home institution. Whenever possible in this situation, the institution should consider adjusting the individual's primary duties to incorporate the extra duties associated with the overload(s). If it is determined that a workload adjustment cannot be made, the faculty member's contract should be amended to reflect a temporary change in compensation warranted by the additional responsibilities. A contract modification should also be done when faculty are involved in joint staffing agreements that warrant additional compensation at another USG institution (see Section 5.3.3 in the Business Procedures Manual).”*

Contract modifications should be done using the USG Contract Addendum for Temporary Overload Compensation. Because overloads involve a modification to a faculty member's KSU original contract, Section 5.3.2 of the Business Procedures Manual on Extra compensation does not apply to faculty overloads.

KSU's procedures for complying with and interpreting Regents Policy are outlined below. Prior approvals for proposed overload compensation are expected to be secured using the required form (which is on the Academic Affairs webpage) before the overload assignment commences.

**Conditions of an Overload Assignment**

Faculty who assume overload assignments for overload pay must meet expectations in all of their normal in-load work assignments. In-load work assignments typically include the expected full-time commitment of the faculty member to teaching, supervision and mentoring duties, professional service (including administration), scholarship and creative activity, and academic achievement and professional development. Overload pay is not appropriate for an individual if the work can be readily assigned on an in-load basis to another qualified person or if the individual’s existing assignments can accommodate the work or can be readily reduced, rearranged, or reassigned in order to accommodate the work on an in-load basis.

Since KSU is in full or partial operation seven days a week in the mornings, afternoons and evenings, many faculty do not share the same daily or weekly work schedules. A “normal full load” must take flexible scheduling into account, regardless of when and where an individual’s faculty-related work is done during the week.

**Avoiding Conflicts with Regular Duties**

Because faculty are salaried professional employees, overload assignments are most acceptable when the nature of the work in the overload assignment is significantly different from the nature of an individual’s work assignments in the normal full load. When the nature of the work is similar for in-load and overload pay, the potential for an appearance of a conflict of interest or conflict of obligation exists and should be avoided or thoroughly justified. Faculty members who write themselves into grants or contracts for services that involve overload pay create the potential for a perceived conflict of interest or obligation.

When an apparent conflict of interest exists within a department, college, or division, an administrator at another level of authority beyond that unit must confirm that the overload compensation is appropriate and does not constitute a conflict of interest or obligation.

1. ***Parking Committee Representative*** – Doug Moodie

Chose one from;

Gabriel Ramirez, Professor of Finance

Jan Wikstrom, Assistant Professor of Voice and Acting

***8. Faculty Club*** – Randy Shelton

***9. A.O.B***

***Note: 8th February meeting is in Clendenin 2008 (science Building), Kennesaw campus.***