<p style="text-align:center">Meeting Minutes **FINAL**, Professional Concerns Committee
November 21, 2019
UC 135, 3:15 pm</p>

Members in Attendance:

Kalyani Ankem, Shannon Alexander, Mike Carrell, Linda Dynan, Kathleen Fuegen, John Farrar, Nicole Grant, Jackie Herman, Collin Herb, Ken Katkin, Jim Kirtley, Alexis Miller, Ban Mittal, Makoto Nakamura, Kathy Noyes, Michael Providenti, Holly Riffe, Hans Schellhas, Tracy Songer, Mauricio Torres, Maggie Whitson

Other attendees:

Sue Ott Rowlands, Janel Bloch, Kimberly Wiley, Grace Hiles

Members Not in Attendance:

Doug Feldmann, Brant Karrick, Gary Newell, Ron Shaw/Michael Hatton, (Rep TBD from Academic Affairs/Honors/Undergraduate Education, (Rep TBD from English), Michael Washington,

1. Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda
    a. No additions – adopted agenda
2. Approval of the minutes from the November 7 meeting
    a. Mike Carrell was in attendance, Jackie Grahm is no longer on PCC
    b. M. Whitson – Motion
    c. K. Katkin – 2nd
    d. Approved
3. Chair's Report and Announcements
    a. Senate Executive Committee
        i. President and Provost were there with most discussion around Success by Design.
            1. K. Katkin – question: Did you follow up with where the 2 million dollars came from.
                a. Chair reports that that wasn't dicussed.
            2. K. Katkin question: One word within the tenure statement.
                a. Determined that that will be asked at faculty senate
            3. Concern around the emphasis of the first five points
                a. Concern brought up but no movement.
    b. Master Planning Steering Committee meeting

i. Beginning year-long process to determine campus needs and priorities.
        1. **PCC Action:** Stakeholder meetings are currently being held. Attend if you can.
4. New Business, discussion item, Support for staff during pension discussions.
    a. Chairs question – How do we want to show them support. How do we express our concerns? Ie. Resolution?
        i. K. Katkin – SC president elect came to senate and they would like us to say that the University should take care of the staff through the retirement. Note: doesn't get into the weeds to see what should be done. Budget committee is looking into it already. We should at least give a statement of support.
    b. Guest: Kimberly Wiley (Chair of Staff Congress Pension committee) & Grace Hiles (Email attachment – Appendix A)
        i. They described the support that the committee is giving to the Teir 2 & 3 employees that would be able to figure out what their individual situation is. She is suggesting that anything we can do to let staff know would be appreciated. There will be many people that will be affected negatively by this. There was an email (attached – Appendix A) that describes the situation and the SCPC's availability to help.
        ii. Going to the board of regents meeting in January. HR has presented to the board the effect.
        iii. Asking for connections to Frankfort or even the board of Regents
        iv. Promote education sessions provided by the SCPC.
    c. K. Katkin – asked if the statement would help. It really depends on what happens in Frankfort.
    d. J. Block – A. Caswell did give a report, but things are more uncertain.
    e. L. Dynan – can we give explicit direction, maybe a fundraising campaign. Since we are doing the strategic initiatives for students, how about strategic initiative for staff as well?
    f. M. Whitson – provide a strong issue of support for now and quickly and once legislature meets and we know what exactly is going to happen. **"Decided if more will be needed"**
    g. **PCC Action** – John Farrar and Ken Katkin will draft a resolution
5. Old Business, voting item, Honored Retired status for lecturers (was Emeritus status) (3 attachments, Original Appendix B, Updated Appendix C, Latest Appendix D)
    a. B. Mittal – asked that the recommendation needs to be changed
        i. Solution – change the word "approval" to "recommendation" or "consideration" in both 1.71 and 1.7.2
    b. A. Miller – add positive or negative.

c. B. Mittal – old language is better (2.1).
d. M. Whitson – first two paragraphs are just defining what they are and the procedure is 2.1.
e. Emeritus status… following the process set forth in 2.11
f. B. Mittal – why is it called appointment (in 2.11)
   i. Its because of the section of the handbook that it is in.
      1. K. Katkin **move** to amend section
         a. Amendment 1.7.1 and 1.7.2 Deleting of the language after the words "board of regents" and replacing it with following "the process set forth" in section 2.11.
         b. In 2.11 Adding the word school to department program or faculty
      2. M. Whitson **2nd**
      3. Motion **unanimously** passes
g. **Move** to adopt the entire policy (including language changes in titles emeritus and honored)
   i. C. Herb **Motion**
   ii. **2nd** K. Katkin
   iii. Motion Passes with dissention

6. Old Business, Discussion Item, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process (Sections 3.2 and 7.3 of Handbook) (<mark>Appendix E</mark>)
   a. Chair spoke with Matthew Zekate about the recommendation of no information added in after it closes for the committee
      i. Problem – if the "new" information came in and caused a reversal of the recommendation and the committee didn't weigh in.
      ii. A. Miller – Departmental guidelines should be the end all.
      iii. PCC has asked that faculty committee should know exactly the same thing as going up the ladder.
      iv. The timeline isn't as tight as we are thinking. Slow down their timeline (reflected in the memo).
      v. Proposed that the dean and chair aren't mentioned. Keeping it in the process of peer review.
      vi. Concern across discipline comparing grade distribution to other instructors.
      vii. Keep this to actual academic criteria – not HR. PCC thinks there is no need to include that as "supplemental" information.
      viii. SOTA has 3 levels, program, school and Arts and Sciences. This must be taken into consideration.
      ix. Main issues, everyone look at the same material by rewriting the guidelines, yes. Second, it will be harder to force Deans

and Provost to not ask for supplemental. We could suggest that the supplemental asked should be told in writing to the committee and then they can comment on the supplemental information. The candidate and committee could comment on what the Chair, Dean, Provost asked for included in the dossier.

7. Adjournment

From:	staffcongress-request@listserv2.nku.edu on behalf of Grace Hiles
To:	staffcongress@listserv.nku.edu
Cc:	Kimberly Wiley; Matthew Zacate; Sue Murphy-Angel
Subject:	[staffcongress] Staff Congress Pension Committee/KERS Pension Help Sessions - PLEASE READ!
Date:	Thursday, November 14, 2019 10:30:02 AM
Attachments:	SC Pension Help Session Flyer 2.pdf

Greetings NKU Staff,

The Staff Congress formed the Pension Committee to represent and provide information and assistance to all staff regarding pension issues through increased communication, education and resources. We are **"staff helping staff"**!!! We want to help you become better educated on how the pension changes will affect you!

The upcoming changes to KERS affect each staff member differently. Each staff employee is in a unique individual situation depending on different factors including your tier level, date of hire, age, years of service, etc.

We have staff who stand to lose 50%, 60%, even 75% of their pension depending on whether NKU proceeds with a hard or soft exit. People are losing hundreds of thousands of dollars over the life of their retirement years....one particular staff employee will lose **over $1 million** over her lifetime. We want you to know your unique situation and how best to prepare for your future!

One of our main goals to help all staff learn how to navigate the online KRS Self Member Service. It is critical that all Tier I and II staff learn how to access and use the Benefit Estimate Calculator to determine their monthly retirement benefit estimate. The **only** way to know how a **hard versus soft exit** affects your **monthly retirement benefit payment** is to compare the benefit estimate for each possibility.

Pension Concerns - Do you know or want to know?
- How will the proposed pension changes affect you?
- Do you have questions we can ask KERS of Human Resources for you?
- Is a hard or soft exit financially good or bad for you?
- Do you know your numbers? Tier, service years, pension, years purchased, etc.?
- Tier I and Tier II staff, have you run your benefit estimate calculations for both a hard and soft exit and determined the lifetime financial effect of both?
- Do you need or want help accessing and using the online KRS Member Self Service and the Benefit Estimate Calculator tool to determine the effect on your unique situation? Attend one of our scheduled help sessions for staff-to-staff assistance.

HELP SESSIONS – come get help logging in and using the online KRS Member Self Service. Committee members will be there to help you with the process. All staff are welcome to each session.

Our first open drop in sessions are on **Thursday, November 21.**

Time	Location
9:00 am – 10:00 am	Steely Library 235 [CITE]
11:00 am – 2:00 pm	Student Union 302
7:00 pm – 8:00 pm	Steely Library 235 [CITE]

Important details to know before coming attending a session:

- You need your PIN from KERS in order to access self-service.
  - Request a PIN. If you have lost or never received a PIN number, please contact the KERS office at 502-696-8800 or 1-800-928-4646 and it will be mailed to the address on record with KRS. *Please note that this option will cause a delay for the member in accessing the needed information while they wait for the PIN to arrive.*
  - Members and beneficiaries who have a valid email address on file with KRS can also request a new PIN to be sent to them via encrypted email, so they will receive the PIN the same day. A member or beneficiary may request a PIN via encrypted email in Step 2 of the registration process for the self-service portal, in the Contact Information module within the self-service portal, or by contacting KRS toll free at 1-800-928-4646. To request a new PIN through the self-service portal, click here to get started: *https://kyret.ky.gov/Pages/Login.aspx*
- To register for self-service, you need the following:
  - Social Security Number
  - Date of Birth
  - Valid Email Address
  - KRS-issued PIN
  - You will create a User ID and Password and answer a secret question. Your password:
    - *Must be at least 8 characters*
    - *Is case sensitive*
    - *Can't contain spaces*
    - *Must have at least one uppercase letter*
    - *Must have at least one lowercase letter*
    - *Must have at least one number*
    - *Must have one of the following special characters: @, #,! ,%, $*

If you cannot make this session OR if you do not have your PIN in time, we will be offering another group of sessions in December before we leave for Christmas break. Attached is a flyer announcing the November sessions. PLEASE feel free to share with your co-workers.

UPCOMING ITEMS:

- A **survey** of all staff will be distributed to gather information on **how the pension changes will affect you and staff as a whole.** We will not be asking for names or any identifying markers and it will be completely anonymous and voluntary. We will use this data age, years of service, numbers in each tier, financial loss, your employment/retirement plans, etc. to prepare a report to reflect **how these changes will impact the campus.** Watch for an email with the link to the survey. And PLEASE consider sharing your information so that we can accurately portray the true impact of these changes on all of us!

- We will speak at the **January 12, 2020, Board of Regents meeting.** We want to report the findings of the survey as well as individual stories of how the pension changes impact individuals across campus.
  - o **We invite you to attend the BOR Meeting and "put a face with a story" for the Board members. We wish to <u>respectfully share</u> our stories with the Board in the hopes that our attendance will reflect the significance of our pension crisis!**
- We are working on a separate "calculator" beyond the KRS site to help you determine your options depending on a hard/soft exit as well as TIAA options. These will be shared at a later date.

Again, we are *"staff helping staff"*! We are here to help but we are not "experts" on KERS and certainly do not know all the answers. Our goal is to help you learn how the pension changes affect you so that you can be better educated regarding your unique situation.

We are willing to help find answers from KERS/HR on your behalf. If you have questions please contact us at the e-mail below.

CONTACT INFO:
SC Pension Committee: staffcongresspension@nku.edu
KERS site: https://kyret.ky.gov/Pages/index.aspx

Sent on behalf of:
Staff Congress Pension Committee Chairperson

Kimberly Wiley
Executive Assistant to the Vice Provost
for Graduate Education, Research and Outreach
Northern Kentucky University
1 Nunn Drive, UC 425
Highland Heights, KY 41076
859-572-7528
wileyk2@nku.edu

Staff Congress Representative

Staff Congress Pension Committee

A new committee formed to represent staff and to provide information and assistance regarding pension issues through increased communication, education and resources.

DO YOU HAVE PENSION QUESTIONS?

- How will the proposed pension changes affect you?
- Hard or soft freeze – good or bad for you?
- Do you know your numbers? Tier, service years, pension, years purchased, etc.
- Would you be interested in attending training/ workshops for help connecting with KERS and determining your unique situation?
- Do you have questions we can ask KERS for you?

Make your voice be heard!

Let's unite to work for an outcome that is best for everyone!

YOUR STAFF CONGRESS PENSION COMMITTEE

Representing staff and providing information and assistance regarding pension issues through increased communication, education and resources.

staffcongresspension@nku.edu

Kimberly Wiley, Chair—7528   Ashley Coates—5648   Brandon Billiter—6607

Gina Yoon—5746   Inna Pylyayeva—7767   Terri Smith—6947   Vicki Cooper—5742

Appendix A

Below is the KERS Participant Count for each University based on Tier levels:

EKU – KERS Participant Count as of 9/13/19	
	Non-hazardous
Tier 1	184
Tier 2	55
Tier 3	81
Retired Re-employed	6
Total	326

NKU – KERS Participant Count as of 9/12/19	
	Non-hazardous
Tier 1	252
Tier 2	174
Tier 3	303
Retired Re-employed	8
Total	737

WKU – KERS Participant Count as of 8/31/19	
	Non-hazardous
Tier 1	229
Tier 2	90
Tier 3	115
Retired Re-employed	8
Total	442

1.7.1 EMERITUS FACULTY AND HONORED RETIRED LECTURERS

Emeritus faculty are tenured faculty and administrators who hold faculty rank, who, upon retirement, and upon recommendation of the faculty of the department or program in which they hold tenure and upon the recommendations of the appropriate chair, dean, the provost, and the president of the University, have been conferred emeritus status by the Board of Regents. Such persons hold the title and rank held immediately prior to their retirement, followed by the title "emeritus."

Honored Retired Lecturers are faculty who hold the rank of lecturer, lecturer II, or senior lecturer, who, upon retirement, and upon the recommendation of the faculty of the department or program in which the lecturer, and upon the recommendations of the appropriate chair, dean, the provost, and the president of the University, have been conferred honored retired status by the Board of Regents. Such persons hold the title of Honored Retired Lecturer.

2.11 EMERITUS FACULTY AND HONORED RETIRED LECTURER APPOINTMENTS

A department or program faculty may nominate a retiring faculty member for appointment to emeritus (for tenured faculty) or honored retired (for lecturers) status. In order to be nominated, the retiring person must hold academic rank. Normally, a person will have served the University for a long period in order to be appointed. Such a nomination will be given to the dean by the chair or director, forwarded to the provost, and then to the president. The dean and the provost may make their own recommendations about the appointment of the faculty member when forwarding the nomination. Emeritus and honored retired status may be conferred only by the Board of Regents, and then only upon recommendation by the president (see Section 7.1, Emeritus Faculty and Honored Retired Lecturers).

Commented [JF1]: Should there be a new section for Honored Retired Lecturer? 1.7.2 (and then renumber the rest of the sections in 1.7)

Commented [JF2]: Should we differentiate between NTTR and NTTT lecturers? Or, does long service to NKU suggest/require that they be NTTR?

Commented [JF3]: Should this just be senior lecturer? A lecturer is eligible for promotion to lecturer II after 5 years with a recommendation from the chair. A lecturer II is eligible for promotion after another 5 years with a recommendation from the chair. Senior lecturer suggests long service to NKU.

Commented [JF4]: Should this title reflect the rank? That is, Honored Retired Lecturer II and Honored Retired Senior Lecturer?

Commented [JF5]: Because it is not clear what the recommendation is. Is the recommendation in regards to the nomination only? Or, could a dean or provost be able recommend a faculty member for emeritus or honored retired status without a departmental nomination?

1.7.1 EMERITUS FACULTY

Emeritus faculty are tenured faculty and administrators who hold faculty rank, who, upon retirement, and upon recommendation of the faculty of the department or program in which they hold tenure and upon the recommendations of the appropriate chair, dean, the provost, and the president of the University, have been conferred emeritus status by the Board of Regents. Such persons hold the title and rank held immediately prior to their retirement, followed by the title "emeritus."

1.7.2 HONOR RETIRED FACULTY
Honored Retired faculty are non-tenure track faculty who hold the rank of lecturer (all ranks), professor of practice (all ranks), or clinical faculty (all ranks) who, upon retirement, and upon the recommendation of the faculty of the department or program in which the faculty member served, and upon the recommendations of the appropriate chair, dean, the provost, and the president of the University, have been conferred honored retired status by the Board of Regents. Such persons hold the title and rank held immediately prior to their retirement, preceded by the title "Honored Retired."

Renumber:
1.7.**3** VISITING FACULTY
1.7.**4** ADJUNCT FACULTY
1.7.**5** ENDOWED CHAIRS AND NAMED PROFESSORSHIPS
1.7.**6** PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE
1.7.**6**.1 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
1.7.**6**.2 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
1.7.**6**.3 PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
1.7.**7** CLINICAL FACULTY
1.7.**7**.1 CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR
1.7.**7**.2 CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
1.7.**7**.3 CLINCAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
1.7.**7**.4 CLINICAL PROFESSOR

2.11 EMERITUS FACULTY AND HONORED RETIRED FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
A department or program faculty may nominate a retiring faculty member for appointment to emeritus (for tenured faculty) or honored retired (for non-tenure track faculty) status. In order to be nominated, the retiring person must hold academic rank. Normally, a person will have served the University for a long period in order to be appointed. Such a nomination will be given to the dean by the chair or director, forwarded to the provost, and then to the president. The chair or director, dean and the provost may make their own recommendations about the appointment of the faculty member when forwarding the nomination. Emeritus and honored retired status may be conferred only by the Board of Regents, and then only upon recommendation by the president (see Section 7.1, Emeritus Faculty and section 7.2 Honored Retired Faculty).

1.7.1 EMERITUS FACULTY

The "emeritus" designation is a way of honoring retired tenured faculty or retired administrators who held faculty rank. Such persons hold the title and rank held immediately prior to their retirement, followed by the title "emeritus." Emeritus status may be granted upon retirement and is conferred by the Board of Regents, after recommendation by the faculty from the department or program in which retiring faculty held tenure and upon approval of the appropriate chair, dean, the provost, and the president of the University.

1.7.2 HONORED RETIRED FACULTY

The "Honored Retired" designation is a way of honoring retired non-tenure track faculty who held the rank of lecturer (all ranks), professor of practice (all ranks), or clinical faculty (all ranks). Such persons hold the title and rank held immediately prior to their retirement, preceded by the title "Honored Retired." Honored Retired status may be granted upon retirement and is conferred by the Board of Regents, after recommendation by the faculty from the department or program in which the retiring faculty member served and upon approval of the appropriate chair, dean, the provost, and the president of the University.

Renumber:
1.7.**3** VISITING FACULTY
1.7.**4** ADJUNCT FACULTY
1.7.**5** ENDOWED CHAIRS AND NAMED PROFESSORSHIPS
1.7.**6** PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE
1.7.**6**.1 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
1.7.**6**.2 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
1.7.**6**.3 PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
1.7.**7** CLINICAL FACULTY
1.7.**7**.1 CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR
1.7.**7**.2 CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
1.7.**7**.3 CLINCAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
1.7.**7**.4 CLINICAL PROFESSOR

2.11 EMERITUS FACULTY AND HONORED RETIRED FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

A department or program faculty may nominate a retiring faculty member for appointment to emeritus (for tenured faculty) or honored retired (for non-tenure track faculty) status. In order to be nominated, the retiring person must hold academic rank. Normally, a person will have served the University for a long period in order to be appointed. Such a nomination will be given to the dean by the chair or director, forwarded to the provost, and then to the president. The chair or director, dean and the provost may make their own recommendations about the appointment of the faculty member when forwarding the nomination. Emeritus and honored retired status may be conferred only by the Board of Regents, and then only upon recommendation by the president (see Section 7.1, Emeritus Faculty and section 7.2 Honored Retired Faculty).

Proposal 1:

Adds a paragraph in 3.2.1 Time Schedule about the bi-annual review for reappointment and the schedule for tenure application.

More importantly it clarifies that evaluation for re-appointment as an evaluation of the documentation and information completed during the current contract.

- (Previous years have been evaluated and future work will be evaluated. The desire here is to clarify that candidates will be evaluated on their documentation and information submitted, not what they plan to do in the future.)
    - Probationary Years
        - AY 1
        - AY 2 – Reviewed for reappointment. Reviewing AY 1
        - AY 3
        - AY 4 – Reviewed for reappointment. Reviewing AY 2 and AY 3, but not excluding AY 1
        - AY 5
        - AY 6 – Reviewed for tenure, reviewing all work completed in their probationary years.

However, it does not preclude the committee from including documents and information from past evaluations.

3.2.1 TIME SCHEDULE

Each spring, the provost will issue a calendar listing deadlines for each step in the evaluation process for the coming academic year, a template for dossier preparation, and notification of any updates to the process.

Applications for reappointment are reviewed bi-annually. Each bi-annual review shall consider the information provided in the applicant's dossier from the contract years under review; however, this does not prohibit documentation and/or information from previous contract years to be included in the evaluation.

Other than exceptions defined in section 6.7, applications for tenure are reviewed in the 6 year. The dossier for tenure will be evaluated in its full context, including all years of service and any credit for prior service negotiated at the time of the initial appointment.

Proposal 2:

Adds a due date to the submission of the RPT dossier. The purpose of this is twofold:
1. To add time to the calendar for RPT committees to review the dossiers.
    a. Large departments have a difficult time meeting the deadlines in the current calendar.
2. To clarify the review period.
    a. There has been confusion in our department about what documents should be included for review. Teaching and Service documentation is predetermined as the previous academic year. In other words, when reviewing RPT files in the Fall of 2019, for teaching, we did not include in our evaluations Fall 2019 teaching documentations, syllabus, assignments, student feedback. The same can be said for Service. We evaluate service completed in the past. For research the times are blurred. Do we include manuscripts that are accepted for publication on September 1st of Fall 2019 in the 19/20 AY evaluation? It was accepted before the current deadline for dossier submission, but outside of the parameters of what is being evaluated, their previous work. The proposal directs the applicant to include the newly accepted manuscript in the next RPT evaluation. What should be included in the current evaluation is the research/work completed in order to submit the manuscript along with the submission, with documentation of the journal and so on. Thus, this proposal defines that all work being evaluated should be from the previous AY year(s).
    b. It's not the intention to ignore or dismiss the work of a colleague who gets a manuscript accepted on September 1st, but rather honor the work completed in the current AY under review instead of the upcoming.

3.2.2 INITIATION OF REQUEST

The applicant is responsible for initiating consideration by applying for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or a combination of them. A full-time administrator with academic rank may apply for tenure or promotion supported by documentation. The applicant will compile and submit an RPT dossier, including a cover sheet provided by the provost's office no later than August 15th, 11:59pm the year of their request for consideration.

Proposal 3:

Changes the due date that applicants are required to be notified of their reappointment. (Keeping in mind the deadline to notify NTTRs of non-reappointment is mid-spring)

Corrects what appears to be a mistake in the dates for notification of reappointment.
- If candidates are notified on December 15, 2019 of non-reappointment, their current contract actually ends in Spring 2020.
- This is where the assumption of a lame duck year is found. This removes the assumption/protection and instead grants the choice of an additional 12 month contract to the department. (whether this should be the chair's decision, a search committee, or RPT is left open)

The inclusion of 6.8 below is to indicate that the lame duck year is secured separately for the applicant who is denied tenure.

The date of December 15th now corresponds with RPT calendar, see last page.

3.2.12. NOTICE OF NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Notice of non-reappointment of a probationary contract must be in writing, by the provost, and given:

- Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service;
- ~~At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service at the University.~~
- Each department will have the choice whether to extend a 12 month contract upon a notice of non-reappointment.

6.8. DENIAL OF GRANT OF TENURE

A faculty member who is not granted tenure during the sixth year of probationary appointment, including university-recognized credit for prior service, will receive a one-year terminal contract.

Proposal 4: Proposed Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Schedule/Calendar

Between April 1st and 30th, 20__	Spring RPT meeting with tenure track and provost. Open to all, but department chairs and RPT committees are specifically requested to attend. • This meeting is for the RPT applicants' questions.
Between August 1st and 14th, 20__	Fall RPT meeting with RPT Committees and the provost. Deans, department chairs and committee chairs are specifically requested to attend. • This meeting is for the RPT Committee members' questions
August 1, 20__	Candidates for reappointment, tenure, non-mandatory tenure review and promotion to full professor provide notification to the department chair and the dean of the intent to apply for tenure review or promotion to full. • Maybe we should create a form that can be completed to provide this intent
August 5, 20__	Dean notifies the provost of faculty applying for reappointment, tenure, non-mandatory tenure review and faculty seeking promotion to full professor. Office of the Provost then provides cover pages for these candidates.
August 10, 20__	Office of the Provost provides rosters and cover pages for candidates for reappointment, mandatory and non-mandatory tenure review, and promotion to full professor to college deans for distribution to departments.
August 15, 20__	Chair and membership of departmental RPT committee and, if applicable, the full professor committee due to the dean and the provost from the department chair.
August 15, 20__	Candidate's reappointment, tenure and promotion dossier due electronically to Department RPT Committee and, if applicable, full professor committee. Candidate will not be able to make changes to the dossier after 11:59 pm. • Both Associate and Full promotions
August 16, 20__	RPT Committees **and** Chairs access to the electronic dossier begins at 12:00 am. • The assumption that chairs do not need the RPT Committee's and full professor Committee's letters to draft their own.
October 31, 20__	Department RPT Committee and, if applicable, full professor committee recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion due to department chair by 11:59 pm. Letter is addressed to the department chair and sent in hard copy form with a copy to the candidate. • RPT Committee and, if applicable, full professor committee's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
October 31, 20__	Department chair's recommendation for reappointment, tenure and promotion due to the dean by 11:59 pm. Letter is addressed to the dean, sent in hard copy form, and copied to the Department RPT Committee members, if applicable, full professor committee and the candidate. • The chair's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
November 1, 20__	The deans, provost and president's access to the electronic dossier begins at 12:00 am. • Same assumption from above.
November 30, 20__	Dean's recommendations for reappointment, tenure and promotion due to the provost by 11:59 pm. Letter is addressed to the provost, sent in hard copy form, and copied to the department chair, the Department RPT Committee members, and the candidate. • The dean's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
December 15, 20__	Provost recommendation for reappointment, tenure and promotion due to the president. Letter is addressed to the president, sent in hard copy form with copies to the dean, department chair, and Department RPT Committee members with a copy to the candidate. The Office of the Provost uploads all letters into the electronic dossier. These letters remain a permanent part of the candidate's dossier. • The provost's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
March 1, 20__	President submits reappointment, promotion and tenure recommendations to the BOR. • The president's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm

3.   EVALUATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

3.1.   CRITERIA

In making evaluations required for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, three major categories of professional responsibility are to be used. These categories, in order of importance, are teaching effectiveness; scholarship and creative activity; and service to the University, the discipline/profession and the community.

All academic units must have specific guidelines concerning expectations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, what materials may be considered in each review category, what constitutes appropriate documentation, and how materials will be evaluated. All guidelines must be approved by a majority of the tenured / tenure-track faculty within the affected unit(s), the Chair or School Director, the Dean, and the Provost. Upon final approval by the Provost, all faculty within the affected units(s) must be notified and guidelines must be made available. All new faculty will be given a copy of these guidelines at the time of their hiring.

3.1.1   TEACHING

Teaching includes all work that is intended primarily to enhance student learning. Assessment of teaching effectiveness should take into account documented student learning, contact hours, preparations, service learning, delivery method, and/or number of students.

3.1.2   SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Scholarship and creative activity includes all work that is related to the applicant's academic discipline or current role at the University. To qualify as scholarship or creative activity, the activity should require a high level of discipline-related or interdisciplinary expertise, and meet the standards of the discipline for scholarly and creative activity. NKU values transdisciplinary scholarship, scholarship of teaching, and scholarship of engagement in addition to traditional scholarship and creative activity.

3.1.3   SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, THE DISCIPLINE/PROFESSION, AND/OR THE COMMUNITY

Service includes all work that contributes to the effective operation, governance, and advancement of programs, departments, schools, colleges, the University, one's discipline, and/or the community. Service also includes public engagement activities.

3.2.   PROCEDURES FOR DECISIONS ON REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

As stated in Kentucky law, all persons involved in evaluation of personnel shall consider all information received and all deliberations as confidential unless disclosure is required by law. For purposes of communication of written recommendations, electronic versions of the documents are acceptable replacements.

> **Commented [JF1]:** To allow for electronic communications rather than requiring hard copies. Should we prohibit electronic signatures? How should these electronic versions be disseminated? How should the originals be retained—by the department/school for committees and chair, but the offices of the dean and provost? What is current practice?

3.2.1   TIME SCHEDULE

Each spring, the provost will issue a calendar listing deadlines for each step in the evaluation process for the coming academic year, a template for dossier preparation, and notification of any updates to the process.

3.2.2   INITIATION OF REQUEST

The applicant is responsible for initiating consideration by applying for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or a combination of them. A full-time administrator with academic rank may apply for tenure or promotion supported by documentation. The applicant will compile an RPT dossier, including a cover sheet provided by the provost's office.

3.2.3. DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Each department or school shall have a reappointment, promotion, and tenure (hereinafter, RPT) committee consisting of at least five tenured faculty members elected at a regular or special department or school faculty meeting. Additionally for promotion committees, these five faculty members must be at least one rank above the level of the applicants. The RPT committee shall be formed from faculty within the department or school, if five or more tenured faculty of appropriate rank are available to serve. If there are not enough faculty members of appropriate rank available to form a committee of five, those faculty initially chosen to serve, in consultation with the department chair or school director, shall prepare a list of tenured faculty of appropriate rank from other departments or schools. When choosing additional faculty members, preference shall be given to faculty members in departments or schools with affinity to the applicant's department or school. The RPT committee will fill its membership by appointing faculty from this list.

The members of the committee shall elect their own chair. The committee chair shall notify the department chair or school director of committee membership within ten working days of election.

3.2.4. DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL COMMITTEE: ELIGIBILITY

All tenure-track faculty in the department or school are eligible to vote to elect the committee membership. Only tenured faculty may serve on the committee. The department chair or school director may not serve on the committee. Department chairs or school directors in other departments or schools may serve on the committee provided that they are in a different college. Assistant and associate deans with faculty appointments serving as administrators with reassigned time may serve on the committee provided that they are serving as administrators in a different college. Tenured faculty with appointments in more than one department/school or discipline may serve on the committee of any department/school or discipline in which they hold an appointment. Faculty on sabbatical or paid leave are eligible but not required to serve on the committee. Faculty on unpaid leave are not eligible to serve on the committee. The Faculty Senate President will not serve on a department/school RPT committee unless there is fewer than five eligible faculty members available, in which case the Faculty Senate President can serve but will not chair the committee.

Upon agreement of RPT committee members, the department chair or school director, the appropriate dean, and the applicant, faculty external to the University and of suitable rank and tenure may serve on the committee. Persons holding full-time administrative appointments, as defined in Section 1.8.1 are not eligible to serve on the committee.

In departments or schools where no faculty members are eligible to serve on a needed RPT committee, the department or school faculty shall serve in place of the department or school committee members to elect suitable RPT committee members.

3.2.5. DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL COMMITTEE: DELIBERATIONS

A quorum of an RPT committee shall be four-fifths (4/5) of its members; a quorum is required in order for the committee to act.

Material considered by the RPT committee must include, but may not be limited to, the applicant's submissions. The committee may consider supplemental material consistent with department/school guidelines that will aid in its decision. If material not submitted by the applicant is considered, the applicant must be notified of this material. As part of its deliberations, the RPT committee may meet with the applicant when such a meeting aids in the committee's decision process.

If an RPT committee requires clarification on any procedural matter, the committee should make this request to the respective department chair or school director. Committees should not ordinarily make requests to the dean, provost, university counsel, human resources, or any other university official or department.

3.2.6. DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL COMMITTEE: VOTING AND REPORTING

Nominally, each member of the committee, including the chair, shall have one vote for each applicant. In recognition of the importance of this process to the integrity of the institution, each member is expected to carefully review the relevant materials, participate as fully as possible in committee deliberations, and exercise their best professional judgment in voting either for or against a recommendation. Members may not vote to abstain. Proxy votes are acceptable if circumstances prevent a member from being physically present for the vote, provided the member reviewed the materials and participated in the committee deliberations. A member who has not reviewed the submitted materials or fully participated in committee discussion about an applicant cannot vote on the recommendation of that applicant. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to ascertain whether each member has fully participated in the committee discussions and review of each candidate to be eligible to vote. The chair will make an announcement to the committee and take note of who is eligible to vote. A quorum must be present for a vote to take place, and a minimum of 4 members must vote.

The recommendation of the committee shall be reported in writing to the department chair or school director and must be characterized as either unanimous or non-unanimous. The recommendation of the committee will reflect the committee's deliberations and must be signed by all committee members who voted. Members who did not vote should not sign the letter. In cases where the committee vote is not unanimous, support for both positive and negative votes must be included in the recommendation. In the case of a tie vote, the committee's recommendation will be deemed a positive recommendation. A copy of the recommendation will be given to the applicant. After receiving a negative recommendation from the committee, the applicant may elect within three business days to withdraw the application and terminate the RPT process. When a negative recommendation is made, the applicant shall be informed, in writing, of the right to request a formal reconsideration.

3.2.7. CHAIR/DIRECTOR

No sooner than three business days after receipt of the committee recommendation, the department chair or school director shall make a recommendation to the dean in writing. The chair or director may consult with the department or school committee prior to making a recommendation, but not with committee members individually. As part of his or her deliberations, the department chair or school director may meet with the applicant to aid in his or her decision. The chair or school director may consider supplemental material that is consistent with the department/school guidelines if it will aid in his/her decision. If material not submitted by the applicant is considered, this must be indicated in the recommendation. The reasons for the department chair's or school director's recommendation, whether positive or negative, shall be

Deleted: . A member voting to abstain will be considered to have not voted at all.

Deleted: However, a

Deleted: submitted by

Deleted: Immediately before the vote of each candidate, the committee chair will determine the eligibility of each committee member to vote on the recommendation.

Deleted: While a quorum must be present for the vote to take place, it is not necessary that 4 or more members participate in the vote.

Commented [JF2]: What happens in the circumstance that a quorum of 4 is present, but 4 are not prepared to vote? That is, they haven't fully participated and reviewed the candidate. Should there be an alternate? A faculty member who reviews the materials, and is prepared to discuss and vote, if called on.

Deleted: abstained or

Commented [JF3]: To remind committees of the responsibility to inform the candidate of their right to request a formal reconsideration.

Commented [JF4]: I have received information that this is required for the policy to be acceptable to the administration.

included in the recommendation. If the chair or school director relies on supplemental material that was not submitted with the RPT dossier to reach a different recommendation than the RPT committee, the dossier with supplemental information will be sent back to the RPT committee for reconsideration and comment. The faculty candidate will also receive the supplemental information and may include a comment, specific to the supplemental information, with the dossier. Written comment(s) from the faculty candidate and the RPT committee will be returned to the chair/director within 8 business days.

The department chair or school director shall forward his or her recommendation, the department or school committee's recommendation, and the applicant's file to the appropriate dean. A copy of the department chair's or school director's recommendation shall be given to the applicant and all members of the department or school committee.

3.2.8 DEAN

After receipt of the department chair's or school director's recommendation and the department or school committee's recommendation, the dean shall make a recommendation to the provost in writing. The reasons for the dean's recommendation, whether positive or negative, shall be included in the written recommendation. The dean may consult with the department or school committee and/or the department chair or school director prior to making a recommendation but not with individual committee members. As part of his or her deliberations, the dean may meet with the applicant to aid in his or her decision. In order to ensure fairness to the candidate, the dean may only consider material submitted in the candidate's RPT dossier. Supplemental material may not be considered.

The dean shall forward this recommendation, the department chair's or school director's recommendation, the department or school committee's recommendation, and the applicant's file to the provost. A copy of the dean's recommendation shall be given to the applicant, the department chair or school director, and all members of the department or school committee.

3.2.9. PROVOST

After receipt of the dean's recommendation, the department chair's or school director's recommendation, the department or school committee's recommendation, and the applicant's file, the provost shall make a written recommendation to the president. The reasons for the provost's recommendation, whether positive or negative, shall be included in the written recommendation. The provost may consult with the department or school committee, the department chair or school director, the dean, or with any combination of them but not with individual committee members. As part of his or her deliberations, the provost may meet with the applicant to aid in his or her. In order to ensure fairness to the candidate, provost may only consider material submitted in the candidate's RPT dossier. Supplemental material may not be considered.

A copy of the provost's recommendation shall be given to the applicant, the dean, the department chair or school director, and all members of the department committee.

3.2.10. PRESIDENT

The president will forward the provost's recommendation to the Board of Regents.

3.2.11. BOARD OF REGENTS

Reappointment, promotion, and tenure may be granted only by the Board of Regents, and then only upon the recommendation forwarded by the president of the University. The Board shall act in accordance with statutory requirements and the bylaws of the Board of Regents.

Deleted: In order to ensure fairness to the candidate, the chair or school director may only consider material submitted in the candidate's RPT dossier. Supplemental material may not be considered.

Commented [JF6]: It seems that the candidate should also be given the opportunity to comment on supplemental information if it is viewed negatively in the dossier.

Commented [JF7]: To give a time limit on the comment period. Is this the correct length of time?

Commented [JF8]: If supplemental information is considered and it results in an opposite recommendation than the committee, the committee and the candidate should have an opportunity to respond. If the supplemental information doesn't make a difference, its use should be noted, but it would not require a reconsideration by the committee. This section is to develop a mechanism for that to happen. Must the Provost and Dean be notified to reset the review timeline, as in a Formal Reconsideration.

Commented [JF9]: We are asking that the dossiers be opened early. Should there be controls on what can be done with it? For example, a chair and dean can review the materials, but must make a decision only after considering the previous recommendations? Is this captured by a timeline? The Chair can't issue a recommendation sooner than three days of receiving the RPT committee's recommendations.

3.2.12. NOTICE OF NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Notice of non-reappointment of a probationary contract must be in writing, by the provost, and given:

- Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service;
- At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service at the University.

3.2.13. FORMAL RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL

In the case of a negative recommendation concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure, or any combination of them, the applicant has the right to a formal reconsideration only at the level of the initial negative recommendation. An "initial" negative recommendation is defined as the first negative recommendation given for a particular reason. If a negative recommendation is subsequently given at a higher level for a different reason, it shall be considered an initial negative recommendation for the purpose of formal reconsideration. When a negative recommendation is first made, the applicant shall be informed, in writing, of the right to request a formal reconsideration.

In order to exercise this right, the affected applicant must request the reconsideration in writing within ten University working days of receipt of notification of the negative recommendation. The request and additional materials should be sent to the chair of the department/school committee or the person who made the initial negative recommendation. Upon receipt of the request for reconsideration, the chair of the department/school committee or the person who made the initial negative recommendation must send a copy of the request for reconsideration to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs for the purpose of resetting the review calendar for the applicant. The department/school committee or the person who made the initial negative recommendation shall complete the reconsideration within ten university working days of having received the request for reconsideration. The applicant and all previous levels of review shall be notified, in writing, of the decision reached, and the letter of reconsideration with additional submitted material and the reconsideration decision will be forwarded along with the dossier to the individual responsible for the next level of review.

During the process of reconsideration, the calendar for the recommendation is extended, and the next level of recommendation shall not consider the applicant's application until reconsideration is completed. Once the decision regarding formal reconsideration is reached, the process shall continue at the next level.

In the event of a reconsideration by the RPT committee, the procedures for the committee's deliberations, voting, and reporting will be the same procedures as specified in Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of this Handbook.

In the event the Provost makes a negative recommendation on an application for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or any combination of them, the applicant may appeal using the procedures set forth in Section 14, Grievances. The appeal must be initiated by the applicant within 15 university working days from receipt of the provost's notice.

3.2.14. WITHDRAWAL OF APPEAL

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

Deleted: , with any additional materials attached

Deleted: ,

Deleted: by sending t

Deleted: or

Deleted: Then,

Deleted: t

Deleted: or

Commented [JF11]: Should all of those at a previous level of review also be informed? How?

Commented [JF12]: By ten days since that is the timeline for reconsideration?

Deleted: T

A faculty member may withdraw an appeal at any time by request in writing. In that event, no further action may be taken concerning the appeal. In the case of denial of mandatory tenure, if an appeal from a negative recommendation or decision is withdrawn prior to a decision on the appeal, tenure cannot be recommended.

3.2.15. TIME

Unless otherwise specified in these procedures, whenever any recommendation or notice is to be given or conveyed, it shall be given or conveyed within 15 university working days of receipt of the file by the person who is to take action.