

## FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 22, 2024

**Members and Officers present:** Terrance Anderson, Janel Bloch, Andrea Brooks, Carole Cangioni, Ronnie Chamberlain, David Childs, Josh Cooper, Joe Cress, Chris Curran, Rebecca Elkins, Jacqueline Emerine, John Farrar (Senate President), Richard Fox, Kathleen Fuegen, Steven Gores, Lisa Holden, Stephen Johnson, Boshra Karimi, Edward Kwon, Christopher Lawrence, Jitana Lee, Zeel Maheshwari, Marcos Misis, Nikk Pilato, Michael Providenti, Robert Salyer, Hans Schellhas, Sandra Spataro, Jessica Taylor, Brandelyn Tosolt, Zach Wells, Kim Yates, Junxiu Zhou

**Members and Officers absent:** Ryan Alverson, Jason Applegate, Ginger Blackwell, William Boyce, Irene Encarnacion, William Herzog, Ken Katkin, Isabelle Lagadic, Kajsa Larson, Jennifer McLeod, Monica Wakefield

**Guests:** Cady Short-Thompson (President), Diana McGill (Provost), Amanda Andrews (Staff Congress), Grace Hiles (Faculty Senate Office), Bethany Bowling, Brooke Buckley, Vicki Cooper, Gina Fieler, Jeffrey Fox, John Gibson, Hassan HassabElnaby, Kristin Hornsby, Suk-hee Kim, Yasue Kuwahara, Madhura Kulkarni, Alar Lipping, Danielle McDonald, Nile Patterson, Shauna Reilly, Holly Riffe, Amal Said, Donna Smith, Emily Taylor, Jason Vest, Karen Vietz, Delores White, Diane Williams

### Call to Order, Adoption of Agenda

The meeting was called to order by Senate President John Farrar at 3:06pm with a quorum present. The agenda was adopted as distributed.

### Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the March 25, 2024 meeting were approved as distributed.

### Guest Reports:

- **President** (Cady Short-Thompson):
  - The Presidential Investiture is this Friday. There will be students performing and Jim Votruba will be the keynote speaker.
  - Young Scholars Academy: NKU had asked the state for funding support. NKU runs this program at a deficit and NKU contributes more than our partners. Still seeking a complete financial analysis of the program. YSA students come to NKU with 50-51% retention. Need to ensure YSA is performing as well as it can. Working with superintendents to discuss cost sharing. Also working with private donors. This is an access issue as well as a workforce development issue. YSA is continuing next year. The Regents are concerned about continuing the program as-is. The hope is to protect this program and make it better.
  - Women's Basketball: Jeff Hans named new coach. He is devoted to the academic part of the student athlete.
  - FAFSA: Waiting with the rest of the country regarding FAFSA. We are starting to get some information to package.

- We are considerably up in paid confirmations but down in overall confirmations compared to last year. Superintendents are being encouraged to continue working with us. The estimate for fall enrollment is flat.
- CFO Chris Calvert is working to tie the budget to the financial statements. A budget forum on 5/1/24 will be presented by the President and CFO. The entire cabinet will be there to answer questions.
- Working on tuition and scholarships. Working to make it easier to understand our tuition rate with scholarships and discount awards.
- QUESTIONS:
  - Commencement schedule – people attend church on Sunday. Has there been any consideration to push the semester back a week?  
ANSWER: There are interesting questions about schedules on the horizon. Some people have asked about 14-week schedules. Would like to hear input from faculty.
  - Do we need a working group to create a universal code of conduct that would apply to the classroom and extracurricular activities?  
ANSWER: It would be an interesting exercise to determine what the standard is and how we could all treat each other well.
  - Is there an update on strategic planning listening sessions?  
ANSWER: Sessions are this week (Wednesday and Thursday). Bonita Brown will lead some listening events around the strategic plan. The discussion will center on continuing the three elements of Success by Design. The cabinet has been asked to consider adding a fourth element, what things have been languishing and need planning? Ideas mentioned included IT, remuneration, equity, cost-of-living increases, culture, and wellness.
  - Are we considering tweaks to Success by Design or a new plan?  
ANSWER: We are going to keep working on Success by Design and add a fourth area. At the end of the three years we can look to envision the future in bigger ways. We need health before growth.
- **Provost (Diana McGill):**
  - Early Childhood Center: There was a response to the RFP, they have been on campus, the Provost is going to visit one of their sites, and there is work on a draft contract to begin negotiations. Necessary renovations must happen; trying to determine the best timing.
  - Orientation: Orientation had been moved out of Admissions and into Student Affairs. Orientation is now back in Admissions with the intentional inclusion of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The agenda was scaled to fit into one day.
  - The search for VP of Student Affairs position will be opened. This will be a cabinet level position that will report to the Provost and the Executive VP of Academic Affairs. Using a combination of vacancies and operating funds to fund the position.
  - QUESTIONS:
    - How soon will the VP of Student Affairs position be filled?  
ANSWER: As quickly as we can.
- **Faculty Regent (Sandra Spataro):**

- Happy to have the legislative session finished.
- Faculty Senate President congratulated Faculty Regent Spataro on being elected to a 3-year term.
- **Staff Congress Representative** (Amanda Andrews):
  - Finishing up administrative evaluations.
  - In the middle of Staff Regent elections.
  - Staff Congress elections have started and will finish 5/3/24.
  - There will be ~~new~~ new staff orientation in June.
  - There will be an End-of-year party on 5/7/24 3-5pm in the SU Ballroom.
- **SGA Representative** (Lucy Burns)
  - SGA representative excused due to SGA business.

#### Officer Reports:

- **Senate President** (John Farrar):
  - In the comment period for administrator evaluations. The Executive Committee has redacted some comments on the evaluations. There is a 14-day period for comments after which the comments will be collated and forwarded to their supervisors. After a few days, the evaluations will be available for viewing in the Faculty Senate office.
  - A group is looking at workload issues. There is a draft document working toward creating a workload policy.
- **Vice President** (Jacqueline Emerine):
  - No report.
- **Faculty Advocate** (Brandelyn Tosolt):
  - No report.
- **Secretary** (Michael Providenti):
  - No report.
- **Graduate Council Chair**: (Ginger Blackwell):
  - No report.

#### Committee Reports:

- **University Curriculum Committee** (Richard Fox):
  - We had our final UCC meeting of the academic year last Thursday. We approved 37 graduate items (all from education) that will make it into the graduate catalog. We also approved new bylaws which will come to senate next month for approval. We will start up again the first Thursday in September and I intend to continue to meet by zoom.
  - We have had 11 submissions for the SLO repository consisting of submissions from 2 departments in A&S, 3 schools in CHHS and both schools in COI and a total of 36 different designators. We will host the repository on the inside UCC web site. I will get these posted sometime in the next couple of weeks and I will send out an email on the UCC listserv to inform everyone on that mailing list when they are ready for access. I hope to have all of the rest of the SLOs submitted by this time next year.
  - Please remind your chairs, program directors and advisors that once the catalogs go live to proofread your sections. Some minor errors we can fix quickly without going through

the curriculum process, especially if the errors are with implementing the curricular changes in the catalog and SAP. If there are errors on your end, most will have to go through the process starting in the fall.

- **Budget** (Janel Bloch):
  - Budget Committee hasn't met since the last Faculty Senate meeting.
  - The next meeting has been moved to 5/8/24.
  
- **Benefits** (Rebecca Elkins):
  - Patty Burke from HR attended the last meeting.
  - Benefits Committee is continuing to get questions and concerns about insurance coverage.
  - There will be an RFP for dental insurance. People have experienced that their dentists are dropping Delta Dental or are moving to private pay insurance within their own practice.
  - Other concerns include vision, routine care, and infertility coverage.
  - If you have very specific questions about coverage, please take them to Patty Burke, not the Benefit's Committee.
  - There was a discussion about salaries and inflation.
  
- **Professional Concerns** (Kathleen Fuegen):
  - The PCC is discussing a proposed change to Section 3.2 of the Faculty Handbook (Procedures for Decisions on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure). The primary question under consideration is, may a candidate under review share their own dossier and any recommendation letters with persons who are not serving on their RPT committee? Section 3.2 currently states "...all persons involved in evaluation of personnel shall consider all information received and all deliberations as confidential..." We recognize that a candidate "owns" their own dossier and is free to share its contents. However, recommendation letters (e.g., from chairs, directors, deans, provost, external reviewers) become part of the dossier over the review period. May a candidate share a recommendation letter, or would this be considered a breach of confidentiality? There may be good reasons for a candidate to share a letter. For example, as Matthew Zacate suggested, one can imagine a situation where an RPT committee could habitually abuse the system without the knowledge of the colleagues who elect members of that committee if a candidate is not permitted to share RPT letters..
  
  - QUESTIONS:
    - Are there situations where it would not be appropriate to share RPT documents?  
ANSWERS: Some departments use external reviewers who write their reviews with an expectation of privacy. They could be upset if their letters were posted to social media.
    - Is the discussion limited to section 3.2 or will other sections be discussed?  
ANSWER: Currently, only section 3.2 is being discussed but there is a possibility that a new section may need to be created.
    - Is there any way to prevent items in Canvas from being shared? Possibly unpublish those things?

ANSWER: That question can be taken back to the committee for consideration.

- **TEEC** (Christopher Lawrence):
  - The final meeting of the semester is Wednesday to finalize the syllabus template and the undergraduate and graduate common syllabi.
  - There was a discussion with CETI about Canvas subaccounts. CETI will reach out to UK and UCF. Getting their feedback on the use of subaccounts and the outcomes.
  
- **General Education Committee** (Andrea Brooks):
  - The GEC met twice in April and has wrapped up committee work. An email newsletter went out last week that shared a summary of the committee's work this year and information related to the assessment process. I will reiterate a couple of points.
    - A new assessment cycle will begin in the Fall. For those teaching/coordinating gen ed courses, know that we'll follow the same order as the prior cycle and so those teaching in the Oral and Written Communication category and Culture and Creativity category will be assessed next year – in the Fall. There will be more specific information sent to those who teach a course in those categories and those who coordinate multiple sections of courses in those categories. In the next cycle, there are a couple of revisions:
      - First, instructors will score their students and submit those scores to us. Most instructors did this previously, but not everyone. We are encouraging departments to work together. The committee had a lot of thoughtful discussion around this, and there may be some departments that work together to accomplish this work.
      - Second, we revised the Close the Loop form. It's a little more detailed and specific as to what we are looking for. We hope this provides a better space for folks who are teaching these courses to reflect on the gen ed learning outcomes and improvements related to those outcomes.
    - We also approved new bylaws that will come to Senate for the May meeting.
  - Finally, I would like to thank all the committee members from this last year. It really was a productive year – they put in time to review in-depth course proposals and assessment forms. This went beyond the scope of just attending meetings, this group did work and I want to acknowledge that and thank them for that.
  
- **School Representative Workgroup** (Chris Curran and Jacqueline Emerine)
  - Everyone has had enough time to look at the concept paper and the workgroup has received a little bit of feedback.
  - The next step of rewriting the Faculty Senate Constitution has started.
  - The workgroup would like to share the revised draft of the Constitution with Ken Katkin for his input before bringing the draft back to Faculty Senate.
  - The workgroup is trying to come up with a general term for academic units under the level of college. Adding some language about where RPT decisions are made might help to clarify the document.
  - There is time so that whatever language is decided regarding the NTT proposal can be added to this document.

**New Business:**

- Discussion item from Benefits Committee: Handbook Section 11.4.4 changes, Faculty Development Awards evaluation criteria.
  - The proposed changes are to make the development awards more intuitive in the Handbook and to make it easier when scoring applications.
  - There are fewer criteria in the revised draft of 11.4.4 as some criteria in the original were similar and were combined into new criteria.
  - A section on “Inclusion of Support Documents” was added.
  - To the section on how preference will be given, a fourth criteria was added: “simultaneous, co-dependent applications.” This is for a situation in which, for example, a grant would be necessary to complete the work of a sabbatical.
  - DISCUSSION:
    - Have the application forms been revised to make it clear when applications are co-dependent?  
ANSWER: Yes, the application forms have been updated. The actual criteria will be updated in the next meeting.
    - What was the rationale behind moving some of the criteria? Example “urgency” went from j to c.  
ANSWER: It isn’t a matter of priority. It was a matter of grouping criteria together that are considered in unison. It’s also easier for the applicant.
    - Suggestion made to modify “h) Inclusion of support documents” to “h) Inclusion of *specified* support documents.”
  - ACTION: This will be a VOTING ITEM in the May Faculty Senate Meeting.
- Discussion item from PCC: Handbook Section 1.3, 1.4, and 1.7.2 changes. Definitions of faculty status.
  - The PCC has thoroughly considered this matter. PCC voted to approve these changes but the vote was not unanimous.
  - The proposal would change the terms used to define NTT faculty. NTTR titles would be replaced with Full-time Teaching Faculty. There would be three ranks: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor.
  - The terms of appointment would change. Currently, appointments are one year. The new terms would be 2 years or 3 years depending on the rank of the Teaching Professor.
  - NTTT titles would change to Visiting Assistant Teaching Professor, Visiting Associate Teaching Professor, and Visiting Teaching Professor.
  - Faculty currently called Visiting Professors in the Handbook would be known as Guest Faculty.
  - Considerations included the impact on tenure-line faculty. Arguments were made that the changes would blur the distinction between faculty on the tenure track and those who are not. Objections were made that extending contract lengths to 2-3 years could have a negative impact on tenure line faculty during budget years that require cuts. There were also concerns that these changes don’t take into account the terminal degrees that faculty not on tenure lines have.
  - The final decision of the PCC was that we should not define faculty by what they are not.
  - The PCC was swayed by the argument that the work that faculty do should be the primary contributor to the terms we use to describe those faculty.

- There are broader issues related to respect. A change to the Handbook cannot mandate that faculty respect one another. This change is an initial step in that direction.
- DISCUSSION:
  - A senator spoke in favor of the proposal: NTT faculty work for less pay, zero protection, and no opportunity for advancement. The proposal will help to more adequately represent what NTT faculty do. NTT faculty and many TT faculty support this proposal. Other universities refer to faculty not holding terminal degrees with professor in their titles, including UC. Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors of Practice are not required to do research or hold terminal degrees. It was recognized that NKU's non-R1 benchmarks do not yet do this. This proposal provides a stronger pathway for faculty both personally and professionally. When cuts were made last year, TT faculty were given an option to leave with a year of severance while NTT faculty were made to leave with no severance. It makes a difference to be able to use Teaching Professor instead of Lecturer on a CV. The battle for tenure will focus on the need for academic freedom and avoiding its abuse. NKU is a teaching university. Job descriptions and workloads will also need to be examined.
  - A senator spoke of a history in their department of supporting all faculty and that we are all teachers.
  - Feedback from NTTs suggested that more security and longer contracts is the highest importance.
  - Question about the term "Visiting." There is concern that at most institutions, Visiting means coming from outside to an institution to teach after which they would return to a home institution.
    - The term Visiting has also been applied to Interim positions, some of which last many years. Indiana State and Indiana University cited as examples.
  - If this motion passes in May, it would go to the Provost and to the Board for their June meeting. If passed, it would go into effect next academic year.
  - What would be the impact on faculty already in these positions? Would there be raises? Would faculty need to reapply for their jobs?
    - Raises are not a part of the proposal. If approved, the administration would need to work on the implementation. The expectation is that faculty would not need to reapply for their jobs. Administrators will need to determine how faculty are grandfathered into these new titles.
    - Departments will need time to create criteria for the different ranks before implementation.
    - Will there be new responsibilities that come with new titles? Responsibilities need to be reasonable.
  - If passed by the Faculty Senate, could the administration approve only part of the proposal?
    - The President can accept or reject the proposal. If rejected it will be sent back to Faculty Senate with the reasons why it was rejected.
- ACTION: This will be a VOTING ITEM in the May Faculty Senate Meeting. The Faculty Senate President will try to determine how the transition might work if the proposal is approved.

**Old Business:**

- None at this time.

**Announcements (John Farrar):**

- The End of Year Party is on 5/7/24.
- Please attend the Strategic Planning Listening Sessions Wednesday 4/24/24 and Thursday 4/25/24.
- The Presidential Investiture is this Friday 4/26/24 at 2pm.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Providenti  
Secretary



Feb 27, 2024

# Statement from the PCC Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on NTT Faculty

---

**Concerning round two of recommendations for the CA&S proposal on “changes to Faculty Handbook policies 1.3 (Full-time non-tenure-track renewable faculty) and 1.4 (Full-time non-tenure-track temporary faculty)” introduced Oct. 5, 2023:**

The subcommittee’s initial recommendations (discussed Feb. 15) were an attempt to address and bring together solutions to a variety of matters of concern that were raised over many meetings regarding the proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences. Those recommendations were seen by many as not being in support of improvements for faculty in current NTTR/T roles, which certainly was not the intent. The discussion about the recommendations revealed a wide range of views that helped the subcommittee better recognize the reasons for some of the choices in the original proposal; therefore, the subcommittee wishes to offer this revised proposal and to emphasize a position of support for faculty affected by the proposed changes.

We were particularly surprised by the level of discussion on the position titles themselves. A wide variety of titles and contract types for teaching and professional faculty can be found across institutions nationally, including inconsistencies of the same title defining different contract types, as well as different titles defining the same contract type. While this presents to us a challenge in selecting appropriate titles for various faculty roles, it also presents us with the opportunity to choose in a way that reinforces NKU’s core values of **inclusiveness** and **collegiality**. For NKU faculty to feel valued, titles should appropriately represent their training, expertise, professional experience, and offerings to their fields of study and to NKU. Furthermore, all NKU faculty should be treated with respect and fairly compensated for their contributions regardless of title designation. As the NKU Faculty Handbook declares, without regard to contract category: “Faculty are professionals employed by Northern Kentucky University ... to perform teaching and other academic responsibilities commensurate with the missions and goals of the University.”

With these thoughts in mind, we submit this substantial revision of our proposal.

# Proposal for Faculty Handbook Revision from the PCC Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on NTT Faculty

---

\*Note: differences between existing Handbook policy and proposed policy are highlighted.

## 1.3. FULL-TIME TEACHING FACULTY

Full-time Teaching faculty hold the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor. Teaching faculty perform full-time teaching and service duties as stipulated by the University and their appointment form. Teaching faculty are not appointed to a probationary or tenured position, and at no point will accrue time toward tenure.

Faculty holding a teaching appointment are generally hired as an Assistant Teaching Professor with a minimum one-year appointment. Subsequent teaching faculty contracts are renewed for an additional two (Assistant Teaching Professor) or three (Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor) year appointment, contingent on positive annual performance reviews as well as support from the department/program chair and dean/director/vice provost. The performance review process is on the normal schedule, based upon duties as stipulated in the appointment form. Notification of non-renewal of appointment must be made to the faculty member by March 31.

Faculty holding teaching appointments are employed as the result of an internal or external search process. At the end of five years in the position, a full-time Assistant Teaching Professor is eligible for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. After five years in the position, an Associate Teaching Professor is eligible for a promotion to Teaching Professor. Criteria for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor will be established in writing by each academic unit, subject to the approval of the appropriate dean, director, or vice provost.

The recommendation for promotion will be made by the head of the academic unit, with input from the faculty, during the normal performance review in the fifth year (Associate Teaching Professor) or tenth year (Teaching Professor) of the faculty member's appointment, or in subsequent years in case of a negative recommendation. The recommendation (positive or negative) will be forwarded to the appropriate dean, director, or vice provost, who will make the final decision.

#### 1.4. FULL-TIME VISITING FACULTY

Full-time visiting faculty hold the rank appropriate to their credentials and teaching experience. Normally the appointment rank will be Visiting Assistant Teaching Professor, Visiting Associate Teaching Professor, or Visiting Teaching Professor. Visiting faculty will perform full-time duties as stipulated by the University, but they are not appointed to a probationary or tenured position. At no point will appointees to these positions accrue time toward tenure.

Full-time visiting faculty are expected to carry a full course load and to perform all the duties associated with these teaching responsibilities. Departments/schools may invite them to faculty meetings and may involve them in appropriate committees; they are expected to attend any meetings related to their teaching. Any other assignments or responsibilities should be specified by the department/program chair at the time of appointment and are subject to the approval of the dean, director or vice provost. Departments/schools may use this category to employ faculty who have no teaching responsibilities, e.g., grant supported researchers or postdoctoral associates.

Faculty holding a visiting appointment are appointed on a one-year basis. A visiting faculty position appointment may be made after consultation between the department/program chair and the dean, director, or vice provost, with approval by the provost. Visiting faculty appointments are one-year, temporary, terminal appointments that can be repeated.

Full-Time Visiting Faculty are provided with Social Security contributions by the University. In addition, health insurance is provided by the University if the appointment is full-time for the complete academic year. If the appointment is full-time for less than one complete academic year, health insurance is provided by the University as needed to comply with local, state, or federal laws or regulations.

#### 1.7.2. Guest Faculty

Guest faculty are persons who hold a temporary appointment for an academic year, a semester, or a shorter term, as designated in their letter of appointment. Normally such persons hold a faculty appointment at another university or college. Such persons hold an appropriate rank preceded by the designation "guest."

# Current Faculty Handbook Text

## **1.3. FULL-TIME, NON-TENURE-TRACK, RENEWABLE (NTTR) FACULTY**

Full-time, non-tenure-track renewable (NTTR) faculty hold the rank of Lecturer and perform full-time duties as stipulated by the University in their appointment form, but they are not appointed to a probationary or tenured position. At no point will appointees to these positions accrue time toward tenure.

Faculty holding a non-tenure-track, renewable (NTTR) appointment are generally appointed on a year-by-year basis following performance review. The performance review process is on the normal schedule, based upon duties as stipulated in the appointment form. Notification of non-renewal of appointment must be made to the faculty member by March 31. Faculty holding non-tenure-track, renewable (NTTR) appointments are employed as the result of an internal or external search process. At the end of five years in the position, a full-time NTTR lecturer is eligible for promotion to Lecturer II. After five years in the position, a Lecturer II is eligible for a promotion to Senior Lecturer. Criteria for promotion to Lecturer II and Senior Lecturer will be established in writing by each academic unit, subject to the approval of the appropriate dean (or program director). A record of satisfactory performance in teaching is a necessary requirement for promotion. The recommendation for promotion will be made by the head of the academic unit, in consultation with the faculty, during the normal performance review in the fifth year (in the case of Lecturer II) and tenth year (in the case of Senior Lecturer) of the lecturer's appointment, or in subsequent years in case of a negative recommendation. The recommendation (positive or negative) will be forwarded to the appropriate dean (or program director), who will make the final decision.

Non-tenure-track, renewable (NTTR) faculty holding the rank of Instructor before the 1994 adoption of this Handbook by the Board of Regents shall retain that rank. After the adoption of this Handbook by the Board of Regents, non-tenure-track, renewable faculty shall hold only the rank of Lecturer for the entire length of their appointment.

## **1.4. FULL-TIME, NON-TENURE TRACK, TEMPORARY (NTTT) FACULTY**

Full-time, non-tenure-track, temporary (NTTT) faculty hold the rank appropriate to their credentials and teaching experience. Normally the appointment rank will be lecturer, adjunct professor, or visiting professor. Temporary faculty will perform full-time duties as stipulated by the University, but they are not appointed to a probationary or tenured position. At no point will appointees to these positions accrue time toward tenure.

These faculty are expected to carry a full course load and to perform all of the duties associated with these teaching responsibilities. Departments/schools may invite them to faculty meetings and may involve them in appropriate committees; they are expected to attend any meetings related to their teaching. Any other assignments or responsibilities should be specified by the department chair/school director at the time of appointment and are subject to the approval of the dean (or program director). Departments/schools may use this category to employ faculty who have no teaching responsibilities, e.g., grant supported researchers or postdoctoral associates.

Faculty holding a non-tenure-track, temporary (NTTT) appointment are appointed on a one-year basis. A temporary position appointment may be made as a result of consultation between the department chair/school director and the dean, with approval by the provost. Temporary appointments are one-year, temporary, terminal appointments that can be repeated. Lecturers holding one-year, temporary, terminal appointments before the 1994 adoption of this Handbook by the Board of Regents may be appointed to new one-year, temporary, terminal appointments, regardless of the number of past appointments, if such positions are available and if their past performance warrants reappointment. No additional notice of non-renewal of appointment is necessary.

Non-tenure-track, temporary (NTTT) faculty are provided with Social Security contributions by the University. In addition, health insurance is provided by the University if the appointment is full-time for the complete academic year. If the appointment is full-time for less than one complete academic year, health insurance is provided by the University as needed to comply with local, state, or federal laws or regulations.

### **1.7.2. Visiting Faculty**

Visiting faculty are persons who hold a temporary appointment for an academic year, a semester, or a shorter term, as designated in their letter of appointment. Normally such persons hold a faculty appointment at another university or college. Such persons hold an appropriate rank preceded by the designation "visiting."

## FDA EVALUATION CRITERIA for HANDBOOK

**APPROVED - NEW - UPDATED**

### 11.4.4. Evaluation

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- b) Overall quality of the proposal;
- c) The urgency of the project to be undertaken;
- d) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline;
- e) The value, utility, merit or worth of the project (to be measured in terms of applicant's growth and/or professional status, teaching responsibilities an students, scholarship/creative activity and scholarly community, the university and non-academic community);
- f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);
- g) Investigation of alternative funding sources and other commitments;
- h) Inclusion of support documents.

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; third, to a candidate who received a program award the longest time ago; and, fourth, faculty who have submitted simultaneous, co-dependent applications.

**Quality (a-d) = 50%; Value (e) = 30%; Diligence (f-h) = 20%**

### OLD FDA CRITERIA

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- b) The value of the project to the applicant's growth and professional status; the value of the project to the scholarly community;
- c) The value of the project to the applicant's teaching responsibilities and students;
- d) The value of the project to the University;
- e) The value of the project to the non-academic community;
- f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);
- g) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline;
- h) Contribution of the project to the applicant's ongoing scholarship or creative activity;
- i) Investigation of alternative funding sources;
- j) The urgency of the project to be undertaken; and
- k) Overall quality of the proposal.

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; and, third, to a candidate who received a program award the longest time ago.

**CHANGES were approved by 92% of the Benefits Committee on 3.13.24**

**11.4.4. Evaluation**

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- b) Overall quality of the proposal; **Moved up in criteria order from k to b**
- c) The urgency of the project to be undertaken; **Moved up in criteria order from j to c**
- d) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline; **Moved up in criteria order from g to d**
- e) The value, utility, merit or worth of the project (to be measured in terms of applicant's growth and/or professional status, teaching responsibilities an students, scholarship/creative activity and scholarly community, the university and non-academic community); **(Moved down in criteria order; Change letter from b to e; combined the original b-e and h- and Removed original h)- Changed in Verbiage & added parentheticals**
- f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);
- g) Investigation of alternative funding sources and other commitments;
- h) **Inclusion of support documents. New criteria added**

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; third, to a candidate who received a program award the longest time ago; and, **fourth, faculty who have submitted simultaneous, co-dependent applications. New criteria added**

**Quality (a-d) = 50%; Value (e) = 30%; Diligence (f-h) = 20%**