

## **Academic Policy Committee Meeting Minutes September 12, 2017**

**Present:** PK Lim, Darby Orcutt, , Greg Young, Sarah Ash, Beth Hawkins

**Absent:** Sid Thakur, Neal Parker, Helmut Hergeth, Robert Hayes, Deniz Eseryl, Sophia Katharioiu, David Auerbach

**Guest:** Katharine Stewart, (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs), Laquore Meadows (ACE Fellow)

**Topic:** Update on the recommendations of the SME task force.

The task force was convened by the Provost to examine, and recommend remedies to, inconsistencies across departments relative to the RPT process that are perceived to create inequities among faculty. It was made up predominately of faculty, with some department heads. A preliminary presentation of its findings/recommendations was made to the Personnel Policy Committee last year. The Provost has now approved its recommendations and Dr. Stewart is working on how those will impact the relevant rules, regulations, and policies.

The first recommendation is to change the name of the Statement of Mutual Expectations (SME) to the Statement of Faculty Responsibility (SFR).

Rationale:

1. There is actually a limited degree of mutuality, especially, from the standpoint of the faculty member.
2. SMEs were being used more like an offer letter, e.g., with promises of support, which was never its intent.

It is also being recommend that the SFR be completed more quickly; currently departments/faculty can have up to 12 months; recommendation is for a 3 month maximum.

Coupled with the change in name is the development of an on-line reporting tool to standardize the process. This would require estimating the percent of effort across all 6 realms of responsibility and must add up to 100%. It will not be tied to funding sources. The goal is to capture what faculty responsibilities really are (e.g., time spent on mentoring), which is critical for RPT considerations.

Is not a time and effort and therefore does not run afoul of auditing issues.

On-line aspect will facilitate annual reporting and will be able to track any changes with their justification. Will be built within the framework of the RPT on-line presence. May come back to the committee for beta testing. Also building a post tenure review on-line format.

Will be a requirement that the SFR be part of the documentation sent to external evaluators. Faculty can be adversely affected, specially if they have a unique appointment within their appointment; it is hoped that this will make it more clear to outside reviewers what the faculty's true responsibilities are.

These changes will require changes in several regulations and policies. Many will be editorial (e.g., SME and SFR changes) – do they need to come to Faculty Senate for approval? No.

But there will also be more substantive changes that should come to the senate, E.g., Statement of ME will have to be completely redone. 6 realms defs do not exist for NTT, therefore cannot currently apply to NTT. Therefore should provide those defs within the SFR reg.

Are irregularities with how NTT are considered for promotion E.g. from lecturer to professorial NTT. This is an opportunity to fix that.

Appointment reappointment and tenure policies will also have substantive changes. Will also need to go to BOT.

Every department/college will likewise have to change local rules from SME to SFR. KS's office is agreeing to drafting those changes and send those to the heads for approval so faculty don't have to spend time on this effort. Can leave it up to the discretion of the department head to bring to faculty for review.

Time line:

Will be dependent on development of on-line tool. Task Force sees the on-line module as the way to support the consistency that they saw as problematic. So the regs won't go into effect until the module is ready.

But want to be ready to go once the module is ready. Want to therefore give the heads a heads up that it's coming, have all the documents red-lined and ready to go.

Dossiers for 2018 will still meet SME v. SFR. Want to minimize distraction and disruption for faculty going thru the RPT process.

Question: How much of this is due to BOG interference re assessment of faculty?

Answer: Is very much a product of the local task force. In addition, BOG feels positively about faculty at NCSU.

Communication plan would also include best practices videos for department heads and DVF.

Will check with Exec Committee to see if Personnel Policy should also hear about this.