

Appendix C: Resolution submitted by an individual senator (not as a committee submission); the resolution has not been vetted or fact-checked.

Resolution – Post Tenure Review

Whereas, the Post Tenure Review (PTR) policies that began at NC State University in 1998 and extended for 17 years through 2015 gave decision making authority to Department Faculty Committees for determining if tenured professors met their job expectations;

Whereas, the Provost at NC State University released new Post Tenure Review (PTR) Policies at NC State University on July 20, 2015;

Whereas, those new PTR policies at NC State University transfer the final decision making authority regarding whether Faculty meet their Statement of Mutual Expectations (SMEs) from Faculty Committees to the administration—the Provost, Deans, and Department Heads.

Whereas, shifting final decision making authority for Post Tenure Review every five years from the Faculty to the Administration will repress open inquiry and discussion in research, teaching and outreach, undermining academic governance, freedom and tenure;

Whereas, UNC System Shared Governance standards (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2005/ND/Feat/veitsb.htm>) state that:

"The following document was adopted by the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina in April 2005. It applies to the sixteen campuses in the university system...

Faculty Governance Responsibilities

4. The faculty, through its designated representatives, must be consulted on any proposal to adopt or amend campus policies of reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and of posttenure review. It is expected that any such proposals will be initiated by the faculty, and that full opportunity for faculty analysis and discussion will be allowed before any modifications in such proposals are adopted.

5. The faculty, through its designated representatives, must be afforded full opportunity to review and approve faculty handbooks, academic policy manuals, and any institutional policy statements that affect the faculty's teaching, research, or conditions of employment.

6. For joint committees on which the faculty is represented: (a) faculty representation must appropriately reflect the degree of the faculty's stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing; and (b) the faculty members of joint committees must be selected in consultation with the elected faculty leadership or by processes approved by the senate."

Whereas, in the aforementioned PTR policy process, (1) the Faculty did not have full opportunity for analysis and discussion of PTR; (2) the Faculty were not afforded opportunity to review this policy that clearly affects our conditions of employment; nor (3) were Faculty adequately represented on the committee that drafted the PTR rule adopted this summer—with 5 of the 6 persons on the committee either being administrators or serving as an administrator, and only 1 Faculty member.

Whereas, on April 21, 2015, regarding PTR rules, the NC State University Faculty Senate debated the PTR rules and voted that: “Where Dean and College disagree it should go to a college faculty PTR Committee – 15 votes; Send the two options of Provost or College Committee to the [Provost’s PTR rule drafting] working group and let them decide – 5 votes. The new rules promulgated by the Provost are not consistent with this vote, and the Faculty at NC State have not had any more opportunity to redress this unsatisfactory process and PTR rule.

Be it, therefore, resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the new Post Tenure Review rules be rewritten with Faculty Committees at the College Level—not persons serving in Administrative roles—having the designated authority for the final decisions for determining if Faculty meet their Statement of Expectations (SMEs).