

Standing Committee
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Lifelong Faculty Involvement Committee Minutes
Tuesday, March 1, 2022, 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM
Via ZOOM

<https://ncsu.zoom.us/j/97839819918?pwd=ckVjSVhWeXJlbiQ5RGpNRE5iV3FWQT09>

Roll Call (6 members needed for a quorum)

Jeannette Moore	P	David Thuente	P
Hans Kellner	P	Kerry Havner	P
Danesha Seth Carley	A	Jeremy Lea	A
Peggy Domingue	P	Susan Osborne (ex officio)	P
Sujit Ghosh	A	Katharine Stewart (ex officio)	P
Qiuyun (Jenny) Xiang	P	Garath Washington (ex officio)	P
Randall Bechtolt	P		

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Jeannette Moore at 4:01 p.m. It was determined that a quorum was present and the meeting could conduct business.

1. It was advised that the meeting would be recorded for use in capturing the Minutes and not shared publicly.
2. The [November 30, 2021](#) Minutes were approved. Motion to approve by Peggy Domingue and seconded by Dr. Hans Kellner and passed unanimously.
 - a. A correction from the [November 30, 2021](#) Minutes, item #3 was made regarding the title for Peggy Dominique.
3. Update of ARF's website and Provost's Office website linking to source websites.
 - a. Dr. Osborne shared that ARF's website had been updated; however, no major changes have been made.
 - b. Dr. Stewart shared that no substantial changes have been made from the Provost's Office; however, discussion regarding updates to the website will be held within the next few weeks. Should those changes affect anything in the portfolio concerning the committee, Dr. Stewart will share the information.
4. Update of ARF Board Meeting regarding the proposed revision to the Emerit/us/a/ex policy.
 - a. Dr. Osborne attended the ARF Board Meeting and shared her takeaways from the meeting.

- i. It was mentioned that there was a lot of confusion from college to college and perhaps department to department regarding how to get Emeritus/Emerita status.
 - ii. There is strong support for a robust widely used single approach to requesting Emeritus status.
 - iii. Emeritus status does not get revoked unless there are unpleasant circumstances.
 - b. Dr. Moore attended the ARF Board Meeting and shared her takeaways from the meeting.
 - i. It was mentioned that sometimes faculty members go on to be Administrators in different colleges than where they started, and that they may want to hold Emeritus status back in their old college.
 - ii. Faculty should be allowed to choose which of the departments and colleges they came from to be their home for Emeritus.
 - iii. There were concerns about the variation from department to department and college to college that sometimes it was perceived that deserving faculty were not recommended for Emeritus status.
 - c. Dr. Stewart attended the ARF Board Meeting and shared her takeaways from the meeting.
 - i. The university needs to be sure that they give faculty members who are coming forward for Emeritus status the choice of where they are holding their Emeritus status if they have served in multiple academic units.
 - ii. Clarifying the eligibility requirements for Emeritus status - the policy states that to qualify for Emeritus status, one must have served in a faculty role for 10 years and be recommended by the Department Head and/or Dean.
 - 1. The criteria from the way that it is written is that you must have served 10 years.
 - 2. The process states that you have to be recommended by your Department Head and/or Dean.
 - 3. The discussion from the ARF Board Meeting leaned toward faculty preferring that the “recommendation” part of the policy be removed from the process; meaning that any faculty member who retires with 10 years or more of service would be flagged either by the University Human Resource Office or the Provost Office. In this case, it would be the University Human Resource Office as this type of data does not live in the Provost Office. From that, the central unit would make sure that the Emeritus request was processed; essentially taking the Department Head and Dean out of the “recommendation” process.

- iii. Question: To what extent was the proposal that the Department Head and Dean would be involved in the process at all or was the proposal to take the Department Head and Dean out of the process entirely?
 - 1. It was mentioned at the ARF Board meeting that there were many individuals in favor of taking the Dean and Department Head out of the process entirely and having the process go through the University Human Resource Office; however, it was uncertain if that was an absolute recommendation and that ARF would not support anything else. There was a perspective for a variety of reasons that this decision should not be the Dean or Department Heads call.
- iv. Question: Once you get the route to eligibility, where do you go from there?
 - 1. Based on the discussion at the ARF Board meeting; the University Human Resource Office would send the names of eligible faculty to the Provost; the discussion at the ARF Board Meeting was that the eligibility criterion was a yes or no question. Did the faculty member serve for 10 or more years? If the answer is yes, then Emeritus status should/ must be awarded. The sole determinant of Emeritus status should be time and rank.
- v. Question: Is there a way to reduce the likelihood that a vindictive Department Head and/or Dean could completely ruin a faculty members Emeritus request without going all the way in the other direction and saying that Emeritus status is strictly a clerical one; that counts the number of years a faculty member has served assigning them the Emeritus honorific? Can there be a parallel?
- vi. Question: Is there an appeal process for a faculty member seeking Emeritus status who is turned down by a Department Head and/or Dean? What are the faculty members prerogative at that point?
 - 1. Currently in the SOP, it does not consider that possibility; The SOP states that the Department Head has to write a recommendation letter.
 - 2. If a Department Head does not write the recommendation letter, and the Dean's office similarly refuses to write a recommendation letter, there is not a possibility that exists in the SOP currently for the faculty member to directly petition the Provost.
- vii. Question: Should there be a process by which a faculty member who has been explicitly denied by their Department Head and/or Dean has a mechanism to appeal directly to the Provost?

1. It was suggested that if an appeal process were built into the SOP, it is possible that faculty members who are recommended for Emeritus status would be treated fairly and possibly improve the process of decision making.
- viii. Comment: It was mentioned that by making Emeritus a decision that is solely on the basis of 10 years or more of service and nothing else; that Emeritus loses its meaning. It takes away the honorary part of the Emeritus faculty. Why do we even have it? Why aren't all faculty members just retired faculty?
1. One of the largest differences between a retired faculty member and an Emeritus faculty member is that an Emeritus faculty member is a voting member of the general faculty. Being a voting member of the general faculty and being eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate is very meaningful.
 2. It was mentioned that there are many universities where Emeritus faculty are given only one seat on their Faculty Senate, whereas at NC State, there is no such limitation. This means that the Emeritus faculty at NC State as a collective, has the potential for considerably more power in the shared governance process than many other universities.
- ix. Question: Could it be the case that a person who is eligible by years of service comes up for the process of Emeritus status and his/her Department Head and/or Dean decide not to put the faculty members name up for recommendation, that they (The Department Head and Dean) would be required to write and pass along a letter explaining their objections?
1. A Department Head and Dean must both write a statement when a faculty member of any track is promoted. They must vote yes or no, and they must write a statement to support that vote yes or no.
 2. It was suggested that one possibility would be that rather than saying a Department Head and Dean must write a recommendation, state instead that a Department Head and Dean must write a statement indicating yes or no; do they support the Emeritus award or not? That statement should then be forwarded to the Provost (this is the way in which promotions are handled). If there are objections by both the Department Head and the Dean; the faculty member should have an option of writing their own response to the statement.

3. Can we make the recommendation process of Emeritus status more consistent without turning the whole process over to the University Human Resource Office?

5. New/Arising Issues for Discussion

- a. Question: Is there a way to put up an unofficial draft of the minutes before they are approved or voted on so that people can see what is going on without the imprimatur of this having been passed and approved by the committee?
 - i. For the meetings for all committees, it is an important process for the minutes to be vetted and corrected if necessary before they get distributed.
 1. It was suggested that when you get to the last committee meeting of the year instead of waiting until next year to make the minutes available to the committee; that the committee do an email vote a week or two after the committee meeting.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by Dr. Hans Kellner.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.