

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
September 20, 2016
3:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting No. 3 of the 63rd Session: Faculty Senate Chambers September 20, 2016

Present: Chair Moore, Associate Chair Orcutt, Chair-Elect Bird, Parliamentarian Lubischer; Senators Ange-van Heugten, Argyropoulos, Ash, Auerbach, Banks, Barrie, Bernhard, Berry-James, Bullock, Bykova, Carver, Feducia, Gunter, Havner, Hawkins, Hergeth, Huffman, Kathariou, Kotek, Laffitte, Parker, Peretti, Pearce, Perros, Rever, Sannes, Sederoff, Thakur, Young

Excused: Senators Fath, Kuzma

Absent: Senators Bartlett, Nam, Silverberg

Guests: Katharine Stewart, VP for Faculty Affairs; Mitchell Moravec, Student Senate; Marc Hoit, VC for OIT; Angkana Bode, Staff Senate Chair; Duane Larick, Provost's Office; Mike Mullen, VC for DASA; Monica Banks, Assistant to VP of Faculty Affairs; Roy Baroff, Faculty Ombuds Office; Brayndon Stafford, Student Body VP; Peter Harries, Sr. Associate Dean of the Graduate School; Mike Carter, Associate Dean of the Graduate School

1. Call to Order - *Jeannette Moore, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Moore called the third meeting of the sixty-third session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. Introductory remarks - *Jeannette Moore, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Moore asked the guests to introduce themselves to the group.

3. Announcements - *Jeannette Moore, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Moore reminded the group to see the second page of the agenda each week to view the announcements and committee activity.

- October 4th – General Faculty Meeting

Meeting to be held in Talley Coastal Ballroom. Meeting agenda was approved today. The topic of discussion will be parking and transportation – the current status and what is happening to alleviate

current issues and what the long term plans are. Dr. Moore encouraged the Senators to attend and to make sure to bring your faculty colleagues.

- October 28 - Kickoff for Faculty/Staff giving campaign
- NC State will celebrate five years of Google with National Cyber Security Awareness Month for the month of October. Please see website for information: <https://oit.ncsu.edu/it-security/cyber-security-awareness-month-2016/>
- The Office of Faculty Development is hosting a Faculty writing retreat for all faculty during fall break – website link was provided.
- Thank you to Dr. Jane Lubischer, who will represent the Faculty Senate on the General Education Task Force. We appreciate her fulfilling this very important role.
- Committees are meeting – please review the meeting minutes on the Faculty Senate website.

4. Approval of the Minutes, Regular Meeting No.2 of the 63rd Session, September 6, 2016

Associate Chair Orcutt called for a motion to approve the minutes for the second meeting of the 63rd NC State Faculty Senate session.

With no changes, a motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

5. Graduate Faculty Appointments and Review – *Dr. Maureen Grasso, Dean of the Graduate School*

Dean Grasso thanked the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to be invited to speak and for allowing her presentation to be moved up to accommodate her travel schedule.

She began by saying that this is something they have been thinking about for a while, and as she stated, “As I talked to faculty when I first arrived on campus, the process of appointing graduate faculty is one of the most intricate and complex processes that I’ve seen on any research campus; when I got here I started asking lots of questions and saying is there a way that we might be able to simplify, yet enhance and keep the quality of graduate faculty and graduate programs.”

She continued that, “As we began to go forward and think about this and talk with the constituents that we have, which are the faculty – what we wanted to do is take a look at how are we currently appointing faculty to the appointment of graduate faculty and could we simplify that appointment by having just one level called graduate faculty and really looking at one level for tenure and tenure track faculty and other

full time faculty.” She stated that right now, we have two tiers within that one system and it’s very confusing to the faculty on this campus.

She continued by stating that the other part is really to look at how do we go about instituting a periodic review of brand new faculty; this part really coming from the University’s strategic plan. She stated, “So when I came on campus, this was already part of the plan and the implementation plan for the University strategic plan and I was asked over a year ago by the Provost to really move this forward.” She stated that she responded to the Provost by saying that we can’t really move anything about this forward until we better understand how we employ our faculty.

Dean Grasso explained that they started with talking with faculty that are currently involved with the process, recalling that we had a whole town hall meeting of directors of graduate programs at a monthly meeting to talk to them about the current process and the process that we might think about going forward, which is would it be valuable to have sort of one level called graduate faculty?

She stated that at the end of that meeting, Dr. Harries came back and said, “We got an applause from all the directors.” So they were fully invested in us moving forward. Dean Grasso went on to say that she has done a lot of research looking at lots of programs nationwide – the top institutions in the country in terms of how they go about doing this; having that backdrop of really talking to faculty and really listening to them and hearing what they want.

Dean Grasso went on to say that they then decided that they needed to hear from other faculty, so, “We had representation from all the colleges, including members of the Faculty Senate, and we held some faculty focus groups. Listening to the directors of graduate programs, we had some ideas from them about how we should proceed and what should be included. And so we then vetted that with other faculty groups and vetted that with all the associate deans of the colleges.”

She continued, by saying that perhaps one of the questions that might be asked is why one level of graduate faculty? She stated that this institution is a research mature institution, and in keeping with our peer institutions, with the exception of one, they’ve all had one level. She stated that we are at the point where we’re ready to have one level of graduate faculty. She continued by saying that what we see also is that the expectation of junior faculty, when they come in, they’re going to hit the ground running in terms of the types of research they bring in, the dollars, the doctoral students and other graduate students. Additionally, she said that we find that the expectations for research by junior faculty is increasing significantly, even over the last 5-10 years.

She continued, “Then we also see that as we move forward, we are still seeing, as we would expect to, a larger percentage of doctoral committees versus the number of committees that require a thesis at the master’s level has significantly dropped off; they’re going more to non-thesis types of models which is consistent nationally.” Dean Grasso stated that the final thing that the DGPs said was that they are confused; who was full, who wasn’t full, who was this level or that level, who’s an associate, etc., and they really welcome the opportunity to create a single level of graduate faculty to make it more efficient and streamlined.

Dean Grasso then stated that there is an important note here, because we want to talk about quality and the role that the DGP has; a single level does not mean that we would eliminate an apprentice model in developing graduate faculty. She explained that each discipline is unique; some disciplines are ready the moment the junior faculty member walks in the door; they're ready to chair the dissertation committee and away they go. Dean Grasso continued by saying that there are other programs that say, well not so fast because we want to make sure that the person is mentored or they have some experience getting research out the door. She stated that it varies across the board and the idea that if a program still wants to mentor or have an apprentice model while developing the graduate faculty, then that is definitely going to continue.

Dean Grasso elaborated that it will continue but that it really depends on the graduate program director. She stated that currently they approve all advisory committees, and they will continue to do so. So in their discipline, in their program, if they feel that a faculty member needs to be paired with a more senior experienced faculty member, they can do so as a co-chair. She continued, "If they say they're ready to go, let them go and let them direct and lead." She stated that we haven't changed anything and that they are not going to be proposing that change; that decision needs to be made at the local level in the program, keeping in mind that each program is unique.

Dean Grasso went on to review the proposals with the Senators as follows: "We are proposing a level called graduate faculty and we are proposing a level called affiliate graduate faculty." She then elaborated by explaining that right now there are two levels within that title. She said that what we would do initially is that if you are tenure track and full time non-tenure track faculty and you currently have graduate faculty status, that continues. However, she stated, if you're currently in one of these other roles as an adjunct or visiting, you currently have some kind of graduate faculty status, we're going to change your title and now call you an affiliate. She further stated that thereafter, whenever this proposal gets formulated and voted in by the administrative board, any new faculty coming to campus, will be designated as graduate faculty or affiliate, depending on their position. She said that if they're adjunct or visiting, they would be affiliate and if they're full time tenure track or a non-tenure track position, then they will be designated graduate faculty. She went on to say that both of those positions are decided by the faculty of the program.

Dean Grasso stated that there is a vote of the departmental graduate faculty that would vote on the individual coming in, just as it should be. Further, she said, the quality of the programs rest with the faculty in the program, and they're the ones to make that decision in terms of the person with the expertise coming in, whether they would be affiliate or graduate faculty; then the Dean of the Graduate School then would approve the recommendation from the faculty.

In summary, Dean Grasso stated, "So that is what we are proposing. The actual policy has not been drafted – this is the direction, this is what we were talking about, this is what we've heard from the DGPs that they're looking for, as we heard from other faculty across campus – that this would really streamline things and help us be more efficient, while also continuing the decision making at the local level."

She went on to say that her experience over the years is that most faculty are really engaged in their scholarship and stay engaged all the way throughout their lifetime at the University and sometimes beyond. She stated that some will retire, some will continue on as well; so just to think that once you get it that's it, and there is no review, and that this is not really conducive to retaining high quality. She further stated that it is appropriate for faculty to have say in reviewing and what they are proposing is that those who are actively engaged in their research as they come up for review will be reviewed by their peers and that the affiliate status would not be. Dean Grasso continued by saying that because it's the graduate faculty that actually chair the doctoral dissertations, that is really where you want to make sure that the individuals are providing quality in terms of their scholarship and leadership.

Dean Grasso concluded her presentation by telling the Senators how this process could be completed; one suggestion is through the DGP's and other faculty who said that we need to tie it to the post-tenure review process so they can look at the materials that they normally would look at for the review of the individual for the post-tenure review and the Graduate School could also provide additional information with respect to participation in graduate education with the individual coming up in the year. Dean Grasso stated that the Graduate School has data that can be made available to the programs so they can assess and make a decision. The individual programs would decide whether the person should continue – the decision would be made by the faculty in the program and it would only be made at that level and that would be it. So that the faculty would then make that decision and the Graduate School would support that 100%.

Questions/comments/feedback

Senator Pearce: *I do not understand that if I am voting on this, why would I kick somebody off the graduate faculty? What is my incentive to do that?*

Dean Grasso responded that the quality of your program is the incentive.

Senator Pearce: *They're not affecting the quality of the PhD program.*

Dean Grasso responded that yes they are if they're directing or chairing.

Senator Pearce: *So assume you have somebody who hasn't been on a committee for 20 years in my graduate program. What's my incentive for voting him or her off? It's not going to change anything other than make them mad.*

Dean Grasso responded by saying that if you are doing your evaluation and you decide that they should continue, then they will continue and will be eligible to direct doctoral dissertations and thesis.

Senator: *So in the programs that you looked at, did you get a sense of how often this happens?*

Dean Grasso responded that in her experience at other institutions, in most cases the best quality programs always have excellent faculty doing excellent research, but there are cases where they would

make the decision to say that faculty wasn't being productive and wasn't current on research and therefore there was no need for them to be a graduate faculty and to direct.

Senator Argyropoulos: *Do you think that you're going to implement additional criteria? Because one can actually go ahead and say some people – it may be that the scholarship is one component but the number of graduate students is another one. And somebody can say – this guy doesn't have enough graduate students and he's got an army of post-docs and he does well but he doesn't really serve the graduate faculty and he shouldn't be there.*

Dean Grasso responded by saying that it would be a decision that the program faculty will have to make. She stated that if the faculty member is doing a great job with post-docs, you may still want to continue him as a graduate faculty because someday there may be a student for him to direct.

Senator Sederoff: *I tend to agree that this may be solving a problem that we don't have. You're creating a punitive measure for people who may be unproductive senior faculty. There are plenty of ways to deal with them, but I am reluctant to get behind imposing another. I think the real purpose and the real value of graduate faculty is something quite different. My experience is that we're being a graduate faculty and have the right to chair a committee that is really important for beginning professors who haven't done it before and who are now dealing with their first graduate student. In my experience, the failure rate of first graduate students is very high because professors don't have experience, they tend to be very permissive, they tend to think lots of things are possible and bad things happen because they simply don't have experience. People shouldn't have that responsibility until they have some experience.*

Dean Grasso responded that you are really speaking well about your program and what I would say is that you would still have that opportunity to provide mentorship under the title, because the DGP would work with the faculty and would say that the junior faculty is not ready to chair. But in other cases that's not true.

Senator Sederoff: *The good ones aren't the problem; the challenge is that there is a high frequency of people who are not ready. They get through a few graduate students and they have a reality check. To use this as a mechanism for punishment is not good. You may not be trying to do that, but that's a matter of unanticipated consequences. When you're setting up the mechanism – we have lots of ways to confront faculty that are not productive but to say no, you can't supervise graduate students anymore, is punitive.*

Dean Grasso reiterated that this is not meant to punish.

Senator Berry-James: *I have a question about the criteria. You said that the vote of the faculty will then be forwarded by recommendation to the Graduate Dean for approval, but I didn't really hear a lot about the criteria of approval. What are you going to decide, in terms of what should be approved or not approved? Because isn't it true that graduate faculty are really the ones determining who serves and how they serve and in what capacity? So what then would you be approving?*

Dean Grasso stated that in her experience as a Graduate Dean, we take the vote of the faculty seriously as a recommendation and we support that recommendation probably 99% of the time. There are situations sometimes that require us to ask additional questions, but I would say that the process right now of the Dean's approval.

Senator Berry-James: *But what criteria are you using?*

Dean Grasso responded by saying that the faculty's recommendation to me is the criteria; the faculty knows best in a particular discipline and she would be using your recommendation. She further stated that this is the process right now and it is not changing.

Dean Grasso asked Mike Carter, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, to relay additional information heard in campus focus groups. He reported that what he heard is that at a Research I institution, if a person is good enough to hire, then the expectation is that they are going to be mentoring PhD students from the get-go. He stated that this tends to be the general perception of the people in the focus groups, that that really is the expectation of the people who are being hired. He summarized by saying that given the nature of the academic marketplace today, certainly the University is able to attract in virtually all fields, just stellar people from all across the country and he really doesn't see the Graduate School playing much of a role in terms of saying no; they don't do that now as the faculty are already being vetted under tremendous pressure.

Senator Auerbach: *This part of it does seem like a solution in search of a problem and I think it is going to produce extra work – a little bit, but those add up. This seems pointless because the relative quality control is already done by the DGP and this will produce extra work and extra decisions. So I don't see the need for this. Its absence is not conducive to a decline in quality and its presence is extra work.*

Senator Kotek: *I was evaluated every five years. It's too much.*

Dean Grasso responded that this is part of the University's strategic plan and that she was asked to bring it forward and to hear the voices of the faculty. She stated that they have heard from other faculty who are supportive of this and it is equally important to hear from the Faculty Senate.

Senator Gunter: *One of the challenges I see is where there are less productive faculty, I can see that being a real issue when those people already have a development plan for improvement and they cannot be rotated off because part of their faculty recruitment plan will be need have graduate students which will in effect allow the head to say it's impossible to implement this.*

Dean Grasso responded that the recommendation is to continue, but with the plan for improvement, and this would likely be tied with that plan.

Senator Bykova: *What are the objectives for this campaign? If we make these revisions on top of revisions it will generate lot of extra work. Revisions – going from associate graduate faculty to just*

graduate faculty. I don't see the point the make these revisions. Who is going to evaluate me? The History department or the Engineering Department?

Associate Dean Carter stated that the policy would be followed; that each department has a small committee that is setup to evaluate.

Senator Bykova: *Thank you for the clarification – but I don't understand the purpose – we are already doing that. So the purpose is not clear at all. If you are telling me that it will just be additional checking the box, it doesn't make sense.*

Chair Moore: *In regard to post tenure review, we have non tenure track faculty in this room who are on the graduate faculty and they don't go through post-tenure reviews. So how will those faculty be evaluated?*

Associate Dean Carter responded that we have a list of non-tenure track faculty and that this is taken straight out of the regulations. These faculty will also be considered graduate faculty.

Chair-Elect Bird: *If the faculty being reviewed doesn't agree with the vote, what recourse is there for somebody who gets a negative vote?*

Dean Grasso responded by saying that a policy has not been developed.

Duane Larick stated that the opportunity for graduate faculty removal has always existed; this is not new. Additionally, he stated that just as the graduate faculty can vote a person on the island, they can vote a person off the island. He stated that he remembers having a long conversation with Senator Pearce when the RSC assessment was done, and Senator Pearce was demanding that we take people out of the graduate faculty because they were hurting the metric – the number of PhDs per tenure track faculty, and the number of dissertations for tenure track faculty.

Senator Pearce: *We solved that by eliminating one third of the tenure track faculty.*

Dr. Larick stated that when it comes to review, productivity is not the issue that this is intended to fix. He continued by saying that we have graduate faculty who have completion averages that are not near the expectation of 100% of our students finishing. This initiative is really aimed at the fact that this institution deserves the opportunity for the graduate faculty to do a real evaluation of the quality of mentorship that is happening in the graduate program and making the decision that a person needs a plan to improve; and if they can't improve they shouldn't advise students in that program – a hard reality.

Dean Grasso asked if the first part of the proposal – the titles of Graduate Faculty/Affiliate Faculty – is an issue.

Senator Hawkins: *What is currently the different tiers of status and how did this get disjointed? What led to this and why do we need this?*

Dean Grasso responded that the titles of full/associate have become very convoluted, and that functionality is an issue; people don't know what their level of faculty is.

Senator: *If you look at the move from associate to full – there are no criteria. It's like whenever the department gets around to it. I think once again the assumption is that many of these people are functioning this way. I think in the end if it simplifies, then it's good.*

Senator Argyropoulos: *What is the reason for doing this? Does this open a can of worms that can undermine the quality?*

Dean Grasso stated that she has not seen that.

Senator Perros: *I have heard that problems arise because at times we have to turn down committees because the DGP didn't do their job. At the same time we are saying the DGPs are going to take care of this. Now we are making three tracks?*

Dean Grasso responded that you can be multiple levels right now.

Senator Havner: *With regard to affiliate graduate faculty, would they still be permitted to serve on graduate committees?*

Dean Grasso responded, yes, they would.

Senator Laffitte: *Would this be a venue for the Graduate School to consider to be able to, if they became aware that a faculty member was unsuccessful in that their students have not been well-served repeatedly?*

Dean Grasso stated that she has not had that experience here, but that she has elsewhere, where she has had to step in and work with the program and the department head about providing the kinds of leadership that needs to happen at the local level. If it is very egregious, she continued, she could step in and say she would not approve that faculty member to chair another committee. She said she would work very closely with the unit and the faculty. It is very rare.

Senator Pearce: *I have conflicting images. I was a DGP for a while and I am not confident that the DGPs are going to do as much monitoring as suggested and I am also surprised that students don't know who is a bad chair. When I was a student, that was pretty common information. Additionally, in my department there are people who are very valuable members of committees; they don't chair them but they are valuable. They may not be as productive as they once were but I understand that the department can say that's okay. My other question is if I don't like my post-tenure review, that's just a recommendation. The Dean would then step in and if there's a dispute then it goes to the Provost. Is that going to be true with this?*

Dean Grasso stated that they have not written the policy but that this is a good point to think about.

Senator Sederoff: *What's the problem is that the evaluation is a negative evaluation and you decide you're going to take somebody off graduate faculty. What you should do is make it renewable so that people have to be approved to retain membership in the graduate faculty; everybody gets a five-year appointment and if you're not doing very well, they simply aren't renewed as graduate faculty.*

Dean Grasso responded that's a very good idea. She reminded that this is also about renewal. She stated that when evaluating faculty we don't think about graduate education until it's made a point of focus. It is not really given the attention and the recognition it deserves. It's a positive for everybody.

Dean Grasso thanked the Faculty Senate for the time to present.

6. Administration's Remarks and Q/A - Dr. Duane Larick, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy & Resource Management

Dr. Larick put some history to what Dean Grasso presented. He stated that the first goal of the strategic plan is student success. There is a lot of information about undergraduate student success but this was a portion of the plan that discussed graduate student success and that completion is a major piece of that success. He continued by saying that the two biggest factors that affect graduate student completion are funding and mentorship. So that initiative is put into the strategic plan as a mechanism to try to allow the community to consider ways of improving mentorship. Graduate Faculty is one way to consider influencing that portion.

Dr. Larick then mentioned that over a period of month, the University tried to explain the most convoluted pay raise system ever passed by a Legislature in world history. There were four pieces to it; there was a 1.5% legislative increase for EHRA and SHRA employees, which has already been implemented. So employees received that increase. Then there was a one-half of one percent one-time bonus for EHRA and SHRA and the one-time merit bonus for the same group of people. He stated that it's very unique to have a one-time merit bonus approved.

He continued that what this allowed the Legislature to do was to claim they gave state employees a 3% raise but the reality is that it's not true. We didn't receive a 3% budget for pay raises. Then he continued by stating that there was the annual EHRA raise process that has been available in the system for the last few years, there was a cap put there of 8.5%. There have been situations where if a person changed responsibilities we've had an EHRA raise process that could be implemented. That raise didn't come with any additional state funding, so you could give a person for retention or merit purpose or an increase in job responsibilities.

Dr. Larick relayed to the Senators that a memo has just come out that is associated with the across-the-board one-time bonus but unfortunately that is one that the University had no say in. The SHRA one-time merit bonus pool was associated with the performance rating. So if a person scores a five, they will get one level of increase and if they have a four or a three, they will get a different amount. Initially it said \$600 and \$400 but they still haven't distributed budget to any state agency, including the

UNC system so that we would know if that is possible. Those numbers are still going to be out there. The challenge is that it's supposed to take place in the October paychecks, which has to be done by October 7th.

Dr. Larick asked that no blame be put on Finance and Administration or Human Resources for this; this has been the most insane thing he has seen in 30 years.

Senator Bykova: *Is this linked to ranges for the position? So this is a salary range to basically bring people up to the level?*

Dr. Larick responded by stating that at the same time that we were authorized to do the EHRA annual raise process up to 8.5%, we had also just completed the University faculty range comparison study. The Provost worked with the Deans and offered was that if a program had a faculty member who was below the minimum range, they could use that 8.5% process to bring them up to the minimum, and the Provost would match that one to one. So if the college/department was able to come up with a dollar, the Provost would match it with a dollar – in order to bring people up to that minimum. The units had the opportunity to do that but it came with no new money to the units. As a result, there were some units that had to respectfully say they couldn't do that for various reasons. These two things were put together to have an impact, however, and they did. He stated that they were able to reduce the number of faculty that were below the minimum range by about half in the process.

Dr. Larick stated that the only search that is currently going on at the Associate level is the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities. That is not within the Provost's unit. The Provost has completed all the searches associated with Deans. He said that the interviews will begin at the end of September and the candidates and schedules are now posted on the Finance and Administration website.

Questions/Comments

Associate Chair Orcutt: *Can you provide the status of the External Affairs/Kevin Howell position?*

Dr. Larick responded that this was a big loss for us. Kevin is now Vice President for Communications and External Affairs at General Administration. Sarah Stone is now serving as interim in this position and that a search is planned for a later date.

Senator Kotek asked about faculty salaries.

Dr. Larick responded that the University does a faculty salary ranges at the Professor/Associate Professor and Assistant Professor by department; by College and then by department alphabetically. It is a fair peer comparison and this information is posted and you are able to see it. He suggested the Human Resources site and look under Faculty Salary Ranges to find this information.

7. Old and New Business

Chair Moore raised the issue of whether the Faculty Senate would like to endorse the recent Faculty Assembly Resolution, titled "On the Governance Implications of North Carolina Session Law 2016-94."

Chair Moore then asked Dr. Alton Banks if he wanted to expand on the resolution. He summarized the reasoning behind the endorsement, which was to point out that this resolution was passed to voice the displeasure of the Assembly as to UNC Board of Governors' failure to follow their own process.

Chair Moore asked the Faculty Senate if there was a motion to endorse the Faculty Assembly Resolution.

A motion was made and seconded to endorse this resolution. Hearing no discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

8. Issues of concern

Chair Moore asked Angkana Bode, Chair of the Staff Senate, for announcements to be made from Staff Senate. She reported that the Staff Senate has addressed the traffic issues that were brought up at the last meeting and stated that this was being addressed on 9/28/16. She asked if there were additional suggestions, they would bring them to the meeting with the Transportation Department on that date. Additionally, she stated that Staff Senate would support the Shack-a-Thon and invited the Faculty Senate to join in this support.

The temperature of the Faculty Senate Chambers was addressed. Chair Moore stated that at the beginning of the fall semester, the temperature is cold but by the end, it will be much warmer.

9. Adjourn

Chair Moore adjourned the 3rd meeting of the 63rd Faculty Senate session at 4:20 p.m.