

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
October 17, 2017
3:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting No. 4 of the 64th Session: Faculty Senate Chambers October 17, 2017

Present: Chair Bird, Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten, Immediate Past Chair Moore, Parliamentarian Kellner, Senators Banks, Berry-James, Boyer, Bykova, Davis, Eseryel, Fath, Feducia, Gunter, Havner, Hawkins, Hayes, Kotek, Lim, Orcutt, Parker, Pearce, Sannes, Sederoff, Smith

Excused: Senators Ash, Auerbach, Barrie, Bullock, Carver, Kuzma, Rever

Absent: Senators Argyropoulos, Kathariou, Laffitte, Nam, Young

Guests: Courtney Thornton, Assoc. Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Policy; Roy Baroff, Faculty and Staff Ombuds Office; Marc Hoit, Vice Chancellor, OIT; Laquore Meadows, ACE Fellow; Adam Schmidt, Student Senate; Katharine Stewart, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

1. **Call to Order** - *Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty*
Chair Bird called the fourth meeting of the sixty-fourth session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. **Introductory remarks**
Chair Bird asked the guests and invited speakers to introduce themselves.

3. **Announcements**
 1. Fall General Faculty Meeting was held on October 3, 2017, in Talley Student Center, Blue Mountains Ballroom, with 95 in attendance.

 2. Culture of Safety at NCSU. The Occupational Safety and Health Committee (OSHC) is working under the Chancellor's Charge to improve communications about safety and best practices in the implementation of a culture of safety. The OSHC desires to foster a campus-wide dialogue to elevate practices that have been effective at creating a culture of safety. Points of Contact are: Ken Kretchman, Director, Environmental Health and Safety and Marian McCord, Associate Dean, College of Natural Resources and Chair, University Occupational Safety and Health Council. All input is welcome with particular interest in:

- How the faculty member orients and mentors new students and staff regarding safe work procedures
- Approaches to performing hazard assessments prior to new tasks or experiments
- Approaches to ensure persons use the appropriate personal protective equipment

3. Chancellor's Fall Address. Friday, November 3rd at 2:30pm, in Talley Student Union, Stewart Theater. Chancellor Randy Woodson. He will address the University's many achievements, speak to its challenges, and look ahead to its extraordinary future. Light refreshments follow his address. Visit redwhiteweek.ncsu.edu

4. **Approval of the Minutes, Regular Meeting No. 3 of the 64th Session, September 19, 2017** - Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten called for a motion to approve the minutes for the third meeting of the 64th session of the NC State Faculty Senate. A motion and second were made and the minutes were unanimously approved, with noted grammatical corrections.

5. **Provost's Remarks** – *Katharine Stewart, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Provost's Office*

Dr. Katharine Stewart represented the Provost at the meeting and took questions from the Faculty Senate.

Senator Berry-James: When are post-tenure review dossiers due?

Dr. Stewart responded that post tenure review is usually done in the spring, and departments have their own timelines. She added that we had to push back the timelines because the new process has to include time for a college committee to meet if a college committee meeting is required. Many departments are trying to get faculty to pull their dossiers together in the late fall so that PTR committees can begin reviewing in early spring.

- **Senator Perros:** How can we address the original requests? (question was mostly inaudible)

Dr. Stewart responded that where the URPTC feels challenged is when they see a candidate who is being denied promotion or tenure and the assessment repeats information that is in the dossier but doesn't really speak to the quality and impact of that work relative to the department's standards. She added that it is pretty typical that departments don't say you must have a book or five articles; in fact, my opinion is that you probably do not want to do that because that implies that quantity is more important than quality of scholarships, which in

general, is not the case. However, she added, where the URPTC runs into challenges is when they can't really tell how a department has evaluated the quality and the impact of the faculty member's work relative to their standards. It is really more about providing context for where the department feels the candidate is strong and where the candidate needs improvement.

- **Senator Perros:** So for the denials? (question was mostly inaudible)

Dr. Stewart responded that it is helpful for everybody; certainly, the candidate who is going up for associate professor can benefit from hearing from the DVF where they might want to focus their effort as they advance towards full professor. She added that where the URPTC runs into challenges is when they see a denial and cannot really understand what the thinking was of the faculty in evaluating that and making the decision that quality and impact were not where they needed to be.

Senator Havner: I know of at least two cases of very talented individuals in my department who did not receive tenure. It was not a matter of their research productivity or quality; it was personality. They were turned down by the departmental faculty on that issue alone because several key people strongly objected to them because of personal inter-relations.

Dr. Stewart responded that in general, we try very hard to follow the procedures that are published by the University; that information in the dossier that is added to the dossier is the official record. She added that with regard to collegiality, the Provost and I have had discussions about collegiality as a standard or as an issue. The URPTC discusses those kinds of issues as well and I can say that the Provost feels that collegiality can play a role in promotion and tenure discussions to the extent that collegiality affects a faculty member's productivity in the realms of responsibility. Dr. Stewart stated that we know faculty whose collegiality may affect their ability to function as a scholar or as a teacher or a mentor; we know other faculty who may have conflicts with colleagues but who remain productive in their realms of responsibility. She added that the Provost's position is that collegiality may play a role to the extent that it affects a faculty member's productivity in the realms of responsibility. She stated that as a University, we remain focused on the six realms of responsibility and how faculty are performing in those.

Dr. Stewart concluded by asking the Faculty Senate to let her know how she can better support them and if they have questions for the Provost, please send those through Chair Bird so that he can be prepared to answer those questions.

6. **Faculty Ombudsman Program: An Update** - *Roy Baroff, Faculty Ombuds*

Background: The NC State Faculty Ombuds Office (facultyombuds.ncsu.edu) opened in late

February 2015 with Roy Baroff as the part-time contract ombuds. The office provides issue and conflict resolution services that are confidential, independent, informal, and impartial. The office published an annual report earlier this year and has additional data to share on its operations. The Ombuds Office would like to engage the Faculty Senate in discussion about office development and how it can best serve faculty across the university.

Mr. Baroff thanked the Faculty Senate for the invitation to provide an update regarding the Faculty Ombuds office. He pointed out the purpose and scope of the Faculty Ombuds office and stressed the confidentiality and independence of this office when assisting faculty.

He reminded the Senators of his neutrality and impartiality and that his purpose is to provide support for faculty and assist them in thinking through issues and concerns they may have. He added that he is not a representative nor an advocate for either faculty members nor the University.

He stated that in his role, he does a lot of listening and then tries to help support them and assist them in locating resources or strategizing as to what steps can be taken to resolve concerns and issues. Additionally, he added, in his role he can surface issues to the University regarding issues about policies or rules that may be brought to his attention by numerous individuals. He will determine where the aggregated information needs to go and will provide the information to the appropriate parties.

Review the Ombuds full presentation on the Faculty Senate website. Here:

<https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2017/10/2017-Faculty-Senate-Meeting-Agenda.pdf>

Questions from Faculty Senate:

Senator Berry-James: Do you work for the University? Are you a University employee?

Mr. Baroff responded that no, he is not a University employee. He has a contract through the Provost's office for 20 hours per week to provide the Faculty Ombuds services and he also provides Staff Ombuds services as well. He asked the Senators for feedback regarding their thoughts about Ombuds services at NC State – both faculty and staff or otherwise – he welcomed those thoughts and feedback.

Senator Sannes: Regarding the idea about having certain broader issues surfaced to the University, in the three years you have been doing this, have there any of those.

Mr. Baroff responded that yes, there have been a few. On the faculty side, there was an issue about confidentiality about Departmental Voting Faculty voting and how something was reported that a faculty member brought. He added that when he looked at some of the regulations and FAQs it looked like there may be a gap in information, so this was an issue he brought forward. He added that typically, since his role is to try to address things at the most informal level, that's where he goes. He added that if there is something going on in a college, he might go to the Dean; if it is a department, he might go to the department head. However, he does not go anywhere if going there is going to risk exposure of where the information came from.

Mr. Baroff then reviewed case data, which is available for review on the presentation that is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Here:

<https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2017/10/2017-Faculty-Senate-Meeting-Agenda.pdf>

Senator Berry-James: You mentioned that you refer people. To whom do you refer people? Do you refer to departments on campus, the counseling center?

Mr. Baroff responded that his referrals are more about "here are resources that exist that could perhaps be of assistance to you," for example, the faculty and staff assistance program, counseling, etc. He added that if people are concerned about fair treatment in the workplace, sometimes that referral would be to OIED; if it is a concern about resources, it could be Internal Audit and here's what they do; if it's a faculty issue, he may mention Faculty Senate as a resource – a range of different areas. He added that it is not typically outside resources but he does not discourage that if the person suggests them.

Senator Berry-James: So if I'm a faculty member and I teach at night and I'm concerned that in the seven years I've been here I've never seen a police officer walk the building when I'm night teaching. Would that be an issue I would bring to you or should I bring it directly to campus safety?

Mr. Baroff stated that he could be a sort of "triage" for things like this and if she is not sure where to turn, he will reach out to campus police or a department head or facilities, working together.

Senator Eseryel asked if he asks those who have sought his assistance if it has been a helpful experience.

Mr. Baroff responded that the data indicates that most is relatively positive in regard to feedback, with most being able to find resources that supported them. He does not have a question "what did you actually do."

Senator Eseryel asked if there is a reason why he is not an advocate for faculty. Some universities have someone in this position who becomes an advocate for the faculty.

Mr. Baroff responded that there are different kinds of Ombuds. He stated that he is considered an “organizational Ombuds,” who is neutral and impartial. He added that if he takes on the role of being “your” advocate, then he is no longer neutral and impartial. He stated that classical Ombuds are advocate Ombuds, meaning that they play the same role and they are an advocate for the constituent that comes to see them.

Senator Eseryel asked why that is the case here? Did the University decide this?

Mr. Baroff responded that in the United States, the model that is typically in educational institutions is this kind of organizational Ombuds model. He added that he thinks it has merit to be this type of organizational Ombuds because being neutral and impartial and not being an advocate allows him to have contact with all the different perspectives and, if you will, the sides of a dispute. He added that there is a mediation program that the University has through Employee Relations, so he is not that type of formal mediator. He can serve as a facilitator and help people have better conversations.

Before taking additional questions, Mr. Baroff relayed information to the Faculty Senate regarding his Ombuds-related professional activities as he is representing NC State University. Those include:

- International Ombudsman Association Annual Conference Session presentation 2016, 2017, submitted for 2018
- Certified Organizational Ombudsman Practitioner Completed application, exam, interview
- American Bar Association Dispute Resolution Section Ombuds Committee and Legislative Subcommittee Chair
- Ombuds Perceptions Survey Participated in pilot survey from led by University of Nebraska at Omaha Professor & Ombuds in Communications Department

Senator Sederoff: Our common goals in Faculty Senate have to do with the fact that we are always looking for things we might be able to address or fix or change, and improve things for faculty. So in terms of those goals, what extent would transparency or the lack thereof create the problem? For example, budgets, resources, decision-making. These things are not common knowledge.

Mr. Baroff responded that he has done some work with a department where budget issues were a concern that faculty shared with him. He stated that as a result, this department is now sharing information related to budgets with faculty. He added that the faculty in that department

identified the issue and were able to make a culture change as a result. "I am not in the position to say "here's what you need to do at NC State." It is more about me making observations." Mr. Baroff added that some of the compensation issues that have come to him have resulted in him exploring those issues and supporting those who brought it forward. He stated, "There are not that many compensation issues brought to my office, but there are some."

Senator Huffman asked what type of information he presents at the conferences he attends.

Mr. Baroff responded that, for example, the first conference he participated in he presented about how to open an Ombuds office. He went on to add that he opened the office here from the ground up, being given the road map by Faculty Senate a few years ago. He stated that this year he has submitted something that is mediation-related since he has taught mediation theory and practice to undergraduate and graduate students. Mr. Baroff added that he is also a professional mediator and a trainer in that field. He also stated that he does not share any specifics regarding cases during presentations, but does share office practices and demographic data. "This is a growing field - - more institutional offices are opening and many times people are looking for help in how to do that."

Senator Berry-James: You had about 129 people who came into the office and you shared data that said 45% of faculty at the University are tenured, in comparison to 42% that are non-tenured track and 12.5% who are on the tenure-track. The data that was shared indicates 70% of the people you are interacting with are tenured, which is perplexing, and the bulk of the work that you have done is involving tenured faculty. I wonder what it is with the tenured faculty sub-population. What are their concerns? Are the concerns around transparency and accountability and evaluation? Are there concerns around work-life balance, campus climate, unfair practices? What is it about tenure-track faculty that cause them to come over and see you in this mediated role? What are the issues for people who are tenured?

Senator Bykova: The data that was shown also demonstrated that most of the people who came to you are senior faculty. The question then is if there is this about climate and some kind of common issue? Where does this data take us then? The data is good but we should be able to use it.

Mr. Baroff responded that yes, the majority of people who come to him in the Faculty Ombuds role are full professors who are tenured and have been around here for a while – almost 70%. The kinds of issues that come to him are also those issues that are similar to those brought to him by newer faculty; that being, what is going on in the department, what is impacting them? For some of those who are more senior, it is "I'm trying to find out what's next," "I'm not getting support from my department leader." Mr. Baroff stated this is the reason for his project about managing faculty transitions – transitions to a range of things. His question is if you are a senior faculty member and you are trying to figure out what is next, what he has heard from faculty is that they have a great relationship with their department head and they are able to work it out. He has also heard of senior faculty who say, "I'm giving you 30 days and I'm out of here, because I'm not being supported and respected." Mr. Baroff continued by stating that he thinks NC State could do a better job of handling those kinds of transitions, but he also thinks they do a really good job at bringing people into the departments – onboarding, mentoring, and support.

He added that it is the transitions, work-life balance, sometimes it's things from off-campus that are impacting them on-campus that they need help working through, like medical issues, etc. He will then connect them with resources to assist them. He welcomes input in collecting data in different ways since this is not his expertise.

Senator Eseryel: If there were something in the culture or things that as a University that we need to improve, the data would be very useful to us.

Mr. Baroff stated that one of his next steps is to develop the data that he has gathered, all the while keeping things confidential and neutral. He thinks we are doing good work and we are on the right track, but there is room for improvement.

Senator Bykova: Thank you very much for the work that you do. This information is important and from this data, I see that something is not right and should be taken seriously. I hear from my own college from senior faculty that they are not satisfied in how they are treated – for a number of reasons. These are concerns for all of us and we need to discuss this and let people know we are interested in hearing about their concerns and we are interested in improvement. This is exactly what we need.

Mr. Baroff commented that one thing he would say is that conflict is around us all day every day, everywhere. “It is more a question of how you engage with it and manage it. The issues may be part and parcel of any large organization and I am not sure that I would be alarmed by this data.” He added that he also thinks it is important to understand how he can have a broader institutional impact.

Senator Sederoff: Do we need legal advocates?

Mr. Baroff stated that having access to legal information and legal advocates is important and Faculty has them if they want them. “The University lawyers represent the University; they do not represent individuals at the University.” He stated that if Senator Sederoff is asking should there be faculty legal services, he stated that he does not know about that.

Senator Sederoff: The job of the legal counsel for the University is to protect the University from people like me.

Dr. Kellner pointed out that avoiding any contact with University lawyers is the goal of this whole process because they work for the University. So keeping everything in a non-advocate and non-adversarial situation is very important. He then spoke regarding the grievance process at the University and stated that he thought that Mr. Baroff's data looked good. He added that the creation of the Ombuds office was a result of needing additional resources for the faculty in trying to keep things as far from the legal process as possible, with someone who has a legal background.

Chair Bird thanked Mr. Baroff for speaking to the Faculty Senate.

7. Old and New Business – Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty

- a. Elections planning update: The College of Education has identified candidates to fill all positions for Committees: Faculty Hearing (603); Non-Reappointment (607) and Grievance (604).
- b. Reminder: Refer to your Senator Portfolio prepared by Joni Lancaster to review candidates needed to represent your College on Committees: Faculty Hearing (603); Non-Reappointment (607) and Grievance (604).
- c. Meeting with OIRP: Jeannette Moore, Joni Lancaster, and I are scheduled to meet with OIRP early November to begin review and discussion of Spring elections timeline.

8. Issues of Concern

Faculty Issues of Concern can be submitted at any time to a senator or to Faculty_Senate@ncsu.edu. Minutes from each Faculty Senate committee (Academic Policy; Governance and Personnel Policy; Resources and Environment) are posted so progress on issues/discussions can be monitored by all.

9. Adjourn

Chair Bird asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

The motion passed unanimously.