

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Executive Summary

October 6, 2015

1. Call to Order

Chair Moore, called the fourth meeting of the sixty-second session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3 p.m.

2. Introductory Remarks

Chair Moore asked all visitors to introduce themselves.

3. Announcements

The Chancellor announced in his address that beginning Fall 2016, children of all faculty and staff at NC State will receive \$2,000 tuition scholarships if they attend NC State University.

The Fall General Faculty meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 20th at 3 p.m. in the west wing auditorium of DH Hill Library.

The discussion on the proposed drug and alcohol free workplace regulation has been postponed.

Senator Beth Fath has accepted the appointment to serve on the Holladay Medal for Excellence Committee.

Chair Moore stated that the current main topic that is being discussed in each committee is listed on the second page of the agenda. Future topics for discussion are also listed.

The topic for the General Faculty meeting is “The Future of Our University in a Rapidly Changing Environment.”

Other Announcements

Chair Moore announced that Extension, Engagement and Economic Development is searching for images with short descriptions of outreach, engagement, service learning, service and traditional extension.

There will be a Data Security for Researchers panel discussion on Friday, October 30, 2015 and this is part of “Protect the Pack, Secure NC State.”

4. Approval of the Minutes, Meeting No. 3, September 22, 2015

Secretary Orcutt moved approval of the minutes for regular meeting number 3 of the 62nd session of the NC State Faculty Senate.

The minutes were approved.

5. Remarks from Provost Arden

Provost Arden reported that there is a budget from the state, but there is still not one at the university level. This year for the UNC system there will be about \$17 million management flexibility cuts to the operating budget, which translates to about a \$3.5 million cut for NC State.

Provost Arden reported that there are some items of concern in the second year of the biennium budget. The system-level cut is around \$49 million and currently the cut in the second year is projected to be more than this year.

Another item to be concerned about in the second year of the budget is the state funding of development operations.

Provost Arden stated that he is also concerned about salary increases. The legislature is giving everyone a one-time bonus of \$750.00 in December, but he and the Chancellor would like to do a merit program for EPA employees of the university.

Provost Arden reported that his priorities over the next two weeks are to work through how they are going to handle the \$3.5 million flexibility cut and how they are going to handle the merit reallocation program.

Provost Arden reported that the ongoing searches are going well.

6. Faculty Ombuds Remarks and Q/A

Roy Baroff, NC State Faculty Ombuds gave an overview of what the Faculty Ombuds office does, which includes what his role is at NC State University, what he has been doing since his arrival on December 1st, and a new initiative from the Faculty Ombuds Office. He also provided a one page office update to the faculty.

7. Enrollment 2025 Projections: Process and Updates

Vice Provost Larick gave an overview of enrollment planning and the Enrollment Planning Committee. He stated that the Enrollment Planning Committee is a very inclusive committee. The committee is made up of about 22 people and the functions of the committee are three roles:

Dr. Larick stated that a few years ago the Enrollment Planning Committee was charged with and completed the task of creating for the first time a long term enrollment plan. In 2010 they created a 2020 enrollment plan, a ten year plan that was strategic in nature. It had both a narrative that talked about the direction that the university should go in enrollment and it also talked about specific targets. The committee is in the process of looking at that 2020 plan and trying to extend that out to 2025.

The next piece is a regular biennial plan. Dr. Larick stated that for enrollment funding purposes they submitted to the State of North Carolina through UNC General Administration then to the Legislature a two year biennial plan.

Dr. Larick stated that the third piece will be done in the middle of the year, so as of September 10th they received census numbers for Fall 2015. He noted that there is a very short window of

time in which they will have the opportunity to take that data and submit a potential change in the projected enrollment for Fall 2016.

8. Old and New Business

Version 2 of the draft document on Best Practice for Shared Governance; see Appendix A.

Chair Moore stated that the Executive Committee reviewed the document and considered all the input from the senators on suggested changes. Chair Moore explained the changes that had been made by the committee.

A motion passed with unanimous support to adopt the document.

9. Issues of Concern

Chair Moore reported that three additional issues of concern have come in and all three will go to the Executive Committee for review.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
October 6, 2015

Regular Meeting No. 4 of the 62nd Session: Faculty Senate Chambers October 6, 2015

Present: Chair Moore, Past Chair Zonderman, Secretary Orcutt, Parliamentarian Lubischer; Provost Arden; Senators Ange-van Heugten, Argyropoulos, Ash, Auerbach, Banks, Bernhard, Bird, Bullock, Bykova, Byrnes, Fath, Fleisher, Gunter, Hergeth, Huffmann, Kathariou, Laffitte, Moore, Pearce, Sannes, Silverberg, Smith McKoy, Steer, Williams

Excused: Senators Cubbage, Perros, Porter, Searce

Absent: Senator: Bartlett, Davidian, Devetsikiotis, Smith, Sotillo, Spontak

Guests: Katharine Stewart, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Duane Larick, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy & Resource; Roy Baroff, Faculty Ombuds

1. Call to Order

Chair Moore, called the fourth meeting of the sixty-second session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3 p.m.

2. Introductory Remarks

Chair Moore asked visitors to introduce themselves.

3. Announcements

The Chancellor announced in his address that beginning Fall 2016, children of all faculty and staff at NC State will receive \$2,000 tuition scholarships if they attend NC State University.

The Fall General Faculty meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 20th at 3 p.m. in the west wing auditorium of DH Hill Library.

The discussion on the proposed drug and alcohol free workplace regulation has been postponed.

Senator Beth Fath has accepted the appointment to serve on the Holladay Medal for Excellence Committee.

Chair Moore stated that the current main topic that is being discussed in each committee is listed on the second page of the agenda. Other topics that they will discuss in the future are also listed.

The topic for the General Faculty meeting is “The Future of Our University in a Rapidly Changing Environment.”

Other Announcements

Chair Moore announced that Extension, Engagement and Economic Development is searching for images with short descriptions of outreach, engagement, service learning, service and

traditional extension, so if anyone has photos that they would be willing to share the contact information is provided.

There will be a Data Security for Researchers panel discussion on Friday, October 30, 2015 and this is part of “Protect the Pack, Secure NC State.” There is a web link for more information on Cybersecurity Month.

4. Approval of the minutes, Meeting No. 3, September 22, 2015

Secretary Orcutt heard a motion and second for approval of the minutes for regular meeting number 3 of the 62nd session of the NC State Faculty Senate.

The minutes were approved.

5. Remarks from Provost Arden

Provost Arden reported that there is a budget from the state, but there is still not one at the university level. This year for the UNC system there will be about \$17 million management flexibility cuts to the operating budget, which translates to about a \$3.5 million cut for NC State. He will work with the Interim Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance to determine how to absorb most of the cut and not pass it down to the units.

Provost Arden reported that there are some items of concern in the second year of the biennium budget. The system-level cut is around \$49 million and currently the cut in the second year is projected to be more than this year.

Provost Arden stated that another item to be concerned about in the second year of the budget is the state funding of development operations. The university’s share of that would be about \$6 million. He said, we have more of our fund raising enterprise on state funds than any other institution. We raise close to \$12.00 for every state dollar spent on development. He noted that there are not many places where the state gets a 12 to 1 return on their investment, but either way this legislation would limit all state investment and development to \$1 million per campus/university, so for NC State that is about a \$6 million cut.

Provost Arden stated that if all of those things come down next year, it could make it a little tough, since we already know that our projections on enrollment will not provide as much new enrollment money as this year.

Provost Arden stated that this year’s budget is about the best budget that we have had in the seven years he has served as Provost. He said next year if it stays the way it’s programmed now, we will be significantly worse off than this year instead due to the combination of less new revenue through enrollment and the cut to development.

Provost Arden stated that another issue to be concerned about this year is salary increases. The legislature is giving everyone a one-time bonus of \$750.00 in December, but he and the Chancellor would like to do something of a merit program for EPA employees of the university.

Provost Arden stated that there is no allocation from the state to do this, so they will have to find resources internally. He noted that it is always a tough call because he and the Chancellor are very committed to move faculty salaries forward, but by the time this gets down to the department level there are not a lot of operating funds, so this is often at the expense of vacant faculty lines and graduate student support, which is deeply troubling.

Provost Arden stated that he would be working with the Interim Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance to see how much of a merit reallocation process they can do. He explained that each 1% merit increase for EPA employees for the state portion will cost about \$3.1 million, so a 2% program would be \$6.2 million on state funds that we would have to identify.

Provost Arden stated that his priorities over the next two weeks are to work through how we are going to handle the \$3.5 million flexibility cut and find out how we are going to handle the merit reallocation program. Those are the big ticket items that we have to get done.

Provost Arden stated that as we work through the merit program we are getting very late in the year. Last year a merit program was done and it was retroactive back to July. The further you get into the year it becomes very difficult to find funds to reallocate at the departmental level, so there is a possibility that we may do a program and make it effective January, which would ease the burden on departments this fiscal year and would give us time, because it would be an ongoing process.

Provost Arden reported on the ongoing searches for the university. He stated that the searches are going well. There is a very strong pool of candidates for Charlie Leffler's position. The searches for Textiles and Management deans are progressing very well. They have also kicked off a dean search for Education and are about to form a committee to develop a search for Dean of the College of Design as well as the search for Joanne Woodard's replacement in Institutional Equity and Diversity.

6. Faculty Ombuds Remarks and Q/A

Roy Baroff, NC State Faculty Ombuds gave an overview of what the Faculty Ombuds office does, which includes what his role is at NC State University, what he has been doing since his arrival on December 1st, and a new initiative from the Faculty Ombuds Office. He also provided a one page office update to the faculty.

Baroff stated that in terms of what this office does, in short, think about the last conflict or concern that you have had or a family member or a colleague have had. Typically that person went to someone to get some help or advice. Baroff said, to some extent he is your second head, the brain to help you think through issues of concern, to help you solve conflicts at an informal level. He noted that he is not an employee of NC State, but an independent contractor and that sort of helps to keep him independent and separate.

Baroff stated that it is confidential when people contact him. There are few exceptions, which are if there is imminent risk or serious harm to others or information about abuse and neglect, which under North Carolina law are required to be reported. He said sometimes people want him to disclose that they have contacted him because they need help with a situation. Other than

that any contact with him is off the record and he is not required to report to others in the university that you have contacted him.

Baroff stated that he is not part of any formal processes on the university campus and he doesn't participate in any formal processes. His goal is to help people resolve things at an informal level. He stated that he is neutral and impartial, so while you may go to someone for help, they may tell you what they think about your problem or your situation. He said he is going to help you analyze and will bring 30 years of experience as a mediator, lawyer, and adjunct professor.

Baroff stated that he has spent the better part of his career trying to help people resolve problems and thinks of himself as a conflict resolution professional. He said he is now the university's and that is the second role that he plays, which is to be sort of the eyes and ears in a place where faculty members can surface issues of concern while still maintaining and protecting confidentiality.

Baroff stated that if he hears from enough faculty members that a certain policy, regulation, or rule is giving them some difficulty, he is in the position to forward that either to the Provost's Office or the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs' office. Baroff said he is going to try to ask the university to consider and think about issues that are brought to him that people feel are larger for the university as a whole.

Baroff noted that the Ombuds office is located in an off-campus location where there is free parking. The address is

112 Cox Avenue, Ste. 213
Raleigh, NC 27605
(919) 542.2575

Baroff stated that an office charter has been developed and that as part of the General Faculty meeting they will have a signing event that lays out the overarching direction of the office and how it's going to do its work. There is also a website that is operational at facultyombuds.ncsu.edu.

Baroff stated that he has been meeting with faculty individually, and across campus by attending faculty meetings. He urged the faculty to invite him to attend their meetings if he has not already done so.

Baroff handed out a poster "The Faculty Ombuds Office Poster" and asked each senator to post it on their bulletin boards. The poster is also available on the web site for downloading.

Baroff reported that so far he has opened 39 cases. The general statistics for an ombuds office is one to four percent of a population, so with NC State's faculty population of about 2400 he is over 1 percent. The goal is not so much numbers as it is providing services to people and the university as a whole. He stated that in terms of the presentations, he has reached close to 1000 people through various meetings.

Baroff noted that most people contact him via telephone or email. If you email through your NC State email address there is a record. If you prefer not to have a record, contact him with an outside email account or telephone.

Baroff stated that his goal with this initiative is to determine how he can help faculty colleagues to be hard on problems, disagree on things, be soft on the people, and to be civil.

Questions and Comments

Past Chair Zonderman commented that there has been some literature about how civility has been used on some campuses to enforce so-called political correctness and on other campuses actually trying to squelch critical arguments on both the right and the left. You phrased it well when you said “don’t stop being critical in the work that you do and arguing tough problems, but go easy on people sort of in personal relations.” I think that is something we need to think hard about. I have been reading about some other Chancellors that have sort of put out these “talk nice to everybody all the time” campaigns. At a university what does that mean?

Baroff stated that this is not a new concept and some may be familiar with Roger Fisher’s “Getting to Yes” where part of the theme is to think about problems in people as both connected and separate. I’m a firm believer that conflict is this neutral energy force that can be negative and can be positive because we can have fights and wars and battles and we can also have catalyst, opportunity, change, and growth and the key that these guys were saying and what I have learned is, can we fight hard on the problem, disagree elegantly if you can and still be civil, polite, and cordial even when you vehemently disagree with someone on the content of the problem. That is what they started in motion and that is really the theme and it should fit with your concern that it is not about squelching any point of view and it is not designed to squelch critical thinking or controversial topics. The idea would be is there a way to do that and still be civil, polite, and cordial with the person you strongly disagree with.

Senator Fleisher stated that he is curious and would like to know who Mr. Baroff’s employer is.

Baroff responded that he is an independent contractor. He stated that he has had his own dispute resolution practice for the last 15 years. He is a lawyer and he is a professional mediator. He is also an arbitrator for the American Arbitration Association, for the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, so he does security arbitrations.

Senator Fleisher asked Mr. Baroff, where does his salary come from?

Baroff responded that he is paid from the Provost’s office.

7. Enrollment 2025 Projections: Process and Updates

Vice Provost Larick gave an overview of enrollment planning and the Enrollment Planning Committee. He stated that there is an Enrollment Planning Committee and it is a very inclusive committee. The committee is made up of about 22 people and the functions of the committee are three roles:

Dr. Larick stated that a few years back the Enrollment Planning Committee was charged with and completed the task of creating for the first time a long term enrollment plan. We had in 2010 created a 2020 enrollment plan. So, a ten year plan that was strategic in nature; it had both a narrative that talked about the direction that the university should go in enrollment and it also talked about specific targets. The committee is in the process of looking at that 2020 plan and trying to extend that out to 2025. We used to be asked by General Administration to do that on a two year basis but we haven't done it for a while. That plan is important to help the institution direct our strategic behavior in investments. As an example, one of the tenets of that 2020 plan has been that we would try to grow doctoral enrollment. And given that charge, then the university has been able to look at how we invest money more effectively to make that happen. An example of that would be the Provost's Fellow Program, where the Provost is now funding this year, 65 doctoral fellows for the first year, spread across multiple departments across all colleges participating in that program, with an initiative to try and grow that to 100 students. So, we have a strategic plan that says we should grow doctoral numbers. We make strategic investments to make that happen, so that is part of that 2025 enrollment plan. Another piece of that would be university operations. That helps the Director of Housing understand what type of housing we might need over the next ten years and it also helps the University Architect to get information about student numbers because that information would then feed into the master plan for the university. So the narrative of the 2025 plan certainly helps us with the strategic investments and strategic behaviors.

The next piece is a regular biennial plan. For enrollment funding purposes we submit to the State of North Carolina through UNC General Administration then to the Legislature a two year biennial plan. We are currently in the first year of our 15-16, and planning for the second year of that biennial plan. We submitted a plan last year for this fall and spring and next fall and spring. This time next year we will be submitting a two year plan for 17-18, 18-19 and it's that enrollment projection that dictates the enrollment increase or decrease funding that we would get from the State of North Carolina, assuming the Legislature funds it, which they have for this year.

The third piece that we do would be in the middle year, so as of September 10th we received our census numbers for Fall 2015 and we have a very short window of time that we have the opportunity to take that data and submit a potential change in our projected enrollment for Fall 2016. So, when we submitted a two-year plan last year, we didn't have today's student enrollment to influence that plan; we get that enrollment and we have the opportunity to submit our projections for how what happened Fall 2015 might change Fall 2016. The memo clearly says we have a chance to submit our projections as to what might happen, but there is no guarantee that our funding model will be changed associated with that projection. My interpretation is that if we submit something grossly larger than what we had asked for in a two year state budget we may not get it.

So, these are really the three main things that we are doing and right now we are ongoing in two of those initiatives. We are looking at our Fall 2015 enrollment and we are using that to inform a revision of Fall 2016 and at the same time we have kind of put on hold for a couple of weeks now, the process of the development, moving out from 2020-2025 on the ten year enrollment.

A little bit about how we go about the project of today which is looking at modifications that we might need to make for Fall 2016: through the University Office of Institutional Research and Planning, we have an enrollment tool that we have sent out to undergraduate directors, directors of graduate programs, department heads, associate deans, and deans. We sent it to them with the history of Fall 2012, Fall 2013, Fall 2014, what they had projected for 2015 and what they had accomplished for 2015 and what they had proposed for 2016 and then are there any modifications for it. We receive a complete set of feedback from the undergraduate level where about 80 percent of the graduate level will take those numbers and kind of roll them up into a college and then university. So the problem with that is we get just a few short weeks from when we have census data available. Our goal is to have done well enough with our biannual 2015-16, 2016-17 planning so we don't have to do major adjustments in that second year. The reality this year is we had put in some aggressive targets. We are about 230 undergraduate students short of what we had projected for Fall 2015. We are 182 master students and 89 doctoral students short. Given that hole that we have dug for ourselves, it is going to be a tremendous challenge for us to hit targets that we established for Fall 2016, so we know we are going to have to work on adjusting the Fall 2016 numbers backwards and what that means is we will not receive as much enrollment increase money as we had projected.

Questions and Comments

How do you plan to make up that difference now?

Dr. Larick stated that the way it works is on any given year if we undershoot enrollment, the following year it makes up, because they become our base and then we project from that. If we are in the situation that we are in now where we are overfunded for our enrollment, as long as next fall we at least hit this year's target, we wouldn't receive a budget cut, but we won't receive additional funds, so that is working with a projected budget. One goal is to make sure that we have at least 452 more students on campus next fall than we have this fall, so we at least will not have to give money back. We had projected an enrollment increase of about 500 additional students for next year and the question is, can we achieve that, and the answer is no.

Senator Bykova – Do you have reasons for the under enrollment in different levels undergrad, masters and doctoral students?

Dr. Larick responded yes, I talked about new enrollment, but realized that new enrollment only accounts for between one quarter and one third of our total, so we model in several different ways continuing enrollment, but at the undergraduate level there are big shifts in the quality of

new students we are bringing in and I think our models are having a hard time predicting, as accurately as we would like, continuing students. At the master's level, a huge trend that we are seeing in the College of Engineering would be a professional master's program. We made some changes a few years ago that made it easier for graduate students to register for more credits and we have a large cohort of students that are coming in with the goal of completing a master's degree in three semesters or two semesters and the curricula are being adjusted to help them do that, but the model is still anticipating that regular nine credit, nine credit, nine credit, three credit. We are doing all kinds of great student success initiatives and that success makes modeling continuing enrollment a challenge. On the new student side, graduate - especially doctoral- enrollment is something that is almost impossible to model. It really depends on the feedback received from departments. The DGPs have an opportunity to know how many grants are available in departments and how many students they have funding for. We really rely on the direct feedback from the Directors of Graduate Programs. I think it's a combination of the two, modeling for continuing students and then challenges at the doctoral level due to the funding that drives it.

Senator Bird – Does actual enrollment have to exactly match or is there a variance allowed?

Dr. Larick responded that historically, if we are over, we don't receive additional money. NC State has a history of being the most accurate university in our system.

Senator Bird – Do you have to report any differences?

Dr. Larick responded, yes.

Senator Pearce – Are there any connections between enrollment projections and admission standards?

Dr. Larick stated that at the graduate level it is distributed enrollment. The department makes an enrollment admissions recommendation to the graduate school and as long as the students meet the minimum requirement and they have a bachelor's degree from an accredited university, the graduate school is going to admit that student under recommendation of the program, so the programs monitor their standards and can raise or lower their standards depending on their enrollment target for that fall or that spring.

Dr. Larick stated that the Chancellor commented yesterday about the improving profile of undergraduates being admitted and eventually enrolling at NC State University, so those standards are something that we have consciously considered as we have only modestly increased new freshman enrollment. Those standards are something that have gone up, and that is strategically an objective, because when you think about student success it is a very positive way to influence student success.

Did the yield change?

Dr. Larick stated that last year they projected that the yield would go down because the quality of the applicants had gone up substantially, but the yield went up. This year they projected that the yield would be up and the yield was down. So we are trying to get a handle on it.

Senator Argyropoulos commented that when we first heard about the increase (I would like to focus on the graduate education aspects and the doctoral education aspects of this), we said how are we going to do it, especially if you belong to colleges and departments that do not have large service classes. You are aware of the fact that there are departments that have large service classes and they can actually compensate for the size of the graduate students in the way the TAs are being seen in return for their services. That is a very important component if you lead a department that doesn't have it at all and graduate students become extremely expensive. Have you thought about and in view of the GSSP is there anything we can do to try to somehow promote some means that take away the equality for colleges and departments that have large service classes versus those that don't?

Dr. Larick stated that there is no question that we have three different groups of students. We have students that are funded, then you need to break those down into research assistants and teaching assistants or a combination of both. We have students that are self-funded in some other way. Then we have students who are supporting themselves. We have thought about that all three of those relationships. The challenge is in order to be eligible for the GSSP is the student has to have the qualifying stipend, and the other challenge is we know that our qualifying stipends are inadequate - so in 1996 we set it at \$8,000 and we have never changed it and part of the reason we haven't changed it is because again understanding that if we were to raise that to a competitive salary of \$25,000 we could be even further disadvantaged in some programs.

Senator Argyropoulos stated that if we are asking for an increase in those numbers for fully funding graduate students, it is almost impossible.

Dr. Larick stated that some of the things that we are doing that will impact that is the implementation of recommendations of the budget instruction and task force, so as program enrollment increases student credit hours increase, but again one of the challenges there is that the large service course programs could be positively impacted by that.

Senator Bullock – What becomes of the colleges that aren't meeting their target but also are disadvantaged by this risk of trying to grow doctoral programs? Also some colleges are funded at a level four where others are funded at a level one.

Dr. Larick stated that the whole tenet behind that, the recommendations of the budget restructuring task force, is it is related to enrollment increase money only, so if we get a dollar because History is teaching another student, then it makes the most sense that some portion of that dollar should go to History for that one more student. That is the simple tenet behind the recommendation of the budget restructuring task force. It only applies to enrollment increase money. It doesn't apply to other sources of money that would be available; it's just this idea that where enrollment is increasing, the people that have the challenge of then teaching those students would have some guarantee of a certain amount of the funding that came from that increase.

Senator Bullock – Is there a reason why the funding model can't change and is there a reason why level fours must be level fours and level ones must be level ones?

Dr. Larick stated that until we learn differently, that is the way the money comes to the university. Secondly the reasons why there are categories (1-4), and then the 12 cells associated with baccalaureate versus masters versus doctoral, is that the original analysis came from IPEDS data and cost of education. Whether or not those 12 cells accurately today predict the actual cost of providing one credit hour to a PhD student in Engineering versus one credit hour to a bachelors in Engineering or in Humanities - it couldn't be perfectly accurate. The idea is that it was established to provide funding associated with what in the mid-nineties was the best relationship people had for the cost of education. There have been subtle changes to that. Different programs have moved from category one to category two, every year the base salary changes depending on our average base salary. Frankly, if I look at it from a university perspective I have to always be careful and say that the formula rewards NC State University because we are a doctoral granting university and because we have STEM programs at NC State. We are advantaged by the formula.

Provost Arden stated that the point raised is a very important point. When you look long term at the assistantships and fellowships that we have on campus over a ten or fifteen year period, what has grown obviously are teaching assistantships and fellowships, but what has not grown is research assistantships. Many of our peer institutions do a better job of growing research assistantships, whether it's through federally funded training programs or assistantships on grants. We have to figure out how to enable that because our competitors are doing a better job of growing research assistantships on campus.

What is the distinction between a grant and a research assistantship?

Provost Arden stated that we have grown our state funded appropriated teaching assistants very significantly, but what we are not doing is growing grant supported assistantships as effectively as some of our peers.

Dr. Larick stated that there has been a 70 percent increase in teaching assistantship appointments in the last ten years. During that period of time there has been a dramatic increase in research funding or expenditures, and you would think that the line for the number of students appointed by research grants would kind of parallel the increase in funding of research, but it doesn't at all.

Why is that?

Dr. Larick stated that in his opinion we have disincentivized faculty members from putting graduate student stipends on grants.

Senator Steer stated that if he gets to the point where he has run out of money to support someone, the downside is really bad, the upside is almost nothing, and so what do you do? You hold back, maybe you pick up a post doc. I would say that's better than a fellowship for the first year providing no guarantee that if things go bad someone would be picked up.

Dr. Larick said it used to be that if I had a two-year grant and took out a three year grant and took on a doctoral student and I did diligently grow grants for those three years and I didn't get funding for that student's fourth and final year, I could go down to the department head and say I need help and there was enough emergency funding around that we figured out a way to cover

that student. The other piece is the fact that many of our federal grants are three years and I would like to push everyone to have doctoral students out the door in four and five years but still there is a little risk. I am keenly aware of that as being two other issues that are influencing faculty's risk to take on a doctoral student.

Provost Arden stated that at the end of the day we need everyone to be thinking about this. It is not a simple thing, but making sure that we have our enrollment strategy aligned with our graduate student support strategy and aligned with our faculty growth strategy is really important, and doing that in a resource restrained environment where we have had budget cuts for the last seven years makes it even more challenging. So far, I think we are doing well, but we have to constantly think about where we are going to get the resources to employ more tenure track faculty, and develop better and more support for our graduate students if we are going to keep moving the university in the same direction.

Senator Silverman commented that we talk about retention, we talk about lapsed salaries, and we talk about increasing RAs. We are allowed in our funding payment for overseeing a student on an RA. We don't do this here, but we could allow a couple of thousand dollars going back to the faculty for administering that RA and if it was tied to the RA it stays within our missions, it gives you that bonus that corporations do, bonuses which go away if you don't have the RAs. It seems to me that is one of the easiest ways to quickly move on all three of those fronts and I don't understand why we haven't done that yet.

Dr. Larick stated that a question that he asked all the candidates was, would they consider a direct return of F&A if a person put a research assistantship on their grant and it was funded, could they get a return as an incentive. That is a question that we have asked and I'll probably ask the committee for finance and administration that question.

Dr. Larick stated that two things he thinks would be very helpful in growing research appointments are to minimize that 25% tuition remission requirement and instead of the negative, turn it into a positive and do some kind of return.

8. Old and New Business

Version 2 of the draft document on Best Practice for Shared Governance; see Appendix A.

Chair Moore stated that the Executive Committee reviewed the document and considered all the input from the senators on suggested changes. Chair Moore explained the changes that had been made by the committee.

A motion passed with unanimous support to adopt the document.

9. Issues of Concern

Chair Moore stated that three additional issues of concern have come in and all three will go to the Executive Committee for review.

- a. The first issue is already being discussed as part of an existing issue of concern. The College of Humanities and Social Sciences has contacted the Senate and they are

concerned about the reporting lines for the Undergraduate Courses and Curriculum Committee (UCCC) and the Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE). They have some suggestions about changing the reporting lines. That falls under faculty governance, which is already being discussed in the Academic Programs Committee. It has also been forwarded to the Executive Committee.

- b. Senator Byrnes submitted an issue of concern: he thinks there should be some type of emergency training and instructions in classrooms for faculty in case an emergency situation arises.
- c. Former Senator Ed Funkhouser submitted an issue of concern related to whether international students are going through agents to be placed at the university.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:21 p.m.