

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Executive Summary

September 8, 2015

1. Call to Order

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

2. Introductory Remarks

Chair Moore asked the visitors to introduce themselves.

3. Announcements

Chair Moore stated that topics the committees are discussing are on the second page of the agenda.

Chair Moore asked the senators to help get the word out to colleges about the Faculty Ombuds office.

Chair Moore announced that the Terrace Dining Room, which is the restaurant at the Lonnie Poole golf course, invites faculty to come for lunch. It also offers limited service in the afternoon.

The *Howling Counsel* newsletter has gone out and it contains a lot of good information for faculty about legal issues at NC State University.

Faculty who wish to fly drones over university property need to be aware of the restrictions.

Senator Karen Bullock has agreed to serve on the nominating committee for the Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity.

4. Approval of the Minutes, Meeting No. 1, August 25, 2015

Secretary Orcutt moved approval of the minutes for regular meeting number 1 of the 62nd session of the NC State Faculty Senate.

The minutes were approved.

5. Provost's Remarks and Q/A

Provost Arden's updates.

Budget

Provost Arden stated that we still don't have a budget. He has heard that the Legislature is close and should be rolling something out this week.

Provost Arden stated that the big issue is what authority the administration is going to have and what resources will there be for EPA/SPA, and particularly faculty. At the moment the

indications are that they might have the authority, not funding which is the same situation as last year.

Provost Arden stated that *US News and World Report* will come out tomorrow and they hope the university continues to move forward in the rankings.

6. Faculty Giving Campaign

Brian Sischo, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, stated that the focus of their conversation is around faculty, staff, and retiree giving. He said they have a good cross section of about ten folks from both faculty and staff representation. They are looking for feedback from the Faculty Senate.

Sischo stated that one of the important to dos in doing this as they galvanize philanthropic support is really tapping one of the most important constituencies, who are the employees of this university. He said it's typically a staple of most universities that they ask their own employees to give back in whatever form. He noted that as part of the SECC, you can designate to a variety of charities including NC State. Out of the half million dollars that is raised annually, about \$28,000 comes back to NC State, so some may designate programs at NC State in the SECC campaign.

Comments from Ann Horner, Executive Director of Annual Giving

Horner stated that they have a great faculty and staff council of ten and they would love to have more participation. The group represents a number of colleges. She noted that they are engaged and clearly care about the university. She stated that during their meeting last week the primary goal was to learn about personal motivation of giving and they would like to add NC State to that list in a big way.

Comments from Lisa Bullard, Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering /Director of Undergraduate Studies

Professor Bullard stated that she was motivated to join the committee because she is a graduate of NC State and looking back at what she gained as an undergraduate through the scholarship she received, through relationships with faculty and opportunities to do high impact activities, she knows what an impact it made on her as a student and now as a faculty member even more so. She stated that she sees students for who getting a scholarship can make all the difference between staying and leaving or maybe just between surviving and thriving, so she sees the impact that giving makes.

7. Old and New Business

a. Results of topics elected by senators at the first meeting: see Appendix B.

Chair Moore noted that there were quite a few topics. One topic was athletics and academics and nine people voted to have that as a fall faculty meeting topic. Roby Sawyers, Faculty Athletics Representative is not going to be in town during the meeting, so he will come to a Senate meeting to give an update.

b. Vote to be taken on minor changes/updates to Faculty Bylaws (Article VII, Committees and Councils)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the updates to the bylaws. A hand vote was taken. The motion passed with 28 for and 0 opposed.

c. Sen.Issue3: Graduate program (including GSSP, increase in PhD numbers) and support of our research

Chair Moore stated that the Executive Committee was not sure where to go on this issue so they are requesting some input.

The Senators provided much input on the issue.

d. Sen.Issue4: Broader review of shared governance at NCSU

Chair Moore urged the Senators to review the draft document prior to the next Faculty Senate meeting. It will be the main topic of discussion.

8. Issues of Concern

- a. All ongoing Issues of Concern are listed on the Faculty Senate Website at: http://www.ncsu.edu/faculty_senate/ (fourth on the list of main links)
- b. IOC 1508b Loss of Faculty/Staff parking in the North Hall lot
This issue was sent to the Resources and Environment Committee for review.

Senator Cabbage asked about the status of PTR in the Governance and Personnel Policy committee.

Senator Fleisher stated that it was discussed at their first meeting and the consensus of the committee was that the decision was already made by the BOG and that they are not going to change what they have decided, so the consensus of the committee is to leave it as is.

Senator Cabbage said he would like to propose a resolution to revisit PTR rules and regulations.

Chair Moore stated that it might be appropriate to share a document that went to the Governance and Personnel Policy Committee with the Senate before continuing a discussion on a resolution.

Senator Cabbage moved that the Senate consider his proposed resolution regarding post tenure review.

The motion was seconded. A discussion will take place at the next meeting.

9. Adjourn

A motion passed to adjourn the meeting at 4:34 p.m.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
September 8, 2015

Regular Meeting No. 2 of the 62nd Session: Faculty Senate Chambers September 8 2015

Present: Chair Moore, Past Chair Zonderman, Secretary Orcutt, Parliamentarian Lubischer; Provost Arden; Senators Ange-van Heugten, Ash, Auerbach, Banks, Bartlett, Bernhard, Bird, Bullock, Bykova, Cabbage, Davidian, Fath, Fleisher, Gunter, Hergeth, Huffmann, Laffitte, McKoy, Moore, Pearce, Perros, Porter, Sannes, Scarce, Silverberg, Smith, Sotillo, Williams

Excused:

Absent: Senator: Argyropoulos, Byrnes, Devetsikiotis, Kathariou, Spontak, Steer

Guests: Lisa Bullard, Professor, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering; Ann Horner, Executive Director Annual Giving; Brian Sischo, Vice Chancellor of Advancement; Roy Baroff, Faculty Ombuds Office; Roby Sawyers, Professor, Poole College of Management/FAR; Duane Larick, Provost's Office; Katharine Stewart, Provost's Office

1. Call to Order

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

2. Introductory Remarks

Chair Moore asked the visitors to introduce themselves.

3. Announcements

Chair Moore stated that topics the committees are discussing are on the second page of the agenda.

Chair Moore asked the senators to help get the word out to their colleges about the Faculty Ombuds office.

Chair Moore announced that the Terrace Dining Room, which is the restaurant at the Lonnie Poole golf course, invites faculty to come for lunch. She noted that it also offers limited service in the afternoon.

The *Howling Counsel* newsletter has gone and it contains a lot of good information for faculty about legal issues at NC State University.

Faculty who wish to fly drones over university property need to be aware of the restrictions.

Senator Karen Bullock has agreed to serve on the nominating committee for the Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity.

4. Approval of the Minutes, Meeting No. 1, August 25, 2015

Secretary Orcutt moved approval of the minutes for regular meeting number 1 of the 62nd session of the NC State Faculty Senate.

The minutes were approved.

5. Provost's Remarks and Q/A

Provost Arden's updates.

Budget

Provost Arden stated that we still don't have a budget. He has heard that the Legislature is close and should be rolling something out this week. He believes that there will be some management flexibility in the zone of about one half percent, which amounts to a couple million dollars for the university as a whole.

Provost Arden stated that the big issue is what authority we are going to have and what resources we will have for EPA/SPA, and particularly faculty. At the moment the indications are that we might have the authority, not funding which is the same situation we were in last year.

Provost Arden stated that he is hearing that SPA employees will receive a \$750 bonus in December. He and the Chancellor are very committed to try and do something up front so that they can continue to move faculty salaries forward. He plans to work with the deans and department heads to determine how much they can do and how they can identify those resources across the university.

Provost Arden stated that *US News and World Report* comes out tomorrow and they (Chancellor and Provost) hope to continue to move forward in rankings. He said they don't try to manage the rankings, they try to do the right things and believe rankings will follow. Interestingly related to previous topics about merit, one of the subcategories that constantly pulls us back from further advancement is the faculty resource category, which is not just faculty salaries, it's a lot of things that include sections, size, and a lot of different things. He encouraged the faculty to look at NC State's report. He stated that he welcomes input, because as they review it they want to make sure that they are making the right investments for the university for the right reasons.

6. Faculty Giving Campaign

Brian Sischo, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, stated that the focus of their conversation is around faculty, staff, and retiree giving. We have a good cross section of about ten folks from both faculty and staff representation. We are at the stage where we are looking for feedback. It has not been put in place and so we really wanted to use this forum to get your thoughts as this comes together. It's important and the reason goes to what the Chancellor has said publicly, this university can be a really good university with state support. It has been and will always be, but the differential between good and great is the private resources that can really go to augment the things that you do on a daily basis, whether it be in the form of professorships, fellowships, scholarships, support for facilities that we all work in, etc. Hopefully we will see when the rankings come out tomorrow, further proof that this is a university with some exponential momentum, whether it's our research profile, whether it's the quality of the freshmen class this year being the highest ever or whether it's the kind of outpouring of support that we've seen

from alumni, parents, friends, and others. This is a university that is capitalizing on what has been a historic strength, and I think as we become more well known, as we become more public in what we are doing that will continue.

Sischo stated that one of the important to dos in doing this as we galvanize philanthropic support is really tapping one of the most important constituencies, who are the employees of this university. Many of you have worked at other universities, it's typically a staple of most universities that they ask their own employees to give back in whatever form. We have had the State Employees Combined Campaign, in fact, NC State has really led the UNC System in support for that SECC and we would expect that that will continue. What we are going to talk about today does not replace SECC. Keep in mind that as part of the SECC, you can designate to a variety of charities including NC State. Out of the half million dollars that is raised annually, about \$28,000 comes back to NC State, so some of you may designate programs at NC State in the SECC campaign. What we are looking to do is really broaden that in terms of offering the ability for faculty and staff to give to whatever their desire may be at the university. What we heard in part from the committee is in one case the individual gives back to his department's discretionary fund that provides travel funds to conferences for that department, totally acceptable. Now again you can't earmark it for personal use, but if you are part of a department that supports those kind of activities, that is all part of what this would represent.

Sischo reported that about 10% of the university gives back to NC State, which is not bad considering that we haven't asked anyone to do so in the past. Interestingly about 80% of the Faculty Senate has given at least once over the past five years. This is a group that actually has demonstrated their willingness to give back. We hope to leverage that as we talk to others.

Sischo stated that the key is participation. This isn't about expecting everyone to give thousands of dollars. There may be some that give thousands of dollars every year, but what it's about is participation, because this is information particularly as we go toward the public launch of our comprehensive campaign. This is the information that foundations see. In fact, most of you are probably familiar that in grant applications one of the lines is what percentage will your Board of Trustees give, what percentage of faculty and staff give, that is considerations they think about in whether they award grants from their foundation or not. Importantly it sends a signal to our students. It sends a signal to the alumni that its employees were in a position to support the university that support us. I just want to stress that this is about participation.

Sischo stated that there will be an opportunity to provide a gift to whatever is most passionate for you. He said, we do see a couple of featured specials. What we see as a special coming to bear in terms of the faculty and staff giving effort is a dependent tuition scholarship program. This has been a stickler for some faculty. A lot of other competitor universities offer a tuition benefit for sons and daughters, dependents of employees. This is something that I know is really important to the Chancellor. Our hope is to be able to offer any, this is still in development, but the concept is that dependents of employees that meet eligibility requirements would be eligible for a tuition scholarship benefit. Right now we are using a figure of \$2,000, which would be dictated in part by what is available. Some of you may know that there is a family scholarship fund already in existence. There is about \$1 million in endowment in that fund, so in total that is spinning off about thirty five to forty thousand dollars a year, which helps, but currently we have

325 dependents of employees enrolled at NC State. That forty thousand isn't going to go far enough to support the demand we are expecting. So, this will be a featured priority and we believe that it will be something that a number of faculty and staff will resonate with. In terms of that program we will have more information to share as the details of this unfold.

Sischo stated that it gets strict in terms of determining eligibility, so that is why we need to be very specific about what a dependent means. What happens if someone leaves mid semester? What students would qualify and which ones may not? We want to be very clear and transparent on that, but I would be interested in your thoughts as to whether that would be appealing to faculty and staff as they consider.

Comments from Ann Horner, Executive Director of Annual Giving

Horner stated that they have a great faculty and staff council of ten and they would love to have more participation. The group represents a number of colleges. She noted that they are engaged and clearly care about the university. She stated that during their meeting last week the primary goal was to learn about personal motivation of giving and they would like to add NC State to that list in a big way.

Horner stated that she wanted to share a few points from the meeting. She stated that they were revealing to her and she learned a great deal.

The faculty interest and priorities are really quite different from staff, so we learned early on that we have some segmenting to do and some messaging to do that will vary and we are in this meeting today and we are also planning a similar meeting with the Staff Senate to learn more about what their needs are. They are really very different. I really enjoyed hearing the personal stories about why the faculty and staff on that council give; feeling the responsibility, somebody said it's what I'm supposed to do, seeing a need or gap and learning to fill it and there is no one in this room that hasn't felt that. Giving to solve a problem and help a student. Students came up over and over again, so we feel like that will be part of our messaging and experiencing something really good here at NC State and wanting to support it so it continues and grows and gets better to insure that it's there for those who follow us. So people give to people, we all know that whether in your church, your neighborhood, we all know that someone comes to you for help, so our challenge is how we do that from a broad base marketing perspective. We hope that this is going to grow into a very large network, but our starting will be from more broad-based communications. So we need a combination of personal stories and data. It is really clear to us that you expect to see a strong case to why you should give to NC State and we are going to work together on figuring out what those specials will be. The scholarship would be one and I think there are others. I proposed that the library be there, but some people felt that wasn't the right one, but I think there will be others. We want to encourage participation, but you will still be able to write in and give to whatever areas you prefer. We will promote sustaining gifts through both payroll deduction and credit card.

So, on Sunday a new web site was launched. It is bare bones, but you are welcome to go in and look at it. If you will just look for faculty and staff giving. There are two faculty stories on there now that are moving and we will be adding more. We'll add data, points of interest, and photos of the advisory council members, so that people can identify with that. I invite you to be in

touch with me for suggestions for the web site, specifically and this program generally. We are open to as much dialogue as we can have before we actually launch. Let me know if you would like to participate on the council.

Comments from Lisa Bullard, Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering /Director of Undergraduate Studies

My motivation for joining the committee is that I'm not only a faculty member, but also a graduate and so looking back at what I gained as an undergraduate through the scholarship I received, through relationships with faculty and opportunities to do high impact activities I know what an impact it made on me as a student and now as a faculty member even more so, I see students for who getting a scholarship can make all the difference between staying and leaving or maybe just between surviving and thriving, and so when I see that need and I see that individual it really brings home to me, that that is something that I care deeply about and I can see the impact that giving makes.

Another thing that I think about with regard to the culture of my department is that there are some things that we don't have to do but they are nice to do, things that we want to do, say if we just had that little bit of discretionary money to send a student to a conference, to welcome incoming students, to celebrate with our graduate, to equip the student lounge with a stapler, microwave, some essential things that would make their life a little bit easier. Those are things that as faculty we see those needs within our own department and recognize that that is a need that is going to make a difference to those students that I'm interacting with and it's a need that we can help contribute to. As faculty our culture is very individualistic. We are judged on how many papers we write, how many grants we get, patents and those sort of things, things that you can count and things that you can list and those things are important because they indicate excellence, they indicate contributions but if you think about what your real legacy is going to be, it's not the number of papers, the number of grants or patents, it's those relationships that you have formed and the ways in which you have been able to give back to your department and your university. So, I really challenge you to help us challenge our colleagues to think about that impact that we as faculty can have, and it's so exciting to see when you are in a position to give back, the difference that can make. I know you see that in your own careers, in your own lives and with your own students, so I'm very appreciative for the opportunity to participate. I personally have a lot of passion for my department and my students, so this is an opportunity for us as faculty to really engage in this process.

Questions and Comments

Senator Fleisher – You asked if a faculty member is interested in supporting students in need, have you considered sitting up a system where you can support a particular student.

Sischo: There is a restriction in being able to identify a specific student, but the idea is you can set up a scholarship fund and if you want to identify you can insert certain preferences, whether it be by county or major, but you can't designate a specific student. We do work hard on the flip side to make that connection between donors and their student recipients. Today we have more than 2400 endowed funds and so our donor selection team works hard to make that connection, so that you can at least see where your money is going.

Senator Williams – Are you thinking in terms of giving to programs? With programs, at least when you are raising money for the private sector, they want to know what they are getting and if you have a program that appeals to them they will give money for that program.

Sischo – The whole key to this is to understand that you as an individual can give to whatever you so desire at the university. Our ability to package some of those areas up and to highlight those as featured specials are the things we are looking for to collect feedback on. That may be an area. Recently there was a partnership announced for Habitat for Humanity in building homes on Lake Wheeler Road, now that is not an NC State program, but that goes to some of the same kind of things you are talking about.

Senator Cabbage – Do you think there is a way we can move all of our foundations to be more interactive, collegial, cooperative programs, so that we do a better job advocating faculty ...

Sischo stated that he thinks it's a good point. In the year and a half that I have been here the notion of moving all foundations in any one direction is not easily met, but I think the notion of continued cross collaboration and setting best case business models is something that I personally have been thriving to do, to create forums where not only the deans, but the development officers in those colleges have the ability to learn what others are doing, so I'm a believer that we can lead folks to the water, shoving their head in the water might not be as easily done. You raise a good point, which is the ability to be communicative, collaborative, and transparent in how funds are raised and how those funds are allocated. It is something that is important for the university.

Senator Bullock – I just want to add to the point about whether people can allocate funds for specific students or not. We have a couple of scholarships in our department and one is for a student who trains in renal disease, so we have a donor who is specifically interested in renal disease, so we select the student, but the donors actually get to interact with the student. That is one of the ways if you really wanted to develop a relationship with the student who is receiving your funds. There are many examples how that can be done.

Sischo – We encourage that. I know there are a number of scholarship funds where their faculty committees are involved in selecting students, so there are ways to make sure that the donor's interest and the type of student and the profile of student is factored into the selection process.

Past Chair Zonderman commented that he was very pleased to hear that 80% of the Senate already give. He stated that it is the reflection of people who care about the future of this place. The question I have is how important retirees are. So, you have someone giving by payroll deduction and they retire. Do you have a mechanism to reach out to them once they retire? If not I would urge you to do that.

The response was, right now they do not have a mechanism to reach out to retirees.

Sischo stated that he thinks there are some mechanisms that can be implemented.

Senator Smith McKoy stated that she is a rarity around these parts by being a black female faculty member and a native of Raleigh, NC and on several occasions she has offered to go with the development team to connect with minority givers in the area, because often the team that goes to meet people is pretty much like the team that you have here. She stated that it does put some distance between minority communities and givers and the university because of that. She said she has never been tapped for that and Dewayne Washington points to an example where he was a little bit upset because there was not one who was willing to give him feedback (this relates to your predecessor, not you) about how his funds were being used, so my question is what sort of diversity awareness do you have built into this campaign? What do you think you could do to maybe connect better to minority givers in the area?

Sischo – I think your offer hits at the heart of it, which is, I would say donors tolerate development staff. They really want to embrace faculty and students and so our overarching objective should be to leverage that offer. My experience has been that there has been nothing more meaningful to those donors, particularly if it is someone with expertise in that donor’s area of interest, to be able to really get to the heart of where their interests lie, so I would like for us to be able to as an outgrowth of the faculty, staff effort to really take advantage of not only the committee but others around campus that would be willing to participate in that. I think from an overarching campaign communications perspective we take diversity very seriously in all aspects of diversity and I hope you are seeing that. For those of you who may not have seen the most recent video that accompanied the year end gift announcement I think that is symbolic of our division in terms of how serious we are about diversity, in terms of how we reflect diversity at NC State and hopefully you will see more.

7. Old and New Business

a. Results of topics elected by senators at the first meeting: see Appendix B.

Chair Moore noted that there were quite a few topics. One topic was athletics and academics and nine people voted to have that as a fall faculty meeting topics. Roby Sawyers, Faculty Athletics Representative is not going to be in town during the meeting, so he will come to a Senate meeting to give an update.

b. Vote to be taken on minor changes/updates to Faculty Bylaws (Article VII, Committees and Councils)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the updates to the bylaws. A hand vote was taken. The motion passed with 28 for and 0 opposed.

c. Sen.Issue3: Graduate program (including GSSP, increase in PhD numbers) and support of our research

When the Executive Committee met the committee wasn’t sure where to go with this so they would like to get some input.

Questions and Comments

Senator Fleisher commented that he didn't vote for this because he had specific questions. It seems that the one thing that could solve most of the problems with the graduate programs will be more money. I don't have any objections to this, but the reality is that a lot of money for the graduate support program goes to international students, because it costs a lot to fund them. I'm totally in support of having international students here, but the reality is that it does impact our system quite a bit. Is there anything we can do?

Senator Pearce – What do you mean by increase in PhD numbers?

Chair Moore responded that that was the enrollment projections that the university put out about the number of students that we foresee in the future and the enrollment projections for PhD students.

Provost Arden stated that it is a part of the 2020 teaching plan where we look at student numbers and our population to be fairly level on our undergraduate numbers just increasing a little bit and have most of the increase on graduate student numbers, doctoral programs. We are a Research I doctoral institution and we need to emphasize that as part of our identity and part of what we are doing. It is somewhat different to the previous enrollment strategy that we had to be biggest on the undergraduate side, so we had a very aggressive growth strategy on the undergraduate side which was putting pressure on both student quality and student experience, so we have leveled that off in terms of our resources to growing the doctoral program.

Senator Pearce— So, are those projections by program and how does that tie in with faculty? When I see my program where the graduate faculty has declined by only “5 (30%) and the number of undergraduates stays the same or goes up. Is there a consistency across this plan?

Provost Arden stated that he can't speak for every graduate program across the university because they are all a little different, but in general the cost of the strategic plan that talks about growth in faculty and the growth of doctoral programs are linked together, so we are trying to invest in both, but frankly we recognize that it is not possible to be where we want to be in terms of growth in doctoral programs without growth in faculty. That has been a big problem in the strategic plan. Now has that necessarily played out in every single discipline or program across the university equally? No, I'm sure it hasn't, but we are all working very hard to grow tenure/tenure track faculty.

Senator Pearce- If the programs are staying the same or getting bigger and the number of faculty involved in the programs are getting smaller, something has to give. We are not reducing the undergraduate program as I understand it, we are just keeping it level.

Provost Arden stated that we are reducing the first time, full time freshmen class, but we are trying to slightly increase the overall number of undergraduate students.

Senator Pearce stated that he is trying to see the consistency in this. The tenure track faculty has been flat in the last ten years.

Provost Arden stated that when he and the Chancellor came into office they looked at it and the tenure/tenure track faculty had not changed more than 3 percent in fifteen years, so that is why they made it part of the strategic plan and they have in the last four years recovered all the losses that they had in numbers across the university during the worst years of the budget cuts and started to make progress, so he is interested to see where we are this year when the faculty census numbers come in at the end of the month.

Provost Arden stated that over the last four years we have been dealing with some significant budget cuts and a lot of those cuts have been taken from vacant faculty positions. The reality is unless we grow to a certain degree particularly at the high end of the 12 cell matrix doctoral students in the STEM disciplines, we won't realize the resources that we need to invest in more faculty numbers, so it's a little bit of chicken and egg. If we hadn't met our enrollment target particularly on the doctoral side, we would actually have had large budget cuts. So it is a challenge to keep these two moving together, to keep investing in the faculty, hence the Chancellor's Faculty Excellence program and many of the other programs that were brought out at the same time to invest in graduate programs, the Provost doctoral fellowship program, the huge amount of money that we invested into the GSSP, so investing equally in both sides goes hand in hand.

Provost Arden stated that making sure that we try to invest in both of those elements, doctoral students, stipends, GSSP, doctoral student equipment, trying to balance that investment in faculty is really at the core of it. The challenge is that we have had massive state budget cuts in the last five years and we have high turnovers in faculty at the moment. We have to replace the 79 faculty that we lost last academic year alone, before we have any net gains on new positions that we allocate.

Senator Bykova – My main concern is not what we are trying to do, but more talking about the quantity rather than the quality of our students, and the question is how to attract good students.

Provost Arden stated that we are talking about both. When we are talking about the enrollment plan, the enrollment plan specifically is numbers, but every program is talking about the quality of students. The quality of students is affected by a lot of things, probably the most important is the quality of the faculty, but the other is the level of support that we have, level of fellowships, level of stipends, and the level of graduate student support programs, where we are really aware of that, going into the task force now on looking at graduate student support and we can continue to invest in that. We are making progress but at the end of the day we have a lot of things that we are trying to do.

Provost Arden stated that he would be happy to share with the Senate some highlights on investments out of the Provost's reserve into the colleges. He has shared them with the A&M, the deans and will be sharing this week with the Board of Trustees, which actually shows the amount of money that we are spending on graduate programs, the amount spent on the Chancellor's Faculty Excellence program, the amount spent on other disciplinary hires and salary increases. He would be more than happy to share that information.

Senator Bykova commented that when we talk about funding we need to also consider the morals of the funding even though it's different in different departments and colleges.

Senator Bullock – Is there considerable risk in growing doctoral programs considering the newly proposed model, the 12 cell matrix, in terms of credit production hours where money will follow students?

Provost Arden stated what we are talking about is how we try to distribute the money once it comes to the university. The bottom line is that unless we are producing an increase in credit hours, particularly at the high end of the 12 cell matrix, we don't get the resources coming into the university. At the moment we have a lack of where there is predictable funding for "D" credit hours but no uniform or predictable or transparent funding for regular on campus credit hours, so what we are trying to do is equalize that and it isn't to pass out all of the money, it is to pass out about 50% of what comes into Provost's reserve and to do it in a way that leads directly to departments and programs for producing on campus credit hours, as well as the distance education credit hours, producing a level playing field. All we are talking about is the distribution of incremental resources, very much a based budget. We are talking about how can we equitably transparently, distribute the resources that come into the university according to where they were generated, whether it's on campus or distance education.

Senator Auerbach - What happens is you invest resources in PhD programs and that ends up decreasing the number of undergraduate student credit hours by a huge amount and the multiplier of the 12 cell matrix doesn't come close to making it up. So it's always nice to think that we are getting so much more money for PhD students, it doesn't if the drop in undergraduate student credit hours is big enough that it is a drop in bucket and that's what we are seeing.

Provost Arden agreed and stated that Humanities and Social Sciences for example, in the last five years has seen a significant decrease in total undergraduate credit hour production. There are multiple factors for that and one is the decrease in incoming first time full time freshmen class of about 600, which means roughly 1100 less first year and second year students on campus taking general education hours. The high preparedness of the incoming class means that more students are coming in with AP credits and not requiring some of those classes. There are several factors, but just for the record what you should know is despite the pretty significant drop in credit hour production by CHASS I haven't cut the college's base budget, so in fact, the college is getting more per credit hour than it has done for a long time. If we are going to go forward with the way we allocate resources to those units that are growing their credit hours, particularly in the high element, we have to also be aware that that means we may be moving money away from some colleges. "The only way that I can keep CHASS's budget where it is despite a 25% drop in credit hours is to take it from other colleges who are growing their student numbers of credit hours and I don't think at the end of the day that is fair to other programs. It's about looking at trends and trying to even things out so that we support programs that maybe have a temporary drop, but we also try to reward programs and support students in areas that are growing quickly."

Senator Porter – How can we recruit and support doctoral students.

Provost Arden stated that it is an important discussion. Education has gone through a big change in reformatting its departmental structure, reformatting its doctoral program structure and trying to align the two, and going from five PhD's to three. We are aware of that and I have already had that discussion with your dean and I think it is a very important discussion.

Senator Cabbage – I agree with David on distribution and where you generate credit hours and also to compliment Dwayne, the GSSP has been easily the most useful, fair and equitable program in our college because it is completely neutral. If you provide the funds you get the GSSP. I do worry that if we put all our focus and eggs in the PhD basket; really we are generating the most credit hours for master's degrees.

Vice Provost Larick --When you are looking at the 2020 enrollment plan and we are working toward the 2025 plan in the current plan and I would bet in the future plan, that plan will say with a focus on graduate education and doctoral education part of that being a true recognition of the fact that there is a huge opportunity in many areas of what I call professional masters and not just the PSM's that we have talked about across many of our colleges. The opportunity to do graduate training that leads directly to credentialed employment would be my broad definition of professional masters.

Provost Arden stated if you look at most Research I doctoral institutions they do have a somewhat larger proportion of doctoral students and post-doctoral scholars and I think moving us toward that end along with deepening our research structure and hiring more tenure/tenure track faculty is consistently where we want to be as an institution.

Senator Bullock – I appreciate your knowledge and that there has been a number of factors that has been causing a decrease in credit hours in the college, but one of the things that wasn't acknowledged was that we don't have control over the enrollment, but the students that were admitted, select the disciplines in our college and that is also a contributing factor.

Provost Arden stated that there are multiple factors. We are admitting more students who are seeking STEM disciplines. Somewhere along the line it is really important when we think strategically and long term about where we are as a university. We make sure that the drivers are who we want to be as an institution and who we want to look like, not how do we get "X" amount of money so a given program can stay viable. Those are the kind of discussions we want to have. I think enrollment management and having a really good enrollment plan is one of the most important things you can do to shape the institution. I'm comfortable with the decisions we made five or six years ago. Let's see if we can tweak them, modify that for the new 2025 enrollment plan.

Senator Pearce – If you allocate by credit hours and you fall short by 20 or 25 percent you are going to be off a few courses, and your credit hours will go down. Is that a justification for which comes first. Is it per capita that you look at?

Provost Arden stated that is true and that's the challenges to keep those things in balance. What you don't want to do is to keep into a downward cycle one way or the other. Part of the strategy

is to keep back 50% of your resources so that we can strategically invest those in certain areas. So, for example, if there is a program that we want to continue to grow and be successful and it is losing credit hours and if we continue to cut its budget it would affect faculty members. We could use some of those resources that were held back from the Provost's reserve to continue programs and keep them moving in the right directions because they are important and critical to the institution.

Past Chair Zonderman stated that he urges that any draft enrollment plan come to the Senate for further review.

Vice Provost Larick stated that they will be as inclusive as they can.

d. Sen.Issue4: Broader review of shared governance at NCSU

Chair Moore urged the Senators to review the draft document prior to the next Faculty Senate meeting. It will be the main topic of discussion.

8. Issues of Concern

- c. All ongoing Issues of Concern are listed on the Faculty Senate Website at: http://www.ncsu.edu/faculty_senate/ (fourth on the list of main links)
- d. IOC 1508b Loss of Faculty/Staff parking in the North Hall lot was sent to R&E Committee

Senator Cabbage wants to know the status of PTR in the committee.

Senator Fleisher stated that it was discussed at their first meeting and the consensus of the committee was that the decision was already made by the BOG and that they are not going to change what they have decided, so the consensus of the committee is to leave it as is.

Senator Cabbage said he would like to propose a resolution to revisit PTR rules and regulations.

Chair Moore stated that it might be appropriate to share a document that went to the Governance and Personnel Policy Committee with the Senate before continuing a discussion on a resolution.

Chair Moore stated that the document was a summary of the timeline starting with summer of 2014 when the BOG made the policy that we had to adhere to and it goes through the steps that were taken and it was sent to the Governance and Personnel Policy Committee.

Senator Fleisher, Co-chair of the committee agreed. He suggested continuing the discussion at the Executive Committee meeting before discussing it at the Governance and Personnel Policy Committee.

Chair Moore agreed to do that.

Senator Cabbage moved that the Senate consider his proposed resolution regarding post tenure review.

The motion was seconded. A discussion will take place at the next meeting.

Senator Cabbage - So if we do discuss this we have heard many times that this grievance process is one of the limiting factors that requires us to have administrators make the final decision and not the faculty. I have also asked several times for some historical information on grievances and how many occurred and what the success rate is. I think that will be very helpful to have that.

Chair Moore responded that information is requested by the chairs of the committee and the committee you were on last year was not in agreement with you in needing that information so it was not requested. Let's hold the discussion until the next meeting.

Senator Smith McKoy wants to know is there a way to list the faculty's concerns for something that they are ordered to do.

Chair Moore stated that the Faculty Assembly meets and brings concerns from all the other institutions. This will probably be one of the topics at the meeting on Friday.

Senator Smith McKoy – How do our concerns become a part of record?

Past Chair Zonderman stated that if it is a formal Faculty Assembly motion it will appear on their web site.

Past Chair Zonderman commented that the Board of Governors new policy mandates three levels of substantive review: The Department of Faculty Committee, Department Head, and Dean

What we developed last year was the system of, if the dean disagrees with department head and/or department faculty committee, it would go to a college level review. If the dean continues to disagree with the college level review then the Provost would make the final decision. The Provost doing that is not mandated by the Board of Governors.

9. Adjourn

A motion passed to adjourn the meeting at 4:34 p.m.