NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
November 28, 2017
3:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting No. 7 of the 64th Session: Faculty Senate Chambers   November 28, 2017

Present: Chair Bird, Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten, Immediate Past Chair Moore, Parliamentarian Kellner, Senators Argyropoulos, Ash, Banks, Barrie, Berry-James, Bullock, Bykova, Carver, Eseryel, Fath, Feducia, Havner, Hayes, Huffman, Kotek, Lim, Orcutt, Parker, Pearce, Sannes, Sederoff, Smith, Thakur, Young

Excused: Senators Perros, Rever

Absent: Senators Auerbach, Boyer, Gunter, Hawkins, Hergeth, Kathariou, Kuzma, Lafitte, Nam

Guests: Randy Woodson, Chancellor; PJ Teal, Chancellor's Office; Mary Lelik, OIRP; Courtney Thornton, Assoc. Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Policy; Roy Baroff, Faculty and Staff Ombuds Office; Marc Hoit, Vice Chancellor, OIT; Doug James, Office of Faculty Development; Laguire Meadows, ACE Fellow; Kaitlin Singer, Academic Analytics; Richard Wheeler, Academic Analytics; Jonathan Fink, Academic Analytics

1. **Call to Order** - *Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty*
    Chair Bird called the seventh 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**
    None

4. **Approval of the Minutes, Regular Meeting No. 6 of the 64th Session, November 14, 2017 -** Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten called for a motion to approve the minutes for the fifth 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 corrections.

5. **Chancellor's Remarks and Q/A -** *Randy Woodson, Chancellor*

Chancellor Woodson greeted the Senate and reported that the University had a great homecoming celebration, with a number of colleges very engaged. "We have tried to consolidate activities across campus to get more involved. The big thing is we changed the "evening of the stars," our distinguished alumni celebration to be the culmination of the week. Thanks go out to the Alumni Association."

The Chancellor relayed a story about how the topic of the Memorial Bell Tower came up between an alumni of NC State and a major gift officer at the University who were both sitting across the street from the Bell Tower when the bells started to play. The Alumni, whose name is Bill Henry and is a graduate of the College of Textiles, asked why there were no actual bells. The conversation continued and from that conversation, Mr. Henry and his family have now completely funded the renovation of the Memorial Bell Tower, the installation of the bells and a carillon to play the bells, as well as a new plaza around the Bell Tower. The Bell Tower will still be named "The Memorial Bell Tower," and will be surrounded by "Henry Plaza." He added that over the course of the next year, we will see construction cranes to install the bells. "This will be a major project, but in the end, it will be good. This is a big deal and a great thing for the University. The family is not seeking a lot of publicity about this, but you will start to see evidence of this soon."

Chancellor Woodson reported that the University won a new TRIO award this year. "This program has been at NC State for many years, but this year for the first time, we won for the Ronald McNair Post-Graduate Achievement program, which is a program that identifies under-represented students during their baccalaureate studies, provides funding for them to get through their baccalaureate studies, and then to pursue their PhD at the University of their choice." He added that this is a great thing for NC State.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the Bell Tower will be illuminated in red on December 5th in honor of Dr. Ron Sederoff's recent Marcus Wallenberg Prize from the King of Sweden. Additionally, he reported that the Faculty will start to hear a bit more about the UNC-GA system-wide strategic plan that we have been asked to align our University with. "This was not difficult since a lot of the goals of the UNC system plan line with our current plan, with a couple of exceptions that are critical for us." He stated that they are very noble goals; the UNC system is seeking to dramatically increase the number of rural students that come to NC State University, and the number of low-income students that are able to attend a public university in our state as well.

He added that the good news is that NC State is already among the leaders, certainly among research-intensive Universities, in serving the rural community of North Carolina and lower-income students. He stated, "We have a very high percentage of our students that are Pell Grant eligible, and a significant number of students who are first generation college students. We will be asked to grow those numbers as part of this plan, and we are good with that except we need to ask where is the money coming from." Chancellor Woodson stated that without a doubt, the large majority of students from rural communities, and certainly low-income students, have greater financial need and also great support need, in terms of advising, counseling, and all the things we try to do to wrap our arms around our students. He stated, "I think most of you probably remember a few years back when the UNC Board of Governors limited our ability to divert institutional money to financial aid, capping us at 15% of our tuition receipts going into financial aid for need. At the time, we were above 20%." He added, "For the last four or five years, if there has been a tuition increase, we have not been able to use any of those resources for financial aid. We are now at 15%, so in future years, we will be able to divert at least some of those resources to financial need."

Chancellor Woodson explained that the development officers across the different Colleges and the ones who report to the Chancellor are working hard to grow the private sources we use to support students that have significant financial need. "So this is something that we are all going to have to be working on and maybe Provost Arden will say more about that either today or in the weeks to come."

Finally, Chancellor Woodson gave a shout-out to Athletic Director Yow about fall sports at NC State. He reported that for the first time ever, all of NC State's fall sports teams were selected to post-season NCAA championship tournaments; men's and women's soccer, women's

volleyball, men's and women's cross-country, and football. "That's a big deal for our student athletes. There is only one other University in the country where all of its fall sports made the post-season tournaments, which is Stanford. I think this is very illustrative that the Athletic Director and her colleagues work hard to grow support for and encouragement for all athletes." He added that he was very proud of what our coaches and others have done to support our student-athletes to be able to compete at that level.

Questions/Discussion

Senator Bykova asked about Tax Reform and how it would affect the University, specifically the proposal to tax graduate school tuition benefits.

Chancellor Woodson responded that the Senate does not have this in their version of Tax Reform. He stated that he has been reassured by both Senator Tillis and Senator Burr that the Senate is not supportive of and will not agree to a tax plan that taxes the tuition benefits that our graduate students receive. "It was in the House version, but will not be in the Senate version. They will have to come together and form a final bill, but there's a lot in the bill that is bad for Higher Education." He added that from faculty's perspective, that has to be at the top of the list but there's also the fact that the House and the Senate both agree to increase the standard deduction, which will be a good thing for a lot of middle income taxpayers, and by increasing the standard deduction to $24,000 for a couple, it will mean that there will be a lot of people who will stop donating to organizations that they believe in, because there is no tax benefit to doing that, unless you itemize deductions.

Other things done that will be challenge for us and for private universities is that they have gone after private endowments in private Universities. "So if you have an endowment and you are a private University that equals more than $100,000 per student FTE, and many do, that would be taxed with an excise tax of 1.5%. This is a lot of money." Chancellor Woodson added that the other thing that the House has included that the Senate may not do, which would be bad for private universities, is that they've taken away some tax exempt bonds, which limits the ability for private Universities to borrow for construction. "This will increase the cost of borrowing and will translate to higher tuition in private Universities. There is a lot in the tax reform legislation that really should give you a sense of how our current leadership feels about higher education."

Chancellor Woodson stated that the graduate student issue is a real one, but that he does not

believe that will be in the final bill that passes. "One thing that will affect athletics here is that as you know, we raise all the money for athletics privately – they are paid for by donors; the university doesn't subsidize athletics, with the exception of the athletic fee paid by students, which is the tickets they get for free. So our athletic budget of $90 million comes from TV rights, buying tickets, and donors. The way donors work is that if you contribute to a non-profit where you have a benefit, in this case, better seats the more you contribute. This is called the 80/20 rule; if you give $10,000 to the Wolfpack Club, 80% of that is deductible and 20% is not because it is viewed as you are getting the benefit of a better ticket. Then on top of that, you have to buy the tickets. So that is going away completely. So both the House and the Senate have said that there will be no taxable deduction for contributions where there is a benefit of improved tickets. Most of the money that comes into athletics at NC State is not big-time donors; it's people who give $1,000 per year. If you lose the ability to deduct it and you lose the ability to write-off anything associated with it, it makes us nervous."

6.   **Provost's Remarks and Q/A -** *Warwick Arden, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost*

Provost Arden picked up comments made by the Chancellor regarding needs-based financial aid, because of the importance of the topic. "If we are to meet the system's goal for enrollment of low-income students through the coming years, and to maintain our needs-based financial aid at its current level, which is the percent covered by needy students, which is currently about 80%, we calculate that would cost us an additional $3.5 million recurring every year. If we fail to be able to have those resources, that means that a significantly lower proportion of students are going to have their need covered." Additionally, he added that we also know that this is one of the most important elements in retention and completion; these really are important numbers and it is very important that we are able to put those resources together. "This will be a dual challenge over the coming years to meet the enrollment of low-income students and at the same time provide the necessary need to make sure that we underpin our retention and graduation rates."

Provost Arden stated that on November 29th, Senior Vice Provost Tom Miller will have his comprehensive five year review beginning at 9:00 a.m. in Room 6 of the McKimmon Center. These reviews are taken very seriously and Provost Arden encouraged the senators to try to attend. "Dr. Miller and his colleagues have been working very hard to coordinate entrepreneurship programs across the University. Princeton Review recently announced that NC State is in the top 25 undergraduate programs for entrepreneurship in the country –

currently ranked #19." He stated that this is something for which we should be very pleased.

Provost Arden reported demographic numbers for the Faculty at the University. He stated that over the last six years, the University has lost 401 tenured and tenure-track faculty. The good news, he stated, is that we have hired 453 tenured and tenure-track faculty, which includes those who are on campus as of the beginning of this month. He added that another nine have signed letters and will arrive in the spring. "If you do the math, our fall faculty census for tenured and tenure-track faculty was 1388. So we essentially have hired 453 out of 1388 faculty, which is a little over 30%; a massive turnover in faculty percentage in a little over a six-year period." What this means is, he stated, that this has been a very significant cost to the institution and we have had to work extremely hard and expend a lot of money to grow slightly. He added that this is the first time we have grown our tenured and tenure-tracked faculty in about 20 years.

Provost Arden stated that this also means that you have a lot of new colleagues on campus, and it's one thing to hire them and get them in the door, but we hope that they stay for the same 20 or 30+ years that those who are retiring did. He added that it is incumbent on everyone to really have supportive environments, to mentor junior faculty and to do everything that we can to help them be successful and help them develop long and successful careers at NC State. "At the end of the day, perhaps after I'm gone from this position, if we look back in ten years and we find that we've hired 600 new tenured and tenure-track faculty, and we've lost 400 of them, that has been a lot of work and a lot of cost for very little gain for the institution." He added that a third of our faculty have been on this campus less than six years and we really need to work hard to make sure that we retain the best of those.

Questions and Discussion

Senator Barrie: Is there a University policy or has it changed, regarding the mentoring of tenured track faculty?

The Provost responded that there is not really a policy and they vary greatly from department to department. Some departments have very well-developed faculty mentoring programs, other Colleges and departments, less so. Therefore, there is not a uniform policy. It is important to Katharine Stewart and to Courtney Thornton to develop those mentoring programs, because one of the critical factors in young faculty success is retaining faculty.

Senator Berry-James: Do you have information about the demographic profile of the tenured and tenure-track faculty?

Provost Arden responded that he does not have them but can get them and share them with the Senate. He added that the last time he saw the numbers, we have made progress in nearly every category. "We have made progress in equity. If you can compare the 450 new hires that we made, the profile is more diverse and more equitable (men and women) than the existing faculty that we have." He stated at we are making progress, but it is not uniform progress; we are not making progress in every category as quickly as he would like. "African-American faculty, we hit a kind of a low point, but we are turning around and coming back and are making progress. We are also making definite progress in the Faculty Excellence Cluster Hiring program in terms of gender and race ethnicity." He added that if you look overall, the biggest progress that we are making is gender, Hispanic and Asian – these are the largest areas in which we are making progress.

Senator Berry-James: Do you have any ideas on the horizon about what to do about the true loss of African-American faculty over that 20-year period when there was such a mass exodus?

Provost Arden responded that a task force was convened four or five years ago to address this issue, and what we realized was that the issue was less one of recruitment than it was one of retention. "Over the period of time that we looked, we hired about 107 African-American tenured and tenure-track faculty over that period and lost about 106. So it is really a turnover issue." He added that from the task force came several different strategies and that you have to look at both sides of the coin; recruitment and retention. He added that during the search process, things like unconscious bias must be looked at as well as more intrusive involvement between OIED and the search process. Provost Arden stated, "When I evaluate colleges and deans on an annual basis, I make diversity and equity data a part of that evaluation every year." Then on the retention side, he stated, "I think so much of the retention comes out of question that was just asked – it comes down to mentoring and it comes down to campus climate." This is also being looked at and addressed in this area.

Provost Arden added that we have rolled out programs such as the Faculty Scholars Program, which was specifically designed to recognize and reward high-achieving early- to mid-career faculty over the last five years. Provost Arden stated that we have added 106 faculty scholars, and they are among the most vulnerable faculty, including minority faculty and women into that

category. He added that so far, we have retained 101 of that faculty.

Senator Bykova: You mentioned that the University is interested in keeping faculty. Are we doing enough for senior faculty?

Provost Arden responded that he has had this conversation many times, and he gave Katharine Stewart and Courtney Thornton a lot of credit in this regard. He added that often the office of faculty development has focused on young, new faculty and improving instructional techniques. He added that they want to broaden the focus and really look at faculty through the life span of a faculty member and to look beyond teaching. "This is an active part of what is trying to be done in re-tooling the office of faculty development and look at factors that retain, that help faculty stay energized and productive and enjoying their academic life at NC State."

Senator Sederoff: The best thing to do with respect to the mentoring of senior faculty is to start mentoring them when they are junior faculty and continuing the process. It begins on day one and continues throughout their entire academic career. He referenced two recent articles on diversity and stated that one of the subcommittees of the faculty senate is currently focusing their discussion and work on retention of minority faculty.

Provost Arden stated that this is an issue that has been addressed through the task force that was convened four or five years ago and through multiple other working groups, focusing on retention of faculty at large, and particularly retention of women and under-represented faculty. "This is a very significant issue and the focus tends to always fall on the recruitment side, which is important, but the retention issue is even more important."

Senator Orcutt: One of the issues is that there are often new startups available to new faculty, but he has heard how difficult it is, after that period, to get even small amounts of funding for things. A lot of folks have said a few years later that they would have been much happier with a smaller startup package that they could spread out over four or five years. He understands the issues of budget with this approach.

Provost Arden that the definition of startup is just that. Budgets do present a problem if that was done differently. He added that we have to be careful that people don't "squirrel away" those startup resources, hoping they're going to be there forever and then after ten years, "Oops I need it" kind of thing. He stated that the startup is intended to get the individual off to a good

start and to make them competitive for significant extra-mural funding; so it is a balance. "The reality is that if someone is really struggling in their fourth year and they've used most of their startup and are on the verge of doing really well, very few departments would not try to give them some sort of bridge funding to help them over the hurdle." Provost Arden added that we have to be careful about startup not being put away for years; it is difficult to plan a budget for that.

Parliamentarian Hellner: With regard to Dr. Bykova's question about senior faculty and their engagement, I want to remind us all about what Ombuds Baroff presented to the Senate and to the lifelong faculty engagement committee and his interest in working with faculty transitions. I think this sort of thing could be helpful and useful with regard to faculty who are facing turning points in their careers.

Provost Arden agreed this was a good reminder and that there will be in the spring, a system-wide faculty and staff engagement survey, so he encouraged everyone to look at that and participate in that so hopefully some beneficial information will result.

7. **Academic Analytics -** Mary Lelik, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy and Resource Management; *Richard Wheeler, Senior Advisor with Academic Analytics; Jonathan Fink, Katie Singer, Academic Analytics*

    Background: There is interest in better understanding the value of Academic Analytics (AA), how and by whom it is used, and under what guiding principles. Related interests include the nature of the data, its consistency, the breadth of disciplines represented, and so on.

    Academic Analytics is a company established in 2005 that provides academic data following the NRC guidance on metrics for different disciplines and has become a commonly used resource for benchmarking faculty scholarship. Some of the areas of research activity include Book publications, Journal article publications, Journal article citations, Published conference proceedings, Federal research grants, and professional honorific awards.

    Please review the presentation on the faculty senate website at:

    https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2017/12/Academic-Analytics-Faculty-Senate-Overview-20171128.pdf

Questions/Comments and Discussion

Senator Sederoff: Under comparative data and details data – they are the same?

Dr. Lelik responded that that is correct; the variables are the same but the period is different.

Jonathan Fink responded that we were guided by our steering committee regarding the time period that should be used. Over the years, feedback received convinced us to expand the time window. There are challenges, but this is as far as we can go back in order to provide the best information.

Senator Sederoff: So the only difference is the time span?

Kaitlin Singer responded that yes, you can actually change that when you go in to view the data.

Dr. Sederoff: Are these the metrics from the National Research Council:

Dr. Lelik responded that the National Research Council was just a previous ranking methodology that is no longer updated. This has now been expanded the information that is included. These are the metrics.

Senator Pearce: I am assuming as part of your checking the program, you download Vitaes of faculty. He added that when he googles "Academic Analytics," some Universities claim that there were lots of missing data. Can you assure us that that is not a problem?

Jonathan Fink assured Senator Pearce that this is not a problem. He added that most of the time what we see when something is not included when the faculty looks at their academic analytics data, it is natural for them to say something is missing here. That is largely due to the fact that if it does not meet our methodological criteria for an inclusion, then it is going to automatically be omitted. Those omissions typically result because we cannot comprehensively capture it, not because it is an error. We are careful about how we talk about error; what is perceived as "error" on the outside; it is purposefully omitted because we cannot comprehensively and reliably capture.

Senator Pearce: So if you download something that has been checked in the journals that meet

your criteria, they are 100% on those Vitaes or 95%?

Jonathan Fink responded that this is not something we typically do; we do not ingest information from a vitae or anything that the institution provides except a faculty list. We go directly to the publisher sources to get this information, scour their database and with our own internal process, smart-machine match it and then quality-assure match it to faculty in our database. That is the process that we engage in. In order for us to be the honest broker of benching and comparative analytics, that is the way we have to do it.

Senator Pearce: So how do you match the hundreds of John J. Smiths in Academia?

Jonathan Fink responded that they have a multi-layered process that we engage in. Part of the strength of this product is that we capture several pieces of information; their full name, place of terminal degree, professorial rank, and what units/departments and PhD programs you are affiliated with. When we initially got started with this, we were scouring publicly available sources. Over the years what we have done is we collect either HR extracts from the institutions, both clients and non-clients, or we ingest a faculty roster. That's how it is done. Once we get the faculty roster, we vet it with what we already know about your institution, then we send it back to the institution for edits and verification and then it gets sent back to us. That's part of why you see a time-delay instead of real-time data. Because we capture the place of your terminal degree, we are able to accurately match that metric content to the appropriate person. When we see an actual problem, that's when we correct it very quickly.

Senator Parker: The DOI – you mentioned that. That is basically how you are generating your primary keys for those objects. If you are using that to uniquely identify the digital object in your database, you are saying that if something doesn't have this, it doesn't matter. I teach a database class, and if you were my student, you would be in my office right now because that is lazy. That is not how you handle that.

Senator Sederoff: In order to assure yourself that what you're telling us is true, what statistical measure do you use to evaluate completeness and accuracy? With the absence of quantitative evaluation _____ [Crosstalk]

Dr. Lelik responded and reported to the Senators that Academic Analytics will be the first to admit that they do not have as complete coverage for the Humanities, but there was 90% or

11

more of coverage. Without having other systematic ways of assessing the CV, this was the best they were able to show. She added that they recognize the limitations, but 90% coverage is good; she has anecdotal evidence from some department chairs who have looked at their data and have said yes it is good for as far as it goes. It does not go to the beginning of time and is not meant to be a substitute for a CV but it is arguably, a resource that allows us to do these aggregations that we would not otherwise have available to us. Having only the CV does not allow a department, a college, or a program to see what its collective effort is.

Jonathan Fink stated that they have worked with institutions where if there is a group of faculty that are publishing in a journal we are not capturing, there are efforts on our end to work with that institution where they can submit information to cross-reference so we can begin to warehouse those journal articles. The problem is that it is not that it does not matter; it is that we cannot reliably capture it and do what we do without that DOI. There is a process in place. If you have faculty in your unit that are publishing in something we do not capture, we can work with you to see if we can get that resolved.

Dr. Lelik responded that this is true; Academic Analytics has full transparency in terms of the data that are available.

Senator Bykova: If I publish my paper in one of the Slavic languages, my name is not spelled the same way as it is in English. There are some discrepancies, and this is something that you do not capture. Additionally, in Humanities, most of our publications are chapters in books and this is not something on your list. This is only journal publications?

Jonathan Fink responded that AA has a product quality team that audits all of the scholars in our database, so we do look for publication name, aliases, we look for different spellings and so forth to make sure that we have that information captured and attached to the appropriate faculty – that is definitely on our radar and is something that we work on daily. Book chapters do matter, and we are currently collecting book chapters; we are just not including them in the comparative database because our coverage is not comprehensive enough. Book chapters, not all, are tagged with DOIs. We have about 4 million plus right now in our details warehouse where we have matched those chapters to faculty. However, you are not going to see it yet – it is something that we are working on and when it is ready, we will make it available. We have taken a lot of the feedback from our clients and steering committee to try to round out this database in way that is going to be the most meaningful.

Dr. Lelik added that she could assure the Senate that this is the most rigorous approach yet that has been taken to try to compile this information in this era of big data. She stated that she feels strongly that we need to arm ourselves to be able to have the counter-narrative if we do find problems with the data or the assumptions being made, I think this is a proactive approach to try to address that and draw a true picture of the work of the University, as opposed to something that someone else is creating in a proprietary algorithm.

Dr. Huffman expressed a concern about benchmarking it to our data. He stated that it is easy to get a radar report on all the grants - you can match the institutions easily. He wondered if we have done any kind of benchmarking from our internal data?

Dr. Lelik stated that we have not done that yet but we can talk about that as next steps. It is mostly anecdotal from folks who have looked at their data. We have not done it systematically, but we could conduct something similar to what Indiana University has done, which is taking a sample. Academic Analytics is always offering to anyone in this room, if you want to see what your detail data are in the database, and how it compares to your own records. They are happy to do that sort of analysis. We can get there but that's part of the reason we are using them as a resource is that we also have our day job and that consists mostly of responding to data requests from General Administration. This is the value-added that we see of this product is that they have scoured the known universe in terms of collecting this information and sharing it with the University.

Senator Sederoff: Regarding DOIs (digital object identifiers) for conference proceedings; in my village, we don't use conference proceedings much, but in other academic villages they do. What percentage are covered?

Dr. Lelik responded that if those are not material to your discipline, the product has the flexibility for you to weight what are the metrics that are available in the database, what do you consider a quality measure of your discipline. It is not a one-size fits all.

Senator Sederoff: My engineering colleagues put their best stuff in conference proceedings.

Dr. Lelik commented that if the department head in one of the engineering disciplines were to look at the benchmarking data for his or her discipline, they could adjust those weightings.

Senator Sederoff: How do you include them?

Jonathan Fink responded that they largely leave it up to the end user; if you're in a discipline where citations are not as important as the other metrics, we can provide you with a default and you can change the weight. If you are in a particular discipline and you're a departmental chairperson and citations by default weighted at 50% in terms of allocated importance, you might say well they're not really important at all; you would then remove that weight and reallocate that percentage to the other metrics in terms of weighting.

Dr. Lelik added that there is not a prescriptive use of this data; perhaps that is the first notion that should be dispelled. She stated that this is a database that is becoming more and more malleable in terms of being a resource that allows you to make true comparisons for your disciplines. This is where the strength is – at the disciplinary level. The only compilations that we are making institutionally are total numbers of citations; the very broad metrics of the overall work and nothing refined to this extent. At this point, it is being made available as a resource to administrators and people in managerial roles so they can look at it in an aggregate way. Those conversations can occur with individual faculty, but that is not the intention of this; we have to start with unit record information to build the compilations.

Dr. Sederoff: Do you have input from people who work in Extension? They write lots of short reports that are distributed to the public; this is their primary product.

Dr. Lelik responded that we are only including tenure-system faculty. They would be included in whatever their disciplinary department is – this is where their work will be compiled. Are you saying it would be outside the database because it is not peer-referenced journals.

Dr. Sederoff: Yes.

Dr. Lelik added that we are not claiming that his is a comprehensive database; this is meant to be complementary to other evaluations or reviews that are done at a department level. This is certainly a useful resource for those areas in which the information is available.

Jonathan Fink stated that this is not designed to look at the totality of research scholarship. We understand that scholarship goes far beyond those metrics, but those are the metrics that we

can go out and reliably and comprehensively collect and attach to faculty. As information improves, as we move along based on the feedback of our clients, we will continue to work and improve our database. The assurance that we can provide you is that what we have up there is what we have in terms of comprehensive coverage for those metrics.

Dr. Lelik added that this in not at attempt to reproduce a CV, not used to assess performance, not used for tenure and promotion purposes.

Senator Berry-James: Every time I go on this system, I cannot access what is being recorded or collected about me and my contributions to my unit or department of the college. Therefore, we do not have access to the Academic Analytics so we have some concerns. We also do not know if the information that is being collected accurately portrays our contributions. For some of us, our contributions are so specific, and organized around disciplines that the kind of information that is being collected is not really there. This is not usable knowledge because a lot of what we do in public administration is not being collected in a system like this. Additionally, when you do research about Academic Analytics around the country, other Provost's office and other Universities and other units are throwing this approach out as invalid. There are real concerns about the validity and reliability with this particular system.

Dr. Lelik pointed out that they have additional information regarding the validity of this system, and that information will be shared. We are not saying that this is the only resource that would be used to evaluate a department's productivity; it is meant to be complementary information and is more fully featured for some types of disciplines than others. If this is not relevant to your discipline because there are other metrics, we will continue to try to expand the coverage into the areas that are relevant to you. This is meant to be a resource, not an absolute measure of activity.

Dr. Berry-James: I have never heard of Academic Analytics in my department. My department chair hasn't talked about it, my school director hasn't talked about it, people don't know about it; I can't check to see whether the information you're collecting about me is correct.

Dr. Lelik responded that we are in an exploratory phase of this; this is not prescriptive and is not something we are using for any purpose of rank, tenure, promotion or hire. But this provides information that a department chair might use, or that a college might be able to use to look at the overall work, based on the metrics that it contains, activities that are relevant to the work.

Senator Berry-James: This costs the University money and so someone is using the information. From a disciplinary perspective, we believe in transparency and accountability so we are paying for data that we don't even know is good data. We are using the data for something and we don't even know what we are using it for. We need to have the conversation about how we can best represent the collective interests of the faculty. I just don't know where to go with this.

Senator Barrie: Maybe I missed this, but as a faculty member, could I get into the system and see what comes up under my name?

Dr. Lelik responded that the portal is not designed for having all faculty access directly to it; there are approaches that some institutions have taken and we can have this conversation. We have a system called digital measures which has academic insights and has a platform that some Universities are using – pulling information from the database in Academic Analytics to populate Digital Measures. There are some colleges and departments here that are using that as a mechanism, and we could adopt that. She added that we are not using these data yet; this is still an exploration so we need to be as transparent as possible. We want to hear your feedback and questions. We do feel this is between you and your department head. This is meant to be a tool where you are looking at the work of a department.

Senator Barrie: It would certainly help me to know specifically who and how, but more importantly, what do they see when they get into this system.

Dr. Lelik responded that they have some examples of what you can see in the portal. This isn't meant to be something that you would then go to the public realm and say, "We are better than Duke," in a particular metric. This is meant only for planning purposes, to get an overall markup of whatever unit it is. Access is based on role, so currently those that have access are department chairs who have portal access to their department's programs, as well as the Deans and their leadership teams.

Senator Barrie: How do you see what is contained in the database?

Dr. Lelik responded that we could either download the data or we can have Academic Analytics take your CV and do a comparison. We haven't done this systematically, and most Universities

do not, but we could in order to address concerns about what it actually contains. She added that this is not unlike other forms of the data – Web of Science, Google Scholar – which are less rigorously vetted than this product.

Dr. Eseryel: But in those resources we can see our information and we can view and edit.

Jonathan Fink responded that the DOI is applied across the spectrum.

Dr. Eseryel: Faculty cannot see their individual entries but administrators can?

Dr. Lelik responded that yes, that is true. She suggested that as a practical solution, port the information that is available into something like Digital Measures, which you then can review and provide the feedback that we need so we can make it available to the Academic Analytics folks and resolve issues or differences.

Senator Argyropoulos: So who is using this? A department or a Dean, you cannot preclude them since you are giving them access to individual records for them to go and look at and make a decision, even though the data may be incorrect. Can you preclude that possibility from happening?

Dr. Lelik responded no, but they could do the same by going to Web of Science or somewhere else.

Senator Argyropoulos: So why do we have this? We do not have access to this but we do have access to Google Scholar and Web of Science, etc.

Senator Bykova: Yes, we do not know what is here.

Richard Wheeler responded that he sees Academic Analytics as important for the Provosts, deans and departments to have this information. The most important one is at the department level.

Senator Argyropoulos: Leave it to the unit level. That is fine.

Jonathan Fink responded that in order for us to understand the unit holistically, it is made up of

faculty so that's the process that we engage in.

Senator Argyropoulos: Fine, but the access goes to the deans and the department heads and we don't know how they're using it.

Senator Sederoff: Tell me why you should not go to faculty?

Dr. Lelik responded that the portal is meant to be a planning tool at an aggregate level. If we gave you access to it, you would see not only you, but you would see the information that is in the database for every member of the faculty.

Senator Sederoff: It doesn't necessarily have to be that way. I still do not understand why someone could not access this data to look at what is in there about themselves.

Dr. Lelik responded that they are examining mechanisms for facilitating that. We have a license to Digital Measures and we can populate the articles that are included in the database in individual faculty members' records so that they can confirm the information about them.

Senator Sederoff: What you are telling us is that it is not intended for that now, but clearly they system is intended to do many of these things in the future. In fact, that would have great value but it still needs to allow us to look at our own data. My feeling is that this is just the first draft version.

Dr. Lelik responded that yes, this is entirely true. They are at the point of rolling this out to the department chairs so they can examine the data. It is not being prescribed how this is used; it is a data resource that allows a department head to see what is contained in the database on their faculty.

Senator Sederoff: And eventually it should be able to look at changes over time and will have great value.

Dr. Lelik stated that this does allow us to look at the information over time to see how the activity has changed for the University for a College and/or department.

Senator Sederoff: Then figure out a way for us to be able to look at our own data.

Senator Fath: We have talked about people not using it for the intended purposes. I have heard you say several times that this is to be used for tenured and tenure-track faculty. This has already been used for non-tenure-track faculty; I have examples. So that is a problem.

Dr. Lelik responded that only tenured or tenure-track faculty only are in the database so she is not sure how that occurred.

Senator Fath: My concern is that I am not represented at all in this because I am in the performing arts. If this is a first step and we are going to continue to build, how does what I do get documented? We might publish, but our journals might not be captured.

Dr. Lelik responded that this is not meant to be a single source for all review purposes and in some disciplines and may not be useful in some situations.

Senator Fath: Have you done a survey of current department heads who are using this?

Dr. Lelik responded that yes, they have. They are setting up WebEx for each of them and once that is done, they will do an evaluation of how are you using this, etc.?

Senator Pearce: Suppose that my department said they wanted to look at how our department compared to the departments in the dozen peer institutions that we often list on our website. Does that data start in 2012 and 2013 or does it go all the way back? Does the detailed data allow him to do that comparison all the way to 2004 or 2005?

Jonathan Fink responded that you have the flexibility as the end user to change the time window, yes.

Provost Arden: How many Universities are using Academic Analytics?

Jonathan Fink responded that their current clients – we have 93 institutions on contract right now. He added that in terms of clients, a number of them that are using this product and he can get the number to the Provost.

Dr. Lelik responded that she knows that they include our peer institutions as well as other public

and private institutions within the state of North Carolina.

Jonathan Fink added that just because an institution is not a client does not mean that we do not capture their information. We have 409 PhD-granting institutions in our database.

Dr. Lelik responded that there is full coverage of R1 Universities.

Jonathan Fink stated that they capture all the very high public and private institutions.

Senator Orcutt: Do you have clients who are funding agencies or do you have any sense of how program officers are potentially looking at these data?

Jonathan Fink responded by asking that if Senator Orcutt means clients outside of academia, no, we do not. We are looking to expand, however. There could be governmental agencies where they have research scientists that want to connect with PhD tenured and tenure-track faculty that are conducting research in a specific area and they want to be able to use our product to connect to those individuals. So that is some of the potential that we are looking at. We have a different product that we are looking to partner with other agencies that's not a benchmarking product, but a discovery product.

Senator Orcutt: Do you do any comparison or would there be the capacity to do any comparison against college profiles, against Google Scholar profiles or ORCID IDs and things like that?

Jonathan Fink responded that there are possibilities there, yes. If you've got a particular college of school and there's a lot of concern about the fidelity and integrity of our product, we can conduct a validation exercise with those units. It is a learning experience for us as far as hearing concerns and making sure that we are serving you the best we can.

Senator Sederoff: There's a world out there that doesn't care about most of the things you're measuring; they care about what are the five most important papers that you've published that really make a difference. Do you have a way of looking for those?

Jonathan Fink responded that we built in quality indicators in our tool; it is not our job to dictate quality to an institution or an end user that works with our products. The departmental chairperson needs to understand the publication pattern of the aggregate of the faculty in their

unit. This is part of the power of this tool. But if they want to select five journals of most importance or relevance, then they can use those five journals to benchmark that unit in order to understand research activity in the comparative universe. So we built in quality indicators where the end user can go in and select what is important. We have warehoused just under 40,000 journals in our database, and most of what we capture in our database is important. A lot of faculty publish in these journals that we capture. There is a process in place that if you are concerned that we are not capturing something that faculty are publishing; we will work diligently with you to see if there is a resolution on our end.

Jonathan Fink added that it is not our intention for this to replace what departmental chairpersons know about their faculty. Most departmental chairpersons know a great deal about their faculty. What they may have challenges with is understanding where John Smith sits in a discipline holistically as it relates to that national comparative universe. That is what this product is trying to provide, in terms of context.

Dr. Lelik suggested that next steps would be having a validation analysis conducted and we could explore what would be the best mechanism for making the information that is available on individual faculty to individual faculty.

Chair Bird: What kind of instructions or label of caution is given to the people who have access to this data about how it should and should not be used within NC State? What do we tell deans, associate deans and department chairs about how we want this data to be used?

Dr. Lelik responded that at this point Academic Analytics is conducting the credentialing Webinars and are gathering information on best practices. We could certainly put on our website the principles and best practices for the use of this information because yes, I agree that there can be abuses of the data and if we have working principles, we have to determine that that means in terms of assuring the data is handled properly.

Senator Berry-James: I disagree with your summary statement. I think you heard concerns for validation of the data and I heard concerns for access to information that is being collected about faculty at the institution, about the way in which we contribute to our disciplines, about the way in which we secure supporter research and share knowledge and generate new knowledge about the things that we think are important. I heard concerns about disciplines that are woefully under-represented in this database, and that someone else outside of the faculty are

21

making decisions about what is important in a discipline. Because we are only picking certain journals to include here, if they have a DOI and if those journals get included. So while you heard concerns for validation, I know definitely I was speaking about access to information that's being collected on me, about me from my Vitae. I think I heard loud and clear that we want access to information that is being collected.

Senator Sederoff: It seems like you showed some data that might be relevant, but one thing we are going to want to measure more and more is how do you measure leadership and interactions and contributions? Do you have the potential to do that?

Dr. Lelik responded that not necessarily in this instrument at this time. That's why we are pairing it with Digital Measures, which does identify engagement and the impact of that engagement. This is something that has to be collected primarily. This is just going out to the public universe and collecting the information that is already out there on all of us, in terms of these particular metrics. We are trying to find the mechanism to measure the things that were mentioned and there are some colleges that are doing that now, but this is not the mechanism for capturing it. She is in agreement that this is a limitation of these data and that another mechanism is needed to compile that information.

Senator Sederoff: I believe that this kind of approach is something that we're going to have to live with for a long time. The criticisms that we have about this have to do with how it's being used and its limitations. But as the database grows, it will fix some of those things. Some aspects we will never be happy with, but we will need to have to live with them.

Dr. Lelik stated that she is trying to convey that message as well; we can deny that this exists, but regardless of what we do, the ratings wars continue and increasingly, the ratings agencies are not going to the Universities for that information; they are collecting them secondarily from available resources that allow them to compile information. She added that she feels this is an opportunity for us to understand how this works, what is and is not available, so we can intelligently argue for and be on our guard against those black box solutions that we have no input into. So I agree there should be complete transparency; you should know what is in here but also find some kernel of utility in this information if, for no other reason, what data is out there on all of us.

Jonathan Fink stated that we have no problem with institutions sharing our product with faculty.

In order for us to have any legitimacy, our product has to be reliable and valid. I know there are questions about that and I've been working in big data for 10 years and it is a challenge to find a 100% error-free database. But this is something that we relentlessly and passionately pursue because in order for this to work at your institution, this is something that we really rigorously work on. So thank you.

(Please note that the entire Academic Analytics presentation was not reviewed during the Faculty Senate meeting due to time constraints)

8.   Old and New Business
a.   F&A Presentation from Fall General Faculty meeting (October 3, 2017) is available at:

https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/general-faculty/gf-meetings/

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 5:00 p.m.

The motion passed unanimously.