

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate**

**August 28, 2018**

**3:00 p.m.**

**Regular Meeting No. 1 of the 65<sup>th</sup> Session: Faculty Senate Chambers      August 28, 2018**

**Present:** Chair Bird, Chair-Elect Kellner; Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten; Parliamentarian Ash; Senators, Barrie, Bartlett(for A. Smith), Berry-James, Boyer, Bykova, Carver, Cooke, Eseryel, Fath, Feducia, Fitzpatrick, Havner, Hawkins, Hergeth, Huffman, Kirby, Kotek, Kuzma, Lim, Liu, Lubischer, Martens, Orcutt, Parker, Pearce, Thakur, Vincent, Williams

**Excused:** Senators Argyropoulos, Perros, Rever, Sannes, Smith

**Absent:** Senators Hayes, Kathariou

**Guests:** Randy Woodson, Chancellor; Marie Williams, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources; Nancy Whelchel, Director for Survey Research; Marc Hoit, Vice Chancellor for OIT and CIO; Roy Baroff, Faculty and Staff Ombuds; Courtney Thornton, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Policy

**1. Call to Order - Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty**

Chair Bird called the first meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3:00 p.m.

**2. Introductory remarks - Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty**

Chair Bird asked the Senators and Joni Lancaster to introduce themselves.

Chair Bird introduced the Executive Committee, Parliamentarian, and UNC Faculty Assembly Delegates

Chair Bird asked all guests and invited speakers to introduce themselves

**3. Announcements**

1. Fall General Faculty Meeting date and location are as follows:

- a. October 30, 2018 at 3pm in the Governance Chambers in Talley Student Union.
- b. Please note the new date update as a different date was announced in April.
- c. Suggestions for topics are being accepted for the Fall and Spring General Faculty meetings.

**4. Approval of the Minutes, Regular Meeting No. 13 of the 64th Session, April 17, 2018**

*Kimberly Ange-van Heugten, Associate Chair of the Faculty*

Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten called for a motion to approve the minutes for the thirteenth meeting of the 64th session of the NC State Faculty Senate. A motion and second were made and the minutes were unanimously approved.

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

Chancellor Woodson reported to the Faculty Senate that the University has a very large freshman class this year, which was a bit unexpected. "We were trying to hit around 4,600 and we came in at 4,938. This is a record freshman class but it is also a record as far as the preparedness of the students. A very large class and the most prepared class in NC State history." He added that we topped out at 29,800 applicants, which is an increase of 12% over the previous year. "So NC State continues to be seen as a very significant place for higher education in the state. We led by a long shot the number of in-state applicants – about 18,000 from NC. The next highest was 13,000 for UNC Chapel Hill and the next highest is Appalachian State."

Chancellor Woodson continued by stating that NC State continues to be in high demand, which is a very good thing. He added that the University is trying to improve the access across the state for students by working on articulation agreements and transfer pipelines. "We had our largest number of transfer applicants this year – almost 5,000. Of those, 1,300 came to NC State this fall, which brings the number of over 6,000 new students now on campus, with an additional 480 students who were deferred for Fall who will join us in Spring 2019.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the freshman class comes from 98 of the 100 counties in North Carolina, 19 countries and 41 states. "This is the most diverse class we have had. Our enrollment is starting to reflect the demographics of the state in a major way. If you look at the demographics of our state, Caucasian students are declining and African American students are declining in higher education – the growth is Hispanic students. This is the first year in our history that the freshman class, Hispanic enrollment is the largest under-represented group." He added that this does not count the two or more races category of underrepresented students that did not designate.

Chancellor Woodson reported that this is also the first class that is almost at parity. "NC State has been a male-dominated undergraduate institution for many years, largely because of our history in engineering, for example. But this year, the freshman class 50.3 to 49.7. We are approaching parity between male and female freshman. This is unusual for large public liberal arts universities. Chapel Hill's freshman class is almost 68% women." He added that the women applicants and admits and enrollees at NC State continue to grow.

Chancellor Woodson also reported that there has been a good amount of construction going on. "The

Engineering Oval, now called the Fitts-Woolard Hall, is on schedule, and we will start to see steel going up in the next few months. The Plant Sciences building is about 6-8 months behind engineering and we should see groundbreaking on that during the spring. You see the work at Carmichael Gym as well.”

In regard to accolades, Chancellor Woodson reported that this year, for the first time, a new Foundation for Agriculture in the United States started awarding new fellowships for graduate students in agriculture-related disciplines. “This is the first time they awarded full fellowships – three or four years of funding for Phd. students in those disciplines. Their inaugural class was 17 students across the country, and NC State had three of those. We don’t represent 18% of the Agriculture enrollment across the country, but clearly our students were very competitive for those fellowships.”

In reference to the ongoing campaign, Chancellor Woodson reported that it continues to go well. He stated that the total campaign is at \$1.35 billion as of the end of June. “The Board is pushing to raise that but we will see how this year goes. Chances are good they will raise the goal.” He added that we ended our second year in a row of over \$200 million - \$215 million in new gifts and commitments and \$165 million in cash in the door both for new gifts and payments towards pledges. He stated that a significant gift is the Park Foundation, which will now continue for another five classes, which gives us more runway to grow the endowment to ensure that in perpetuity we will have a strong Park Scholars program.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the Goodnight endowment to support the Goodnight Scholars program, as of June 30<sup>th</sup>, was valued at \$161 million. “If you do the math, that’s \$6.44 million per year, and the program, as it is currently structured, only costs \$4.2 million per year, which gives us room to grow that program in the future.” He added that this is a great opportunity for us, because the Goodnight Scholars have quickly become some of the most impactful students on our campus and certainly among the most diverse scholarship programs in the UNC system in terms of access and equity across a number of ethnic groups. “Currently on our campus, there are about 250 students receiving their full-ride scholarships because of the generosity of the Goodnight Endowment.”

Chancellor Woodson also reported that Athletics is doing very well, seeing our highest graduation rate among student athletes, at least since the history has been measured the way that it currently is. He added that the athletic program at NC State finished 15<sup>th</sup> in the Director’s Cup, which is a great thing. “When Debbie Yow arrived, the program was not in a good place in terms of overall success and behavior so it’s a good thing to see this occurring.”

Chancellor Woodson reported that the Board of Governors provided guidance on what is called the ARP – the annual raise process – which was a bit different this year. “The State of NC announced a 2% raise for state employees, which was true for state employees except for those in the UNC system and the community colleges. We got \$20 million for the whole system, which equated to a .8% raise if applied across all employees of the UNC system. So the BOG elected to do was, because all SHRA employees were given across the board a 2% raise, they wanted our employees to be treated the same way. All SHRA employees that met or exceeded expectations received the across the board 2% raise.” He added

that this left a bit of money for EHRA for faculty and non-faculty, so by working with the Deans and other administration, NC State instituted a 3% pool policy EHRA faculty and non-faculty raise, subject to merit and equity issues. “That is all in the hands of the Deans and Directors and those responsible for employees in their units, which is currently underway. The raises will be retroactive to July 1<sup>st</sup>. “

Marie Williams added that these amounts would be paid out in October.

Chancellor Woodson also pointed out that the state also mandated and funded for mandatory increases for any full time employees that made less than \$31,200 per year, which is a significant number of employees at all of our universities.

### **Questions and Discussion**

*Chair-Elect Kellner:* The enrollment plan that was devised a good many years ago when the Strategic Plan was done is obviously moot today. Because the situation has changed a lot since then, could you describe how things have developed in the last five or six years?

Chancellor Woodson responded that his understanding is that you will recall a couple of years ago that we got into a little bit of an enrollment bind, largely because of the graduate school. Our plan, associated with the Strategic Plan, was to try to keep undergraduate enrollment constant to slight increase. He added that what we had not fully anticipated is that the students would graduate as fast as they are. “What is happening is that our retention rate has gone up and our graduation rate has gone up and our time to degree has come down. So it turns out, if you’ve got people graduating, then you can generate more room if they’re graduating in a more timely way. We also didn’t anticipate going from 15,000 applicants to 30,000 applicants. So the demand has been strong. Our plan was 4,600, not 4,900, so we didn’t intend to grow quite as much as we did. Our whole plan is still around 25,000 undergraduates.”

*Chair-Elect Kellner:* Do we make or lose money on each undergraduate admitted as a freshman and going through four years?

Chancellor Woodson responded that this is another wildcard. He explained that in the current environment, any enrollment growth has the potential to generate money, with more money being generated from graduate enrollment in STEM disciplines. “Here is the good news – it’s better to not be shrinking, but our uncontrolled growth that I saw when I got here was not sustainable, in terms of quality and graduation rate and retention, etc. So our enrollment management plan was really an attempt to make sure that the students that we have here could get into classes and could be successful.” He added that now that the overall quality of the applicant pool has increased and certainly the number has increased, we are in a better position to start back growing a little bit.

*Chair-Elect Kellner:* The Provost was sanguine about the potential changes to the way the 12-cell matrix was done. Do you feel the same way?

No response.

*Senator Williams:* Speaking of the 12-cell matrix, can you give us an update on the proposed new funding formula and how that will affect us?

Chancellor Woodson responded that it is sort of at a standstill. “The first iteration of that, which came out of a task force, essentially got tabled and sent to the “rules committee, “ except I don’t think it’s going to die. I think they are determined to do something. At the end of the day, what they were proposing could have been devastating to the flagship campuses.”

Duane Larick added that eventually we are going to transition to a point that we are not funded for what we project Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 to be, we are funded at the end of the year for what they actually are. That would be a big change.

Chancellor Woodson cited an example of a University that missed their enrollment target and it would have resulted in almost a \$12 million budget cut on a \$60 million budget. “The frustrating thing for us is that they didn’t receive that budget cut, but we didn’t receive everything we should have received.” He added that there has been a recent practice of shoring up smaller campuses at the expense of those that are performing well, and that is not sustainable, which is the argument that he and Chancellor Folt continue to make.

## **6. Provost's Remarks and Q/A**

*Duane Larick, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy and Chief of Staff*

Dr. Larick re-visited the topic of the transfer student population on campus. “We have looked for ways to become extremely thoughtful in mechanisms to accomplish some strategic goals, like the percentage of students that come to NC State from rural counties and those types of areas that we are trying to enhance.” He added that we are working on creating the Community College Collaboration – the C3 Collaboration with eight community colleges. Those eight are: Alamance, Central Carolina, Durham Tech, Johnston, Nash, Vance-Granville, Wake and Wilson. “We started with the community colleges that are centrally located closest to us. Those also happen to be the community colleges where we get the majority of transfer students that come to NC State.” He added that of the transfer students who have come, 56% of them transfer to us from community colleges. He stated that this is a program that will help us and will help us balance our enrollment.

Dr. Larick stated, “As the Chancellor said, along with the fluctuations that we’ve had, the quality of students coming in has gone up and that’s a part of what has resulted in continued growth and improvement in our six-year graduation rates.” He added that Louis Hunt has stated that this incoming class six-year graduation rate will be over 81%, which puts NC State in the middle amongst our peers, instead of being 4%-6% less. He added that our four-year rates went up to 58% and that is tremendous

growth, almost a 12% increase in four-year graduation rates, which has been a goal.

Dr. Larick then spoke about graduate education numbers by stating, “We have 3,055 new graduate students, 6,301 continuing, for a total of 9,356. At midnight last night, that was exactly the same as the number of students we had on census day last year.” He added that we had a target to grow a bit this year, so we are somewhere in the area of about 170 students short – 120 master’s students and 50 doctoral students short of our growth targets that we had projected two years ago. He stated that we will get out of the business of projecting those two year growth patterns and we will be funded on actuals, so the important thing is are our actuals greater than they were last year. He added that at the undergraduate and graduate level both, we are doing fine there. “We will expect to see some enrollment funding coming from the legislative pool, but we do not know how it will be calculated.” He stated that we are told that it will be a part of the approval process for the November Board of Governors meeting, so between now and the time that the agenda goes out for the Board of Governors meeting we are assuming they will start asking us for input. “We assume it will be very similar to what they did last year, which was take Summer Session II SCH’s and Fall SCH’s, and use those to predict Spring and Summer session, so we are modeling that now.

Dr. Larick stated that regarding the salary equity study, the Provost wanted the Faculty Senate to know that the college level results have been distributed so at this time, Sheri Schwab, Mary Lelik, Katherine Stewart and others are available to come to colleges to talk about the salary equity study if there are any questions at that level. Additionally, Dr. Larick spoke about the Faculty Central website at [facultycentral.ncsu.edu](http://facultycentral.ncsu.edu) and encouraged all faculty to visit and see the information that is included on the site. He added that this has been quite an effort from many groups – the Provost’s office, Office of Research Innovation and Human Resources, Office of Faculty Development, the Office of Communication and Marketing – a large group of people put together a website that you can go to and find the information you are looking for. It is up now and there is a place to recommend additional content and things you went there to find and are not there so that website can continue to grow.

### **Questions and Discussion**

*Senator Pearce:* What is the increase in the faculty, both tenure and non-tenure track?

Dr. Larick responded that we have gone up about 456 faculty in the last eight years, about 400 of those are replacement faculty, so we have had a growth in that period of about seven tenure track faculty. “If you look in the HR system today, that represents just a third of our tenure track faculty, that 456. So if you look at that Human Resources database today and faculty that are eligible for retirement, we would expect over the next five years, there are another third of our faculty that are eligible to retire.” He added that we are going to have to do a lot of treading water to stay even; we are going to have, with that large number of faculty – we had set a goal in our strategic plan of growing our tenure track faculty by 300, but the reality is that over these last three years of the plan it is very unlikely that we will achieve that kind of growth.

*Senator Vincent:* Is the salary equity study available for us to take a look at?

Katherine Stewart responded that the Salary Equity Study will be presented to the full senate at an upcoming meeting and we will talk a little bit about methodology. Unfortunately, it does not include faculty in the teaching, research, clinical practice or extension tracks, so we will have to look at that. “The issue of compensation for faculty in those tracks is something that the Governance & Personnel Policy Committee is working on this year.”

*Senator Orcutt:* Jennifer Kuzma and I were talking earlier today about the possibility of bringing a very high-profile speaker to campus, and we realized that we didn’t know where we stood with the idea that had been recommended by the senate to establish the Speaker’s Committee at the University level. Do you know where that stands?

Duane Larick responded that he sat in meetings a year ago.

Katherine Stewart responded that the Committee on Committees voted to transition the Harrelson Fund Committee to the Committee on Speakers and Lectures. She added that there has been a transition in the membership of the former Harrelson Committee. There are several members who have transitioned to the new Committee on Speakers and Lectures, and they will have their first meeting this fall.

*Senator Bykova:* Regarding graduate enrollment, do we still have a plan of ranges of increase?

Dr. Larick responded that there was a plan from 2010-2020, and that plan was updated in 2015. So that is the plan that is on the books today and that is the growth. “We are not lagging dramatically behind that growth if we consider total graduate enrollment, certificate programs, master’s and doctoral programs. This year we have had some significant challenges related to international students, which dramatically affected master’s enrollment. We have also had some challenges on the doctoral side related to funding. He added that we do have a plan that shows an emphasis of growing professional master’s and doctoral programs. He added that the Enrollment Planning Committee is in the process now and one of the things that the plan says is that we are not going to wait every 10 years to update the plan. So the Enrollment Planning Committee has been charged this year with doing an update. He stated that this target will be difficult to achieve in the current climate – both funding and political climate.

## **7. Spring 2018 Employee Engagement Survey: A Summary of Results and Next Steps**

*Marie Williams, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources*

*Nancy Whelchel, Director for Survey Research, Office of Institutional Planning and Research*

In this presentation, the Faculty Senate will get an overview of the Employee Engagement Survey (a 5-year UNC initiative), hear results from the Spring 2018 administration of the survey at NC State, learn about plans for using the data, and have the opportunity for questions and discussion.

AVC Williams thanked the Faculty Senate for the time given to discuss the Employee Engagement Survey, which is a system-wide initiative that was given back in February of 2018. “The reason why we engaged in this survey is because it is connected to the UNC Strategic Plan.” She explained that this is a system-wide, five-year initiative, so we will be at this for a while. She added that they appreciate the participation of Faculty Senate members to give us your feedback because it is very important.

AVC Williams continued, “This is connected with many of their Strategic Goals, one of them focused on human capital.” She stated that they will be looking at a lot of data, particularly turnover data. “This is one of the tools they are using to help sort of gauge how we’re doing as system institutions.” She added that Nancy Whelchel will talk about how NC State did in the survey, which was well. She then recognized Nancy Whelchel to go through the data.

AVC Williams noted that this survey was done by Modern Think. She explained that this survey is a five-year plan, a full census, given in 2018 and then will be given again in 2020 and 2022. “The goal is to see targeted metrics moving and getting more favorable.”

#### **Brief Summary:**

**NC State gave more favorable ratings than the UNC system overall on all but 1 of the 15 core dimensions, most notably for:**

- Senior leadership (6 percentage points higher)
- Facilities (5 percentage points higher)
- Faculty, administration & staff relations (4 percentage points higher)
- Policies, resources & efficiency (4 percentage points higher)

**Compared to Great Colleges benchmark, NC State average favorable ratings are:**

- Within 2 percentage points on 8 of the 15 core dimensions
- Notably lower for:
  - Shared governance (7 pt difference)
  - Compensation, benefits and work/life balance (6 pt difference)
  - Respect and appreciation (5 pt difference)
  - Collaboration (4 pt difference)
  - Communication (4 pt difference)
  - Professional development (4 pt difference)
- NC State did not have an unfavorable rating that “warrants attention” on any core dimension
- Employees overall were most likely to give unfavorable ratings in the areas of:
  - Fairness
  - Compensation, benefits and work/life balance
  - Communication



- Respect & appreciation
- Policies, resources & Efficiency
- Shared governance

- A majority of NC State employees overall gave a favorable response to 53 of the 60 individual belief statements
- Two-thirds or more gave a favorable response to half of the items
- Three-fourths or more gave a favorable response to 13 items
- Items most favorably rated by NC State employees are generally the same ones most favorably rated by the UNC system overall

**Most favorably rated item by NC State employees overall:**

I understand how my job contributes to this institution's mission

- 15 percent or more of NC State employees overall gave an unfavorable response to 19 of the 60 individual belief statements
- One-fifth or more gave an unfavorable response to 7 of the items
- One-third or more gave an unfavorable response to just 2 of the items
- Items most unfavorably rated by NC State employees are generally the same ones most unfavorably rated by the UNC system overall

**Most unfavorably rated item by NC State employees overall:**

I am paid fairly for my work

**Questions and Discussion**

Senator Pearce: How is N measured?

Response: The population end is based on the OUC code of where the employee is working. Full time.

Senator Lubischer: When you say we're doing pretty good, are you comparing to other units?

Response: Compared to UNC schools as a whole and whoever these Great College 2017 participants are for your publics who participated at that time.

Senator Lubischer: So if I read this right, for a number of points, when you get down to the right side of the graph, not so good for communication and shared governance?

Response: Right.

Senator Pearce: How do they weigh the questions? Equally?

Response: Everything is weighted equally. There is no weighting at all.

Senator Berry-James: This is hard for me to distinguish between the job categories as pointed out, but my question is all the way to the right of the line, the last point for faculty is communication. So then the next point that falls below the standard is shared governance. So because that point is below the line, does that mean it is something that we ought to sit up straight about and pay attention to it?

Response: It's not a good thing.

Senator Berry -James: So fairness and collaboration is above the line and respect and appreciation is close to the line.

Response: All of these things are.

Senator Berry-James: So in my opinion, it's not okay that the teaching environment is hitting the line. So does this mean that there is more unfavorable responses to the teaching environment?

Response: Yes, from the faculty. The questions are very teaching specific but everyone is answering these questions. They don't give us the number of respondents for any given question - they just give us the total number of responses in the group who responded to the survey.

Senator Kuzma: My question follows up on Senator Berry-James. So the good governance one below the line requires attention and one could argue that for faculty, over half of these parameters require attention. That's a very different story than the one you just painted. I am acknowledging that we all come to the data in different ways. I might be careful and I'm a little worried because to me, it shows a little bit of a concern for faculty.

Response: We have a lot of different people looking at these results and you are welcome to dig around as much as you like. We are not relying on this line. We also cannot look at job classification by gender or race, but we are looking at the results of every question by each demographic group and each job characteristic group that we have. There are a lot of differences in there.

Speaker: But that line is a 55% favorable. So it's not dismal.

Response: Yes.

Senator Berry-James: So if that is the case, shouldn't we be concerned that at least 40% of the faculty who responded to the survey find shared governance unfavorable?

Response: No. You always need to remember that these are the people who said "strongly agree" or "agree." And then there's that whole category of "sometimes agree," and "sometimes disagree." So when you see 50% favorable, that does not mean 50% disagree, because some unknown percentages

are in that middle group.

Senator Berry-James: So where is the data? Because I think that's what I'm having an issue with. I don't know the full story because I'm only getting one side. Is it because of the company that produced the survey or because of the limitations in our analysis or presentation?

Response: I share your frustrations. This is based on the data we have been provided. We are having conversations now about spending a rather large chunk of change to purchase access - but we will never get our data. We can use this clunky tool to download more in-depth reports.

AVC Williams added that it is important to realize that this is a system-wide survey. So they did ask the system institutions to provide some feedback and we provided lots of feedback about the framing of questions, what should be in there and what shouldn't. At the end of the day, the systems office came up with what you see today. Some of these can be interpreted very differently by respondents, which makes it difficult to report. So the data is flawed in some sense. So going forward, our focus is going to be primarily on what are the themes of what we have heard, in terms of trying to improve next steps. The challenge is that this survey wasn't our own survey and so there are things about the survey and some of the questions that we cannot truly explain.

Chair-Elect Kellner: Is it correct to assume that N=9 means the number of respondents equals 9 people?

Response: Yes.

Chair-Elect Kellner: So, on the "teaching environment" question, the 942 members of the faculty gave it a considerable lower rating than the 9 people in SSAO Tier I (i.e., upper administration). I suggest that their line be eliminated from this question because the SSAO Tier II are so out of numeric proportion to the other groups that are, generally speaking, of greater relevance to things like teaching environment.

Senator Pearce: Regarding faculty turnover - shouldn't we compare ourselves to Chapel Hill? We are not typically competing for faculty with a lot of smaller schools so it might be useful to know if Chapel Hill is doing the same thing.

Response: It is unclear to me if we're ever going to get data for a given UNC school. Thus far, they have said that is not going to happen but every week it's something new so that might happen.

AVC Williams stated this was a system-driven survey and the University was required to take part and provided a lot of feedback and concerns. So this is what we had. That is why we said it does matter in regard to participation. We had to make sure that NC State showed up on this survey. We understand that this is not the perfect survey but what we are trying to do is to share the information that we have, but we do not have the details of the data. We are unable to do the data dive, but the information may still get out. We do caution - do not get flustered by when you're seeing numbers because when we compare ourselves to other institutions, we are doing well, but we also make sure we are focusing on

areas that need improvement.

Senator Kuzma: Are there Universities outside of North Carolina that are taking this same survey?

Response: Again, this is why we had zero input on the development of the questionnaire because it is a standard instrument that they use for their Great Colleges and the schools that want to participate in that. We did get a bunch of other benchmark groups, none of which were in any way remotely comparable to us. I even took that off the slide because there would be no point.

Chair-Elect Kellner: Is there a process for converting these figures into a number of action steps, and if so, would those action steps be taken at the University level or at the system level?

Response: (Duane Larick) Right now, the greatest interest is at the College level. This has been presented to the Deans - they have had the opportunity to see and go through the data. The Deans on this campus. Our thought has been that we want this to be out to the Senate, we've given it to the Deans. Some of you in your colleges have had conversations about this at the retreat level or will be having this conversation. The system may use this as a way to say there are areas that need to be improved.

Chair-Elect Kellner: Will there then be more surveys in the future if the money for them keeps coming from G.A. ("system")?

Response: Yes, they have a contract and a commitment for two more.

Chair-Elect Kellner: Have there been any relevant "satisfaction" surveys in the past, or is that just all dead. Has there been anything to compare this survey with?

Response: The company has comparison data.

Response: They are very committed to not sharing the names of participating institutions. Unless the school has made their "honor roll" they won't name the school. So we had five different benchmark groups and I didn't know who was in any of them. So they will not release our names. At the system level, they are presenting data by campus, comparing them, to the Board of Governors. They are looking item by item. It is important that our campus is pretty aware of how we fare in this because the Board of Governors is talking about this. We are supposed to get anything they share at the Board of Governors meetings ahead of time so we will keep you posted.

Chair-Elect Kellner: Would the Leadership object to the Faculty Senate of NC State asking the Faculty Council at Chapel Hill, which has undoubtedly had a presentation very similar to this presentation, whether we might share and compare the results? This could give both faculties better insight.

Response: It is unclear what is happening on other campuses with the data. We are putting way more effort into this than others are. I know they got a report.

AVC Williams complimented the work that Nancy Whelchel has done in terms of dissecting the data, without using their expensive tool because that money is better spent on things that matter to NC State. So they aren't slicing and dicing the information the way that we are and I don't think they are going to this level of detail, to be honest.

Dr. Larick added that if your comment is "Here is this slide from NC State, what does the slide look like for Carolina and what areas are you below the 50th percentile and what might you be doing about it," I think that is a conversation that the faculty senate at NC State and Chapel Hill should be welcoming.

Response: They are going to present the information to the Staff Assembly at some point.

Dr. Larick added that he wants to make sure that everybody understands the dashed line - so if you pick teaching environment, that means 55% of the people that scored that, 55% of them gave it a 4 or a 5. We don't know what the others are. So to say that it automatically means that people are dissatisfied, it's possible that no one scored it "unsatisfied." We do not have that data.

Chair Bird: Is it true that people who are not in the faculty role scored that item?

Response: Yes, but these are the results - each line is only for a specific group. In the overall results, yes, that would be a lot of people scoring who have no idea what's going on or maybe they skipped it. So these do break out - so this is just faculty or people who said they are faculty.

AVC Williams reviews Action Items and next steps:

### **Action Items/Next Steps**

- Focus on mission, vision and values
- Align survey focus areas with NC State's Strategic Plan and the UNC Strategic Plan
- Do not forget to celebrate and build upon our strengths
- Address opportunities for further improvement
- Keep action planning process SIMPLE (do not reinvent the wheel on initiatives to be implemented)
- Develop 2-4 survey focus areas each with specific strategies and metrics (EES belief statements)
- Look for low hanging fruit where NC State can move the needle

## **8. Old and New Business**

a. Status of Resolutions passed in the previous year – *Carolyn Bird*

