

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
December 4, 2018
3:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting No. 7 of the 65th Session: Faculty Senate Chambers

December 4, 2018

Present: Chair Bird; Chair-Elect Kellner; Associate Chair Ange-van Heugten; Parliamentarian Ash; Senators, Barrie, Berry-James, Boyer, Bykova, Carver, Cooke, Eseryel, Fath, Feducia, Fitzpatrick, Havner, Hawkins, Hayes, Huffman, Kirby, Kotek, Lim, Liu, Lubischer, Martens, Orcutt, Parker, Pearce, Perros, Rever, Sannes, Vincent, Williams

Excused: Senators Argyropoulos, Hergeth, Kuzma, Smith

Absent: Senators Kathariou, Thakur

Guests: Randy Woodson, Chancellor; PJ Teal, Chancellor's Office; Anna Howard, Teaching Associate Professor, MAE; Kevin Howell, Vice Chancellor, External Affairs; Katharine Stewart, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs; Marc Hoyt, Vice Chancellor, OIT; Courtney Thornton, Faculty Affairs; Roy Baroff, Faculty and Staff Ombuds; Dan Monck, Department of Music; Nancy Moore, Teaching Assistant Professor, MAE

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

Chair Bird called the seventh meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3:04 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 65th Session, November 6, 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 sixth meeting of the 65th session of the NC State Faculty Senate. A motion and second were made and the minutes were unanimously approved, with noted grammatical corrections.

5. Chancellor's Remarks and Q/A

Randy Woodson, Chancellor

Chancellor Woodson brought greetings to the Faculty Senate and reported that at the last meeting of the Board of Trustees in November, the Board approved a recommendation for tuition increases for the campus. "As a reminder, this is just one step in the process; it has to go to the Board of Governors, where they will act on this in a subsequent meeting." He added that "the Board gave us instructions to not have any increases in undergraduate resident student tuition, so that is still flat. This will be the third year in a row that there is no increase for undergraduate resident students."

Chancellor Woodson stated that the following has been recommended to the Board of Governors: 3% increase for undergraduate non-residents, which is the lowest in probably five years for out-of-state students; a 2% increase for graduate resident students and a 4% increase for graduate non-residents. "There is an attempt to try to adjust prices to market in both of those cases. The revenue generated from that would, for the first time in six years, allow us to put money back into financial aid for undergraduates." He added that about seven years ago, the Board of Governors passed legislation that limited us to no more than 15% of our tuition revenues going to Financial Aid for students with financial need. We were well above 15%."

He continued, "The irony being that the previous Board had insisted that any tuition increase, 25% went to Financial Aid. So we were all above 15% because we were mandated to be above 25%. Then the new Board mandated that we be below 15%." He added that it does not take an economist to determine that those numbers do not add up. He stated that NC State has been above the 15% for six years, but for the first time we fell below that number. "As a result, we can put money back into Financial Aid, which is critical so we can compete for the best students that have significant financial need. We also have the opportunity with the funds that are raised to put money back into the graduate students' support plan, which is critical with the increase in tuition for graduate students. We will also be able to provide the funding necessary for promotional increases for faculty that are realizing promotions this year. Then we will be able to put a little less than one third of the money into accessibility and quality – things like seats and sections." Chancellor Woodson stated that this will go to the Board of Governors for their final act on it and hopefully that will happen in February or March, 2019.

Chancellor Woodson spoke to the Faculty Senate regarding the partnerships that have been formed with eight community colleges, called the C3 program – Community College Collaboration. "This is eight community colleges that we draw heavily from in the transfer pipeline. This is a dual admission program where students actually apply as a freshman at the community college to ultimately transfer to NC State. If they are admitted to this dual program, from the beginning they will get access to NC State advising, which is critical to ensure that they are transitioning to the University." This program has gotten a lot of attention from the Board of Governors and from General Administration, and it will

be part of the state budget request to seek some funds to help with the increased cost of advising. He added that these funds also provide advisers at the high school level that feed into the community colleges so that young people that might not really envision themselves having an opportunity to land a place at NC State can see a pathway to get here.

Chancellor Woodson added that the other budget priority for the Board will be faculty salaries and raises for state employees that work on our campus, in addition to R & R. “We have fallen woefully behind, not only at NC State, but many of the campuses, in our ability to maintain facilities. We have about \$650 billion in deferred payments now. So the cost keeps going up but somehow we have to tackle this.”

Chancellor Woodson shared that UNC system President Margaret Spellings has resigned from her position and Bill Roper has agreed to come in as President on an interim basis. “We will see what the transition plan is. I can tell you this, I am excited about Dr. Roper. I know him well. He serves as the Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Medical School. The reason I am excited about it is because you don’t have to explain what a research university like NC State is about; he understands what our faculty do, he understands the cost of a place like NC State. So we start out from a good position, at least in understanding of the key role that we play in the state.” That transition will occur very quickly and will begin in early January.

Chancellor Woodson announced the following ranking and faculty recognition:

The Princeton Review Top 11 list has NC State named as number 11 (up from number 19) in entrepreneurship for undergraduates. “Three years ago we were not on this list at all. This isn’t about helping undergraduates start companies, although sometimes that is an outcome of it, it is really about creating an entrepreneurial mindset among our students and our graduates. Companies and large corporations are looking for those skills.”

Walt Wolfram (College of Humanities and Social Sciences) was named to the 2018 Gov. James E. Holshouser award of excellence for his public service. He is a linguist who studies many things – including many of the dialects associated with North Carolinians across the state. His most recent work that has gotten a lot of acclaim is his work on African American dialects in North Carolina, the south and across the country. His documentary, called *Speaking Black in America*, received national attention and brought a lot of good attention to NC State.”

Jennifer Kuzma, (College of Humanities and Social Sciences) was just selected as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. “She is phenomenal co-director of the Genetic Engineering and Society Center and it is great recognition for her.”

Richard Kim received an R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company award of excellence for teaching research and extension in the College of Engineering. “Dr. Kim is a leading scholar in asphalt who works on efficiency and productivity of asphalt, a critical material for our country and the world.”

Questions and Discussion

Chair-Elect Kellner: Regarding the Community College, C3 plan, has there ever been any talk about placing students who are at a level of entry to NC State but for whom there is not space, in other schools in the system, with a guarantee that if they maintain their grades they will be admitted to NC State? Students have the option, the path to citizenship in the NC State degree community, which many would have up front but there just was not space. Has there ever been talk about that kind of thing?

Chancellor Woodson responded yes, but it gets complicated by the need to manage your enrollment. "If we told everyone that if you do this, if you achieve at this level at any university in the UNC system and at that level you have the right to transfer to NC State, we could be overwhelmed. There have been a few campuses around the country that have done things like that, such as the University of Central Florida, which has grown beyond their capacity because of making commitments that they cannot live up to. We try to enter these things carefully and thoughtfully so that we can continue to manage our enrollment. If you're focusing all of your attention on students transferring into the University, it changes the dynamic of the faculty dramatically and the courses that we teach. You don't go into it without your eyes being open, at least in my view."

Chair-Elect Kellner: So the dual admission plan must plan two years down the line?

Chancellor Woodson responded, yes, it is. It is also a very limited scale program.

Provost Arden commented that we have about 80 - something students who have signed up for this year.

Chancellor Woodson added that the goal is to try to give people some clarity on different pathways to get here, because there is so much demand - 30,000 applicants for 4,500 spots. "Particularly for areas that are under-enrolled that have capacity. The spring applicants that we have done; that's not been open to the College of Engineering because they are full. We are reluctant to just give a blanket "if you do this it's going to be fine" because we could be overwhelmed with interest."

Senator Huffman: You mentioned the seats and sections funding – that went away two years ago, at least from all of our budgets. Is that coming back or is this a new approach?

Chancellor Woodson responded, No. "When you look at quality, there will be a portion of the money that the Provost has to sit there and think about what can he do. We are going to have to do something because we are going to have another freshman class that is above what we were counting on."

Provost Arden added that there is always a portion of tuition receipts that are set aside for what is

generically called (inaudible) and accessibility. “Historically, it would be one of the ways we would fund seats and sections. We still look at that money for enhancing the student experience, predominately the undergraduate student experience. Seats and sections will be approached a little differently now. It was historically one of the ways that we would find money to hire additional faculty and proliferate some seats.”

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

Warwick Arden, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Provost Arden brought to the Faculty Senate an announcement from Amy Jinnette regarding Honorary Degree nominees. “The honorary degree is the highest honor university bestows and we are always looking for great nominations. I have asked each Dean to make sure each college has at least one nomination. Anybody who is on faculty or a staff person can nominate a person for an Honorary Degree. Go to go.ncsu.edu/honorary-degrees to start the process.”

Provost Arden stated that the end of fall semester is usually the time that he and the Chancellor give the annual strategic plan report card presentations. He told the Senators that if they would like the full presentation that he will make sure that happens. “You could also go to the office of institutional planning and research website and look under ALM presentations and find the full presentation there.”

Please see the presentation here: <https://oirp.ncsu.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/2018-November-ALM-Presentation.pdf>

“You will recall that for each of our major goals we have specific numerical endpoints that we are looking for. You will find graphs that chart where we started. Our benchmark year was the 2010-2011 year and the final point we are looking for is where we are in 2020. It is great to see that on many of those variables, we have actually met or exceeded our goal two years early. He encouraged the Faculty Senate to go look at the data.”

He added that there are currently a couple of five-year comprehensive leadership reviews going on; Mary Lelik’s review and also Dean Jeff Braden from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. “Please do participate in these reviews. They are very important and the Chancellor and I take them very seriously.”

Provost Arden reported that there are a number of leadership searches going on. “I am pleased to announce the appointment of Greg Raschke as the Senior Vice Provost and Director of Libraries.” Other searches include the Poole College of Management search, which will begin moving forward in the early part of 2019.

Provost Arden shared that within the last week, working with the Chancellor and Brian Sischo, we were able to establish, through the generosity of Dr. Jim Goodnight, four more distinguished faculty

positions at the University. “So this is two distinguished Chairs and two distinguished professorships. The Chairs are in Molecular Toxicology and Quantum Computing; the distinguished professorships are in Geospatial Analytics and Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning.” Dr. Goodnight gave \$2 million for each of those Chairs and that will make the endowment around \$2.6 - \$2.7 million. “Each of those will yield a discretionary expense account of around \$100,000 per year. For the two distinguished professorships, he gave \$1.5 million, which will yield about an \$80,000 discretionary account.”

He continued by explaining, “When you form a distinguished professorship or a distinguished chair, that provides in general, enough money for a significant discretionary spending account and sometimes, depending on the terms of the gift, we can also use some of those proceeds toward a base salary. In general, we have to come up with a base salary and startup as separate lines. So two of these I am expecting to do as national searches – Quantum Computing and Artificial Intelligence. The other two will be internal appointments. We are now up to 201 distinguished chairs and/or professorships. This has been a major goal, which was to really build capacity in endowed distinguished professorships and chairs. This is an area that we have done extremely well in. Many thanks to the Chancellor and Brian Sischo and others who have worked very hard on this.”

Provost Ardent also reported that he recently returned from the Emerging Issues Forum in Asheville, the first forum held outside of Raleigh in 32 years. “Under Leslie Boney’s leadership, we decided to go to a different format, which is rather than having one big forum and a completely different theme every year which is hard to keep up with, we would have an overarching theme that spanned about a three-year period. This time it’s “Reconnecting Across North Carolina”.” He further noted that the format is going to be two meetings per year, or six total meetings on this theme. Three of the meetings will be held in Raleigh and the other three are going to be across the state; one in Asheville, one in Charlotte, and one in Greenville. This was extraordinarily well-received by the folks in Asheville. “This model really speaks to getting out around the state, engaging stakeholders from around the state, taking input from local communities rather than simply being a Raleigh-centric event. It was a great start to this three-year engagement.”

Questions and Discussion

Senator Pearce: What were your biggest disappointments in the Strategic Plan?

Provost Arden responded that so far, the biggest disappointment is the number for new faculty growth. “We had said in 2011 that we would grow our tenure/tenure track faculty somewhere between 300 and 350. What we really didn’t take into account were the demographics of our faculty and how many would be retiring or recruited away. So the figures are that while we have only a net gain of around 60, which is far from our 300 or 350, in the last seven years we have hired 480 tenured/tenure track faculty to make that gain of 60. What that means is that we have turned over more than one-third of our tenured/tenure track faculty in a seven-year period, which is really

massive. Between the Deans and myself, in the last two years we are spending about \$30 million on startup. We are recruiting in some extraordinary faculty, we are trying to give them really good startup packages, and I think the fruits of this will be borne out five or ten years from now. We are already starting to see it in our external research receipts. So yes, we didn't hit our 300 or 350, and we're not going to, but when I look at it I can't say I'm displeased because I know how hard everybody has been working to recruit and retain extraordinary faculty."

Senator Perros: These distinguished chairs and professorships - where are they going?

Provost Arden responded that the way this works is Dr. Goodnight has a preference for STEM areas and STEM education, so he has asked himself and the Chancellor to list what we believe to be high priorities. "He will look at those, approve those, and then we will come back and propose specific ones for this current year. Because this is probably going to be ongoing; maybe not four per year but at least a couple per year. So based on these areas, molecular toxicology will be in the College of Sciences, Quantum Computing will most likely be in Computer Engineering, Geospatial Analytics will be in Natural Resources, and Artificial Intelligence, most likely in Computer Science."

Chair-Elect Kellner: You mentioned, with regard to the Goodnight bequest, that the Board of Governors had some role in it and it seemed that the amounts changed. Do the Board of Governors add to these monies?

Provost Arden responded yes, there is a Board of Governors matching fund for distinguished professorships and distinguished chairs. "So the way it works is that up to a certain cap being \$2 million, I think, they will give up to a one-third extra. So it's actually a pretty good deal. The lowest level that you can form a full distinguished endowed professorship is \$1 million. If you give \$667,000, the Board of Governors will add the other \$333,000 to make up the \$1 million. Once that is in the pipeline of an endowment, we have the ability to go forward and make the appointment of the individual. When you get up to the \$2 million mark, I think it caps out at \$667,000. So these wind up as \$2.6-\$2.7 million endowments for the chair and around \$2 million for the professorships."

Chancellor Woodson added that this is a program from the state, from the General Assembly, that has been in existence for 11 years. He explained that you get in the que and as soon as the donor has given you everything they committed to, then you get to submit to the Board of Governors and there's a long list of them. "As the money comes in from the state, they fund them. We usually have a dozen or more in the queue waiting to be funded."

Provost Arden added that he can remember a time when we would have maybe two or three in the queue and Chapel Hill would have 100 in the queue. "Chapel Hill would be very very frustrated because it would often take many years to get them matched. So they started to bring their number in the queue down. In the meantime, we are putting 12-15 in the queue and making pretty good progress in

getting them matched in a given year. Usually a donor doesn't have to wait more than a year or two before they're matched for NC State.

7. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty Employment Conditions and Faculty Designation**

Phil Sannes, Co-Chair, Governance and Personnel Policy Committee

Marina Bykova, Co-Chair, Governance and Personnel Policy Committee

Committee Members: Donna Carver, Paul Huffman, Barbara Kirby, Jennifer Kuzma, PK Lim, Jane Lubischer, Darby Orcutt, Angie Smith, Steven Vincent, Paul Williams

The Faculty Senate's Governance and Personnel Policy Committee has been exploring how to improve the status of faculty who are not in tenure line faculty positions. Following extensive conversations within the Committee and with University leadership the Committee has formulated a set of preliminary recommendations. The discussion will allow the Committee to gain feedback from senators to refine the recommendations to be made to the Provost.

Please view the presentation slides here:

https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2018/12/Proposal.NTT_.pdf

Senator Sannes reported to the Faculty Senate that this presentation is a culmination of two years of work on this issue. "We have received a lot of input, including other colleges and universities who have also contributed."

The committee decided to develop a position piece on proposals and guidelines about how NC State may improve the status and wellbeing of non-tenure track faculty. "We broke this down into three basic realms, and that is Title (what we call people), Rights and Benefits (which are attached to what these titles may bring) and then Strategies and How To Go From There."

With regard to **Titles**, there are issues with the names that we call each other. In that regard:

1) It is proposed that all faculty ranks be categorized within two major tracks:

a) Tenure Track (unchanged with established designations)

b) Professional Track (previously called "non-tenure" track and part-time)

The professional track will retain existing modifiers (e.g. Clinical, Extension, Teaching, etc.). These changes would minimally alter existing university regulations/policies, but more importantly,

elevate the recognition and appreciation for the important contributions made by non-tenured and part-time faculty. Notably, these title designations would apply to all departments and

colleges.

- c) Alternatively, the order of specific titles could be rearranged such that the track “level” appears first and the modifier second. For example: Assistant Research Professor, or Associate Teaching Professor.

Whether these suggested proposals are seen negatively or positively, the goal today is to get feedback from the Faculty Senate.

Senator Sannes asked for thoughts around the idea of promoting the “non”-something title.

Senator Pearce: I was confused a little because you told us that professional would not appear in anyone’s title, correct?

Senator Sannes responded yes, it would just be a grouping. “Rather than calling them non-tenure track faculty, that group would be gone. This is not a title; this is a grouping.

Senator Bykova added that this is not a title but would be instead of non-tenure track, professional track.

Senator Pearce: So basically, it would appear in University documentation.

Senator Sannes responded yes. This would really just be how we look at the generalized grouping and essentially trying to get rid of this “non” title.

Senator Barrie: I am not sure how relevant this is but in looking for a parallel term. Tenure track is clearly a track towards tenure; professional track – they are not on a track to being professional. In the College of Design, we hire professionals.

Senator Sannes responded that the distinction here is that it is, in fact, a track because we do promote people within that track. So rather than promoting them within the non-tenure track, it has a slightly different connotation and gives a little bit more substance than being something you’re not.

Senator Berry-James: I represent a global accreditor in a lot of different work in my field, so we often refer to two different types of faculty as academically-qualified faculty and professionally-qualified faculty. The professionally qualified faculty do not have a terminal degree; they often have an advanced degree or a graduate degree in order to teach in our programs and that type of thing. I don’t know if that distinction and definition of how those two types are distinguished helps.

Senator Parker: I don't think it will work. In my college, we have a lot of people who are academically qualified who are not on tenure track. I think that is extremely common in some colleges.

Senator Sannes reminded the Faculty Senate that this is a first reading of the proposals and that this is not the time to make decisions. We are looking for input.

Chair Bird added that some of the other terms we found in other places included contingent faculty and contract faculty. Those seemed less appealing than using, as a category, professional track. Professional track is used at some other universities as well and of what we saw out there, what did we think had the best representation.

Senator Parker: I did like contract faculty; it makes us sound like we are mercenaries. [Laughter]

Senator Williams: Tenure track is also a misnomer; it's permanent tenure track. That's the track they're on. Anybody has tenure as a term to their contract, but tenure track faculty is a term that refers to people who are on a track for permanent tenure. So maybe we should change tenure track to permanent tenure track. That's exactly what they are.

Chair-Elect Kellner: I congratulate you for wading into this very difficult naming notion. Paul has a good point – it is permanent tenure that we are talking about. But what we have here are terms like non-tenure track and tenure track that have sort of frozen into reality over the decades because they exist and people have used them and haven't worried about them too much. As for the titles, they've changed and changed perhaps two or three times in my 15 years here at NC State and elsewhere. So the question that Tom brought up; what is the opposite of a professional? The one phrase you haven't mentioned when you mentioned the alternatives is "Of the Practice." At least when you see that, you have a pretty clear idea of what it means. Many mainly private universities use it. Did you discuss this as an option?

Senator Sannes responded, "Not in those words."

Senator Lubischer: That is one of the modifiers. Professor of the Practice is one of the modifiers, like clinical and teaching.

Senator Parker: In my school, those are the non-academically qualified.

Chair-Elect Kellner: That's what we call Adjunct Faculty.

Several: No

[Several speaking at once]

Senator Fath: At other universities in my discipline, that would be someone who was not academically qualified [Inaudible] but had professional experience, they would be Professor of the Practice.

Senator Pearce: I would not be in favor of Paul's suggestion. If we changed tenure track to permanent tenure track, then HR would say we have to put that into all your job categories. Then people would not know what that meant. I think that's a well-known description of the position.

Senator Sannes responded that it is hard to come up with fully inclusive titles for people who fit into every one of these. Professional is one we came up with that might be more on the inclusive side.

Roy Baroff: From my perspective, you're on a great track. Some of the visitors I've had over the years would be on this professional track and I think you will find that folks will appreciate this and it will mean a great deal. I appreciate your work on this.

Senator Sannes responded that this is a cultural issue, and one of the goals was to look at this situation of what we call each other and how it fits into the culture of the overall institution, as well as department and college issues as well. This is a first reading and discussion on this and whatever comes out of this, we will reformulate, revisit and look at ways of smoothing out whatever edges need to be smoothed. Please feel free to contact any of us with your thoughts.

Senator Perros: I was wondering what prompted this discussion.

Senator Sannes responded that this is no small issue to some of the non-tenure track/professional track individuals. They feel left out of the equation oftentimes, and starting off with the title is part of how we look at our colleagues. I must tell you that coming from the Veterinary College, we have never had this as an issue. Half of our faculty are what we call clinical track faculty, who are professional track individuals. They are a part of all of what we do so it is not an issue. But it's not always that way in other colleges and departments. The Office of Faculty Development also came to us and said they need guidance on this and would like to know how the Senate feels about this.

Senator Parker: I think a couple of us on Executive Committee were talking about the order of the titles. I had a student who thought I was the TA (Teaching Assistant).

Senator Bykova: This is the same for Research Assistants; some think these are RA's (Residence Advisers).

Anna Howard: One possible downside of rearranging the titles is it gets a little fuzzy when you start talking about people who are Associate Professors in a department. If you put the teaching in the middle, then you may be excluding that.

Senator Sannes responded that we discussed that and I agree. Keeping the associate, assistant, full professor designation together as part of the title is highly useful.

Senator Berry-James: We have a regional accreditor I am assuming. Do they make distinctions between the faculty titles in the way that we are proposing changing them that might make life complicated?

Provost Arden responded that he is not aware of that. The term tenure track is very commonly used but universities vary in what they use for those who are non-tenure track. The Chancellor and I have been approached by faculty personally who are non-tenure track, who would say, "We don't like being non-something." SACS tends to use the term full-time faculty and not full-time faculty. This is also misleading because for us, full time means anyone with a .75 appointment in either track. When SACS is talking about full-time faculty, they tend to be talking about full-time tenure track.

Chair-Elect Kellner: One of the issues that has come up for years about the track formerly known as non-tenure, is that it contains so many really different kinds of functions that it is easy to confuse the situation of members of the group. You have said that the professional track will retain the modifier – clinical, extension, teaching, etc. – but have you talked about having separate tracks - a clinical track, an extension track, a teaching track? If you did, would that not help, right off the bat, to clarify and structure that group of contract or fixed term or non-tenure or professional faculty? Did you talk about that possibility?

Senator Sannes responded yes, our initial thought was how do we make some generalized categories. We thought this gave us some flexibility to do exactly what you're saying; in this particular realm they can take out or those modifiers can then be used in creative ways by departments and by colleges to do whatever is unique to them.

Senator Hayes: So it seems that the real driver is to have a descriptor between your rank and your discipline. So I would be an Associate Professor of Nuclear Engineering but someone else would be an Assistant Professor of Research or an Associate Professor of Teaching and then by discriminating their discipline from their rank, keep their rank together and the discipline separate. It sounds like the goldilocks model.

Senator Sannes responded that some of us do that on our own. We will oftentimes add onto that what it is that you do, like you just described. The University may or may not recognize that as part of our real title, but we use it as descriptors in some of our documents. That is a distinction we do have to make but there is flexibility in all of this to do that. Please get in touch with any of us about this; this is still a malleable process.

With regard to **Rights and Benefits**, we are proposing:

- a) It is proposed that voting rights be extended to Professional Track faculty for reappointment and promotion decisions within their track for the appropriate ranks, as is currently done by Tenure Track faculty as members of the DVF for RPT decisions. These voting rights would also apply to department decisions involving curriculum policy, faculty recruitment, and graduate or professional education.
- b) It is proposed that departments appraise of all their faculty (both Tenure and Professional Track faculty) of rules, opportunities, and eligibility relevant to promotion, career development, and incentives.
- c) It is proposed that in hiring practices, a minimum of 0.75 FTE (benefits eligible) be encouraged when possible and appropriate. It is encouraged that regular, periodic equity studies be performed for professional ranks based upon discipline standards.
- d) It is proposed that a minimum level of compensation be established (for both part-time and full-time faculty), based upon a metric of the FTE. It is proposed that the minimum for a full time, 9 month appointment have a salary of no less than \$48,000. It is encouraged that pay ranges on a discipline specific basis be established for the Professional Track.

Senator Pearce: Suppose that you have a professional track person who is an Assistant Professor and they're coming up for a promotion to Associate. Is it their recommendation that people who are Associate or Full in the professional rank would have a vote on that as well as the Department voting faculty but they wouldn't get a vote on someone on the tenure track? So tenured faculty would be voting for both but they would not.

Senator Sannes responded that we do address some of that later. I know we discussed it.

Senator Havner: I thought adding the various professional track to vote on individuals in their own specialty track was a good idea. As you say, some of the departments are doing that across campus now. So this would be a consistent policy.

Katharine Stewart: Right now, the University only recognizes the vote of the "official" DVF; now defined as the tenured faculty, for a promotional vote. Many departments do take a vote of their senior ranked professional track faculty, but when the vote is recorded to us in the Provost's office, it is recorded as the "official DVF votes," so those votes of the professional track faculty don't actually get reported to us because by university policy, they do not count. Some department heads describe, "We took this vote and included all these people and here's how that went down." The concern of some professional track faculty in those situations is that if the department head reports the total vote and then the official vote is recorded on a cover sheet that goes up through process, then when you look at the dossier, you can figure out what the professional track faculty voted. So you violate the

confidentiality of the professional track faculty vote, potentially depending on the numbers. So some professional track faculty have noted that their confidentiality is more vulnerable than others.

Senator Pearce: Assistant Professors on the tenured faculty would be included in that vote as was recorded by the department head in that letter, but not the official vote.

Katharine Stewart: Potentially, yes.

Senator Pearce: It would be strange to not ask tenured track assistants if you're going to ask non-tenure track faculty. (Several at once) That would be rare.

Katharine Stewart: For promotion to associate or for promotion to full, that might be a little different. Your point is a good one. Of course, it is completely different for the department of health and exercise studies and music, which remain primarily professional track faculty.

Senator Fath: We are in a unique situation. I have two people in phased retirement right now, but other than that, we are all professional track. Some of these things are happening for us, and as recommendations go forward, I want to make sure current things we are able to do stay protected – like going to faculty meetings or getting kicked out of the voting. Since these two departments are professional track, that means that on this campus, there are disciplines that have no track tenure, which is inconsistent with every other UNC system school and is inconsistent with every other university that I know of.

Senator Sannes agreed that this is a very important issue.

Senator Barrie: I totally agree with the spirit of the committee and the recommendations as proposed. We hire a lot of our professional colleagues in the College of Design. It's the content that worries me. This section I divided into faculty full-time, called permanent faculty, responsibilities and administrative discretion. This first category really falls into the faculty responsibilities. Every college is different but I think we should give examples. At the School of Architecture where we work with a lot of our professional colleagues, it's the full time, or permanent faculty, who are best positioned to make judgements rather than assessments on our professional colleagues, because we are typically paired. It would be very rare to have a pairing of professional colleagues. Usually we're all teaching together. So when it comes to discussions, in our case, of promoting from lecturer to assistant professor of practice or associate professor of practice – we have four ranks – it's the full time, or permanent faculty who are really at the best place to do that. Conversely, from the professional side of the house, we regularly invite our professional colleagues to serve on committees and so forth, but there's no expectation that they have the responsibility to do so, because we are not prepared to compensate them. So I worry about, in some ways, an unfunded mandate for our professional colleagues to serve on a committee of which ultimately is only in an advisory role as proposed.

Senator Sannes responded that one of the things that was grappled with a lot by the committee through this process is flexibility. The way it exists now, there is this level of inconsistency built around the notion of flexibility. So I agree with you.

Chair Bird added that we have non-tenure track faculty who have continuous employment. They're not on contract, but they're still called non-tenure track. So they're hired into a faculty position, they've been here 20 years and they're not term employees, but yet they're non-tenure track. So are you talking about people who are hired on contract?

Senator Barrie: We hire them on a semester basis, so we have colleagues who have been teaching for 20 years for one semester a year.

Senator Sannes responded that as we go further along, you will see that we have some recommendations that may fit. Our goal is not to remove flexibility completely from departments or colleges, but try to develop as much consistency as we can between some of the various university units so that we don't run into what we talked about; we have departments and colleges that have none.

Senator Havner: I assume that inclusion of the professional track in the decisions about promotions would be the full time only.

Senator Bykova: This is why I said that we should add that – full time.

Parliamentarian Ash: I think it's important to remember the spirit behind this; it's not to make life impossible for departments that have their unique structures. It's to deal with departments where you have these full time faculty members who are integrally involved in teaching and curriculum development, yet they may be frozen out of departmental decision making that is related to what they do. They are very much involved in the department, and yet the department may have policies that prevent them from having a voice in what goes on in the department. So I think it is important to think about those people rather than how it's going to screw up my department where everything is functioning fine and the professional track faculty are happy. The point is more to deal with those departments where the professional track faculty feel disenfranchised and unappreciated and not able to have their voice heard.

Senator Berry-James: The NTT faculty are important to the academic discipline, to the campus, to students, to planning, and I also heard the Provost say that in our reflection on the strategic plan we didn't meet the numbers. So I wonder why wouldn't we be advocating for an increase in tenure track faculty, given these full time people mirror, except for title, the work that tenure track faculty do. I do

not understand if there's no distinction between academically qualified and professional qualified, then why aren't this group of people in tenure track? Why aren't they tenured at the university.

Senator Sannes responded that this is where they came up the third one – to have this very thing happen.

Senator Berry-James: But does c) make them tenured?

Senator Sannes responded no, not necessarily.

Senator Bykova: Two things we should keep in mind; not all professional track faculty want to be tenure track.

Several: I don't want it.

Several: Why not?

Senator Bykova: I was surprised but this is what we figured out in our research. Many times tenure is associated with service, with additional responsibilities. For some, they do not want to be tenured. So the assumption that many of us have that all non-tenured want to be tenured is incorrect. The second point – yes, we do have people on the non-tenure track who are searching for a job and would like to have a full time job. This is why we introduced (c. (*see above*)) This is what we should keep in mind. This is a surprise for me as well, but not everybody wants to be tenure track.

Senator Vincent: In response to the point about tenure, the proposal was not to try to preclude encouraging the university to hire more tenured people; this is simply trying to talk about the conditions within which non-tenure track or professional track faculty exist and have at the university. The other point I would like to make is that some part-time people, NTT/professional track would prefer not to be involved with the administrative parts of the university. We are not trying to mandate that they be involved, but it seems to me that it would be useful for them to have the option of participating if they so desire, and many of them do. We are not trying to preclude the university having more tenure track positions.

Senator Fath: There are some people who do not wish to be tenured, but there are some people who would like the option. I would guess that I am the only non-tenured department head at this university. I have a question about the \$48,000 and how that number got determined and to what rank that would apply?

Senator Sannes responded that it came from a study.

Provost Arden added that it was taken from a labor department recommendation under the prior administration, so that the minimum full time salary would be \$47,750. If you remember, we actually put a lot of work into figuring out what this would take at the university. This mostly affected post-docs, but we looked at what it would take to move them \$47,500 or \$48,000. Then the administration dropped it. We decided to go ahead and do that anyway because we felt it was a reasonable fair minimum salary for postdocs and also because Duke and Chapel Hill were doing it so we wanted to remain competitive within the region. Since then, we have looked and there are some full time faculty earning less than that amount of money. This comes out of saying if we're going to have \$47,000 as a floor for everybody for post-docs, then shouldn't it at least be the floor for faculty as well?

Senator Fath: Did you talk about rank as well? We have been talking about professorial rank, but in my department, more than half are lecturers and senior lecturers.

Katharine Stewart: When you draw that floor the Provost described and you look at the people whose full time salaries are below that floor, they are very much the lecturer/senior lecturer group. There's only a few professorially-ranked full time faculty who fall below that floor – very few. The vast majority are in the lecturer track.

Provost Arden: It is very hard to argue that we should have a floor of \$48,000 for post-docs but we can be paying lecturers significantly less than that. That would be a hard argument for us to make.

Senator Orcutt: We had also looked at this because you're looking at a traditional (inaudible) for teaching (inaudible), this comes about to \$6,000 per course.

Senator Bykova: I'd like to avoid this discussion right now because it seems that the courses (inaudible), and this is why. This is the idea but what is important to keep in mind is that it does give flexibility to colleges because what we are saying here or what we are proposing here, is that this is for 1.0 FTE for full positions.

Senator Fath: The lecturers in my department are full time people who are sometimes here 30-40 years.

Provost Arden: Let me clarify. This was one of the criteria that you needed to be paid hourly if you were below. In other words, if you are a full time employee making \$46,000, then you needed to be paid hourly. It's actually far less expensive for us to raise people from \$46,000 to \$48,000 than it is to start paying them on an hourly basis because there are many postdocs who are working more than 40 hours per week.

Senator Pearce: Faculty recruitment. What did you mean by that in part a)?

Senator Sannes responded that the idea of keeping the decision-making distributed amongst appropriate faculty so faculty feel included. This could be up for debate I suppose, but we were really pushing to try to make this more universal across colleges and departments so there is more inclusion involved. It goes back to the point that Kerry made about full time.

Senator Pearce: My concern would be two-fold: we are a research university. I have some very valuable colleagues who specialize in teaching undergraduate courses with no research responsibilities. Do they get a vote on when we are trying to vote on new faculty? The other is, being a department head in the past, is there any problem with people voting who are on fixed contracts?

Senator Parker: I've been on a lot of those committees and I just try to do what's best for the college.

Senator Pearce: I understand. I was just considering this as a hypothetical. The last question I have is what fraction of student credit hours are currently taught by tenure track faculty?

Senator Sannes responded that this had come up about gateway courses.

Katharine Stewart: It is a high proportion of gateway semester hours. So like the really big general education courses, I believe it's more than half of those semester credit hours are taught by teaching track faculty.

Senator Pearce: I think that just shows that we have to take this seriously because without them we would be screwed.

Senator Lubischer: It's great to have this wide-ranging discussion but we also need feedback on these very specific things. I think the discussion of who gets tenure and who's eligible for tenure is worth having, but I think it is beyond the scope of what we are talking about here. I don't want them to become too combined because that is a very different issue. This is about how we treat these faculty and how we use these faculty. I think there are strategic reasons for hiring faculty who have a high teaching load or a high clinical load who would not be in a position to be competitive for tenure, based on their expectations. You may have a strategic need to hire someone who is going to carry more load in teaching and that will put them at a disadvantage for being competitive for tenure. So unless you wanted the department to have a different discussion about what tenure is about and what it means, I think that's a separate issue. What I would like to see included is that when we talk about strategic planning and our need for tenure track faculty, that departments, units and colleges also think about what is our need for clinical faculty, for teaching faculty, for extension faculty. Because there are strategic reasons to hire in these lines. I would like to see all of these lines of faculty included in that planning in a strategic manner.

Provost Arden: If I can jump in as to why we made a strategic goal of growing tenure track faculty and non-professional track faculty was when we looked back over the last 15+ years of data, we had actually grown professional track faculty very significantly but we had not grown tenure track faculty at all in over 15 years. Going forward, we have gained about 50 or 60 in tenure track faculty, but we have also continued growing non-tenure track. The reason we put emphasis on that is not because we are saying this is so much more important, it's just that one had shown growth and the other had not.

Senator Williams: If you want to make these changes then you want the professional faculty to be fully participating members. Most of them don't understand that they have tenure, which means they cannot be dismissed for purposes of personal malice or for discrimination, and they can exercise their first amendment rights. Most of them are afraid. That message needs to be communicated to them – don't be afraid, speak up – because you have tenure.

Dan Monck: A specific example that is relative to the departments of music and HES, the regulations allow for the professional track faculty in our departments to vote on promotion; however, the current regulations preclude them from participating at the college level of those promotion decisions when there are no tenure track faculty available. So there is no representation of their discipline at their college level review and promotion, which is a problem relative to the current situation.

Senator Vincent: In terms of the compensation issue, this is something that has concerned me for years and years - the minimum wage argument for people who are valuable to the institution. The number of NTT faculty is very large and they teach probably, at least in my school, probably 50% of the contact hours with students. They are extremely important and many have been doing it for a long time. It is a national scandal and at NC State. If you look at the region, Duke and Chapel Hill pay roughly twice as much as we do for the same services in their department. So to move the minimum up to \$48,000 per year, it is the first step in terms of getting toward equity. It seems to it's a no-brainer to move them to this level.

Senator Barrie: One thing I would recommend that would be helpful is that this document is predominantly remedies. It needs a preamble that states the problem that it is seeking to remedy and really defines the types of professional colleagues that we are seeking to enfranchise.

Senator Rever: We are unique in HES since we are 99% non-tenure track with a couple of phased retirees currently. One of the issues that I see bringing up the salary to \$48,000, which I think is a fantastic thing. But within our department, you're going to have people who have been here two decades who are making just more than that minimum salary. Then you have someone who is brand new coming in at that \$48,000 level. For us, the larger issue for our department would be how do we effectively compensate the rest of the department that have been there for many years.

Senator Sannes responded that they added wording in part c) that should address that.

Chair Bird added that they have this same issue in the tenure line with salary compression and salary merging – we have that same issue.

Senator Bykova: This is not news for us and we discussed it. Another point to mention is what is important for us to keep in mind is that we cannot expect departments and colleges to come up with this amount of money. This amount of money should come from elsewhere. This is one of the main points here. Everybody is enthusiastic about this, but once it comes to the compensation issue, we do not have money. If we enforce this at the departmental level, other bad things will happen like avoiding the hiring of NTT people or at this level. So funding issues are important.

Senator Williams: It ultimately is a legislative issue. When the legislature appropriates money for raises, they don't make a distinction between professional faculty and tenured faculty, yet the criteria is based on what the tenure track faculty do. So it may make sense to send our lobbyists to speak to them about this issue.

Provost Arden responded that in recent years, the amount of money the legislature has given us is not that great. We do a lot of this by internal reallocation. I have always been an advocate of moving into the direction of giving a lot of discretion to the department heads about what they value and what they reward without us defining what merit is.

Chair Bird responded that Faculty Assembly has adopted this as a legislative initiative. The situation across the 17 institutions is dire, and some of them are in worse situations than we are.

Senator Berry-James: Can we also talk about security for the NTT/P faculty so they don't have to worry about a one-year contract and that type of thing.

Senator Parker: My contract is already three years. I started out with two one-years and then switched to a three-year contract.

Katharine Stewart responded that the regulations allow for a full time faculty member in one of these five tracks to be continuously reappointed on one-year contracts for 30 years, if the department head wishes to do so. Some departments operate in the way that once a full time faculty member has been in the department for a couple of years, the expectation is that longer term contracts will be awarded because the department head has predictability about what the person's contributions are going to be. Other departments have linked length of contract to rank so that when faculty are promoted from teaching assistant professor to teaching associate professor, they get a longer contract. The regulations permit a rotating one-year contract for as long as the department head wants to keep faculty on a one-year contract.

Senator Pearce: What's the longest contract?

Katharine Stewart responded that five years is the longest contract term in these tracks, including lecturers.

Senator Parker: One of the things that I have been horrified to see is what we refer to at other universities as adjunct, but that is not the right term here - part time faculty that teach one course who are still considered part-time, despite teaching two or three courses per semester. I think a more strongly worded guideline than "be encouraged when possible and appropriate" is needed in part c). If you cannot make a real compelling argument, I don't think lack of money should be a good justification for using a part-time faculty member.

Senator Sannes responded that this is actually in the last portion of the presentation – Strategies. We also propose that contract renewals are at least three months prior to the end of an existing contract, and for best practices, and Paul brought this one up, it really should be 12 months in advance – for fairness.

With regard to **Strategies**, we propose:

- a) It is proposed that the use of part-time lecturers as a permanent strategy to meet educational goals be discouraged.
- b) It is proposed that departments be encouraged to complete contract renewals at least 3 months prior to end date of an existing (current) contract, with a best practice of 12 months being preferred.
- c) It is proposed that Tenure and Professional Track faculty be included in strategic initiatives regarding faculty as appropriate and necessary to achieve strategic goals.
- d) It is proposed that all Tenure and Professional Track faculty at all ranks be eligible for all relevant departmental, college and university faculty awards.

Anna Howard: Are you going to request that the Board of Governors award be available for teaching track faculty?

Katharine Stewart responded that our Faculty Assembly delegation has asked, and the answer keeps coming back "No." I don't think that the Faculty Assembly delegation has to stop asking.

Chair Bird stated that the goal of this conversation was to develop a set of recommendations that we could forward to the Provost's office for consideration. How would you like to proceed? The co-chairs of the Governance & Personnel Policy Committee, Phil Sannes and Marina Bykova, would greatly

appreciate it if you would send your clarifying statements and questions to them so we can incorporate them. Would you like to have another conversation?

Senator Parker: I would like another conversation that would result in some kind of resolution.

Senator Bykova responded that this is the goal.

Senator Sannes added that this is what we wanted to do and this is very helpful. We want to get a universal consensus.

Chair Bird added that she appreciates some of the Senators speaking about the worst-case scenarios, because that helps as well.

Senator Lim: For the Provost – I am curious. To implement a big part of these long-term goals, money has to come from somewhere. Will the Provost office have funds to use?

Provost Arden responded that once he gets a feeling from this group that this is agreed upon as a recommendation, then he can start having HR run the numbers on how much that actually would mean.

8. Old and New Business

- a. 2018-19 Res. #1 Resolution in Favor of Implementing Paid Parental Leave for FMLA-eligible employees (DRAFT). See Attachment A.
- b. Faculty Engagement in Shared Governance at NC State. This discussion seeks input from senators for recommendations on how to reach and encourage faculty to serve on:

Faculty Senate

Faculty Disciplinary and Discharge Hearing (603) Committee

Faculty Grievance (607) and Non-Reappointment (604) Committee

“The overriding principle, however, is that responsibility for the academic welfare [of student athletes] is not an extracurricular or departmental obligation of a few faculty members and administrators; it is a fundamental responsibility of the faculty as a whole.”

<https://www.aaup.org/report/role-faculty-governance-college-athletics>

These items were tabled until the next Faculty Senate meeting on January 8, 2019

9. Issues of concern

Faculty Issues of Concern can be submitted at any time to a senator or to Faculty_Senate@ncsu.edu. Faculty Senate committee meeting minutes are posted on the Faculty Senate website.

10. Adjourn

Chair Bird asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:53 pm. The motion passed unanimously.