

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Faculty Senate

February 19, 2019

3:00 p.m.

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

Excused: Senators Barrie, Eseryel, Kathariou, Kuzma, Martens, Smith, Thakur

Absent: Senators Argyropoulos, Hawkins, Liu, Parker

Guests: Randy Woodson, Chancellor; Maggie Thompson, Chancellor's Communications Specialist; Courtney Thornton, Assoc. Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Policy; Roy Baroff, Faculty and Staff Ombuds Office

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

Chair Bird called the eleventh meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3:01 p.m.

2. Introductory remarks

Chair Bird asked the guests and invited speakers to introduce themselves.

3. Announcements

The Spring General Faculty Meeting has been set to take place Tuesday, March 5, 2019 in place of the Faculty Senate meeting that was scheduled at that time. The meeting will be held in Room 4140 (Governance Chamber), Talley Student Union.

4. Approval of the Minutes, Regular Meeting

Associate Chair Ange van Heugten called for a motion to approve the minutes for the tenth 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. Chancellors Remarks and Q/A – *Randy Woodson, Chancellor*

The Chancellor congratulated new member of the National Academy of Engineering, Rodolphe

Barrangou. Dr. Barrangou was also just selected by the National Academy of Science last year. “For those of you that pay attention to these sort of things, that’s a fairly rare feat to be a member of two academies.”

“Rodolphe Barrangou is in the department of Bioprocessing and Nutritional Sciences. He is a great member of the faculty, coming here to get his masters and Ph.D., went off to work in industry for a while but came back here in 2012. All of his work is in genome editing and the technology associated with the ability to edit the genome.”

“We just had a total of five National Science Foundation early career awards for our faculty, which is one of the largest single year number for us in quite some time. When you add together the young investigators for the Department of Army, Air Force, DOD, and DOE, we have had over 12 young investigator awards this year at NC State.”

Chancellor Woodson added that we are fourth in the country in the number of Fulbright Scholars from our faculty, seeing seven new Fulbright Scholars at NC State, which ties us with the University of Michigan.

Lee Stiff, in the College of Education, received the 2019 National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Lifetime Achievement Award. Lee has now stepped up to be an Associate Dean for the College.

“To date, we have had almost 31,000 applications for Fall admission. For early admission, we have almost 20,000 applicants for early decisions. Those were released during the last week of January. We have another amazing class coming in this Fall. Those that have been admitted, to date, represent all 100 counties in North Carolina, 48 states, and 26 countries. We are increasingly female at NC State, and this year we almost reached parity, being just slightly over 50% men. The number of women admitted, to date, is almost 60% of the freshman class. This is actually a trend in Higher Education.”

The dual enrollment program continues to be strong. “We have worked hard to build relationships with eight community colleges. Not to say that you cannot transfer to NC State from any community college in the state, but we have a partnership with eight where students are admitted as freshmen to NC State, subject to their performance at a community college. That is really getting a lot of traction across the state. I am proud of it because it keeps the university accessible to students around the state.”

Questions and Discussion

Senator Boyer: 50% women admitted?

Chancellor Woodson responded, "Remember when you admit students it's a funnel; you start with a large number of applicants, you take that down to a significant number of admits, and then you enroll. The conversion of an admitted student to an enrolled student is called yield. Our yield for in-state students is quite high, typically in the 45% range. Out-of-state applicant yield is 25%, or even lower. The fact that we have admitted almost 60% women tells you the competitiveness of the applicant pool that is women. I think we will see the freshman class for the first time as a majority of women. We have been moving in that direction."

Chair-Elect Kellner: Comment on what particular qualities you were looking for in an athletic director?

Chancellor Woodson responded, "The critical attribute was demonstrated ability to lead a complex athletic program at a Division I institution and having significant experience in athletic administration and oversight with integrity. Number two, is the ability to build relationships with constituents because so much of our athletic program is externally funded. To be successful in the athletic department at NC State, we have to consistently raise \$20+ million per year for athletics. The scholarship bill alone is \$15 million. You've got to be good with people and you've got to be a very effective manager. And we have one."

Senator Williams: I am assuming then, that he buys into our verification of eligibility and program?

Chancellor Woodson responded, "Without a doubt. The first conversation I had with him, he was thrilled to find out that ASPSA (Academic Support Program for Student Athletes) does not report to athletics. He was as thrilled to find out that athletics doesn't have their own Title IX investigative unit. At NC State, all of that is outside of athletics. Not only does he buy into it, he would have asked to change it if it wasn't the case. Part of that is because he started at Notre Dame, he went from there to Duke, and then he went from Duke to Army."

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

Provost Arden announced that he has begun a program called Provost Faculty Fellows Program, a formal mentoring program where individual faculty apply, we choose a small cohort and my office buys out a quarter of their time, anywhere from a semester to a year. "The initial class of those individuals is Faculty Chair Carolyn Bird, Jane Lubischer, Jason Bocarro, Paola Sztajn, Janice Odom and Roger Narayan. "We will begin cohort meetings with them shortly. This is really looking at exploring academic leadership. Each of them will be identifying a project with a Vice Provost to work with over a year's time. I am looking forward to this program and interacting with these individuals."

He added, "You likely saw the announcement from my office today that Kelly Wick, my assistant, has

been promoted to a position of special projects and planning for the Provost's office. Kelly has really great organizational skills and she will continue to work with me but also with others, particularly supporting the strategic planning process over the next eight months." He stated that he will begin the process of searching for another executive assistant very shortly.

Questions and Discussion

Chair-Elect Kellner: Just a comment; three of your Provost Fellows were members of the faculty senate, and more than members, leaders; Chair Bird, Jane Lubischer and Paola Sztajn. We have to be proud of that.

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

At the December 4th Faculty Senate meeting, the Governance and Personnel Policy Committee presented its preliminary proposal regarding methods to improve the status of faculty who are not in tenure line faculty positions. This discussion reflects the incorporation of senator feedback and additional refinements to the proposal and provides another opportunity to gain feedback from senators to refine the recommendations to be made to the Provost.

Please see presentation here:

<https://facultysenate.ncsu.edu/files/2019/03/NTT-Faculty-Presentation-021919.pdf>

Senator Sannes pointed out the small variations that have gone into this updated presentation.

"This presentation really has to do with discussions that have been going on for quite a while now. There were deficiencies present, and we have spent a lot of time discussing this and had others come in to speak with us from other administrative groups around the campus. We have formulated a series of recommendations." They are below:

Introduction

The contributions of faculty not in tenure track positions have clearly expanded over the past several decades. Yet their status remains relatively unchanged and deficient in recognition, respect, and rewards. Following extensive conversations with faculty, university leadership, and members of the

Faculty Senate, the committee has formulated a set of recommendations for improving the treatment and compensation of non-tenure track faculty on the professorial track.

The committee proposal is divided into three basic realms: **Terminology, Rights and Benefits, and Strategies Going Forward.**

TERMINOLOGY:

- 1) It is proposed that all faculty be categorized within two major tracks:
 - a) Tenure Track (unchanged with established designations)
 - b) Professional Track (previously called “non-tenure” track)

The titles of professional track faculty will retain any existing modifiers such as Clinical, Extension, Research, Teaching, and Of the Practice or specific titles such as Lecturer, Librarian, and Field Agent. These changes are designed to remove current exclusionary modifiers and elevate recognition and appreciation for the important contributions made by non-tenured faculty. These title designations would apply to all departments and colleges and would minimally alter existing university regulations.

RIGHTS AND BENEFITS:

- 1) It is proposed that a formula be developed such that departmental voting faculty committee composition include Professional Track faculty for decisions within their track and as appropriate to their rank. By this same mechanism, Professional Track faculty voting rights would apply also to other departmental matters, including courses and curricula and undergraduate, graduate, or professional education. Departments that appoint faculty only in the Professional Track may vary from this requirement.
- 2) It is proposed that departments inform all of their faculty (both Tenure Track and Professional Track faculty) of rules, opportunities, and eligibility relevant to promotion, career development, and incentives.
- 3) 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 disciplinary standards.
- 4) It is proposed that a minimum level of compensation be established such that a full time, 9 month appointment will have a salary of no less than \$48,000. Best practice would be that teaching nine credit

hours, with associated responsibilities, equal 0.75 FTE.

5) It is proposed that a minimum level of compensation be established such that a full time, 12 month appointment will have a salary of no less than \$58,700. Best practice would be that teaching nine credit hours, with associated responsibilities, equal 0.75 FTE.

6) It is proposed that a minimum level of compensation for part-time faculty be established that is scaled to their FTE relative to the minima established above. Department heads should specify an FTE appropriate to the amount of work expected for any given part-time faculty hire.

7) It is encouraged that pay ranges on a discipline specific basis be established for the Professional Track.

8) It is proposed that the funding needed to bring the compensation to the proposed level should be provided to the Colleges and Departments by the Provost's Office .

STRATEGIES GOING FORWARD:

1) It is proposed that the use of part-time faculty as a permanent strategy to meet educational goals be discouraged.

2) 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.

3) It is proposed that Tenure and Professional Track faculty be included in strategic initiatives regarding faculty. This is both appropriate and necessary to achieve strategic goals.

4) It is proposed that all Tenure and Professional Track faculty at all ranks be eligible for all relevant departmental, college and university faculty awards.

Senator Sannes thanked the Government and Personnel Policy Committee for some of the finest committee work he has seen while he's been at the University. He stated he is very thankful for their hard work.

Chair Bird thanked Senator Sannes for stepping up and leading this committee for the past two academic years. He bridged last year's committee and this years and continued to work very hard on this project.

Questions and Discussion

Senator Fath: Is the location of the modifier going to stay the same?

Senator Sannes: We decided to minimize that and not change that particular sequence. If there is huge uproar about that, then we will continue to discuss. There is still opportunity here for modification if these are strongly felt.

Senator Fath: The problem is that if you're off campus and you call someone a Teaching Assistant Professor, people think you're a graduate student. This has happened to me and to a lot of professional track faculty.

Provost Arden responded that sometimes a teaching assistant professor is confused with a teaching assistant. This is up to you, but there is some confusion around this.

Senator Fath: Everyone that I have spoken to in the teaching track feels strongly about this, but I haven't spoken to everyone.

Senator Sannes responded yes, they can certainly discuss this further.

Chair Bird added that as she recalls, there was strong favor of modifying it, but then entered into the conversation was the proper English. If we can agree that you want to set aside that argument and for purposes of clarity and communication, that we would prefer assistant teaching professor and associate teaching professor.

Senator Pearce: I have seen other places where they will have assistant professor of the practice of associate professor of the practice. Can't colleges and departments adapt whatever they want, or does it have to be the same?

Senator Sannes responded that he feels there is some flexibility there. In fact, those departments that do not have any tenure track at all will have some flexibility. We do cover that as we get into rights and responsibilities.

Senator Pearce: I have one other suggestion. Have a graph that shows the fraction of student credit hours taught by non-tenure track faculty over the last ten years. It will show how important they are. They feel a lack of respect and most colleges do not realize how dependent upon them they are. We must know this number, correct?

Senator Sannes responded that in discussions with Katharine Stewart about this, one of the statistics that we were struck by is that 60% of the gateway courses are taught by professional track faculty. "That's a lot."

Senator Vincent: The last numbers I have from 2014, 36.25% of the faculty are NTT. Fifty percent of introductory courses were taught by NTT.

Chair-Elect Kellner: I am a little bothered by the phrase "decisions within their track." I think that is awfully general. I can think of decisions that are not made with these personnel and hiring decisions. I am just saying that decisions within their track can be interpreted to cover an awful lot of ground. I don't know what to do about that and I think your intent is quite reasonable

Senator Sannes responded that the idea was that they tend to get left out of decisions that clearly affect them.

Senator Lubischer: My understanding is that the intent of the original language was that this be about hiring and promotion decisions. Is that correct? To be included as part of the DVF when it is appropriate within their track.

Senator Fath: I am not on this committee, but did you discuss in departments where there are both tenure and a fair number of professional track faculty, did you discuss having promotion rules for both? Because I know that in some other departments, I have spoken to some who are being held to the same rules as the tenured track faculty but this is not going to help get them there. I wasn't sure if it had been discussed or not. Maybe it's a recommendation.

Chair Bird responded that one of the Provost Faculty Fellows selected will be on the NTT policies and promotions guidelines as a project. She added that Katharine Stewart and her office is working on that.

Senator Hayes: I could easily see some departments being reticent about putting a non-tenure track person on their graduate admissions committee. If they're not going to advise the students, then do they need to have the vote for a say in who's going to come when they are not willing or able to advise them?

Associate Chair Ange van-Heugten: NTT faculty do have graduate students.

Senator Sannes added that inclusion was an important part of this whole process.

Senator Lubischer: There should be an acknowledgment of the variability and the time commitment and

workload and different credit hours. In this case, nine is not always a full. If you teach a three credit course with 300 students, that's quite different than a three credit course with ten students in it, whether you're doing it as part of a contract or on a course-by-course basis. It is more complicated than this.

Senator Fitzpatrick: If we were to use a faculty member who only taught 30 hours per semester, is it true they receive \$8,000 minimum for that class?

Senator Bykova: \$6,000.

Senator Pearce: [Inaudible] In my own department we have several people who are "of the practice," and who do a very good job teaching but they do not fit in the graduate program and they don't do research. Do they get an equal vote in the strategy of the department who, let's say, decides that we need to upgrade our research efforts, etc. Would they have a vote on hiring?

Senator Sannes responded in their track, yes.

Senator Pearce: So you'd still have kind of two citizens; one who gets to vote on both and one who gets to only vote on teaching practices? I don't think we vote on hiring NTT faculty. I think we vote on the motions but I think the department head and the Dean maybe decide on who gets hired on the NTT, professional track. Are we a big outlier?

Senators: No. I don't think so.

Senator Lubischer: I think the regulations are that the department head is to consult with the DBF for those hires.

Senator Pearce: And the DVF would change, right? Would there be five different DVF's, depending on what you're voting on?

Senator Vincent: The intention of the committee is to suggest that professional track faculty should have some input in the decisions if they're .75 FTE or more - in decisions of people being brought into their own track or lower in the track; nothing else. We are not proposing that professional track faculty have anything to do with hiring of TT faculty. This is trying to include them in some of the considerations of hiring specifically to their track or a lower track. Just bringing them into that process so we get their input and opinions because they often know more about these tracks than the tenured. We are not specifying; we are leaving flexibility for departments to decide what is appropriate in each department.

Senator Pearce: So the fact that nobody votes on hiring professional tracks in our department; that would be our departmental decision, right?

Senator Rever: Just for clarification, the pay scales are intended to address the salary progression, I'm guessing, and not as a long term scale; you've been here 5, 10, 15 years because we know the funding for any potential raises isn't a guaranteed dollar figure.

Senator Sannes responded that our attempts were really to provide guidance on a floor.

Senator Rever: So it's not necessarily moving forward with longevity, it's just to bring everybody up to a current.

Senator Sannes responded that these are recommendations that we are making. Obviously, the Provost's office will take these under consideration. Going forward, they're probably not going to be written down.

Provost Arden added that there are not a lot, but there are some teaching track, NTT faculty who make less than the post-doctoral.

Senator Berry-James: Last year, we adjusted the minimum scale for the post-docs. Has there been any movement between last year and this year for the NTT professionals to adjust that minimum scale?

Provost Arden responded that there is no minimum at the moment. This is one of the things we are working on and there is only a handful of individuals below that minimum of \$48,000.

Senator Berry-James: We don't know how many faculty that are going to be impacted and we don't know which colleges are disproportionately paying their TT faculty. So we don't know what Chapel Hill does.

Provost Arden responded, "Correct. Part of this discussion and what we move to correct that we have to look at is if we're going to mandate what a full-time professional track faculty is making; we're almost by default having to mandate a minimum per course."

Chair-Elect Kellner: I think if you talked with department heads, the department heads will know very well what they're paying at Duke and Chapel Hill.

Senator Vincent: I have done this for my own department because I know people at Chapel Hill and Duke. Even if we raise the floor to \$6,000 per course, we would be paying maybe $\frac{2}{3}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ what they pay

at Duke and Chapel Hill. I don't know other disciplines, but I suspect that we are way behind both of those institutions in terms of salary.

Senator Williams: Moving everybody to that floor - there's a long-run issue as well. You get them there, and how do they progress? We have a single pool of raise money and there is a criterion that is used for allocating that, which tends to be biased toward those who are research faculty. I have watched it in my department. We've had people there for 25 years who barely make \$48,000 because when it comes time to provide rewards, the department head tends to allocate those rewards to research faculty. It seems to me we need to think about that if we're going to have two classes of faculty who do different things, then we need a guarantee that those in the professional track are going to be vying for merit raises every year and that they won't just get the stuff that falls off the table. So we have to think about this in the long run as well. How do we dole out merit raises for faculty who are in two different groups?

Senator ____: I think when we look at distance education classes [Inaudible] \$225 a student, so if you have a class of 10, you only receive [Inaudible].

8. Old and New Business

a. Elections Update, *Hans Kellner, Chair-Elect of the Faculty*

Chair-Elect Kellner encouraged the Senators to encourage their peers and colleagues to become involved and volunteer for both the Grievance and Non-Reappointment and Hearing Committees. These are important roles. Please get the word out since the deadline is Wednesday, February 26th.

b. Resolution of Commendation for Director Debbie Yow (Attachment A)

This was the brainchild of Chair-Elect Hans Kellner, and Senator Feducia has agreed to bring the motion forward.

Senator Feducia thanked Chair-Elect. Kellner for his recommendation for this resolution and brought the motion to the floor. Motion was made.

Discussion regarding whether or not this would be noted on the resolution if this passes as a unanimous vote.

Chair Bird agreed that this language can be added.

Chair-Elect Kellner stated that the purpose of this resolution was to not only praise Debbie Yow, but to inform the new Athletic Director that these are the values that the Faculty cares about at NC State and if he is really looking at his constituencies, he will see the faculty of the University as an important

constituency and this is what those constituents are interested in; academics and equity across sports, things that Debbie Yow can legitimately be commended for.

The Resolution passed unanimously. We will add that to the resolution.

c. Enterprise Research Administration Advisory Group *Carolyn Bird, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Bird described the purpose and role of this group to the Faculty Senate.

She stated that we need a Senator to serve in this group, with the first meeting to be held on March 27th. The committee meets every other month, and virtual participation is possible. If you would like more information, she will send a link to you regarding this project and will connect you with the coordinator of the project. Chair Bird will participate on the Committee and another volunteer is needed. She asked for interest emails over the next day or two.

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.

- Chair-Elect Kellner stated that he has an issue of concern regarding the closing of the childcare center, and that faculty parents now have a relatively short time to find a new solution. This is a broad concern and an ongoing issue.

Chair Bird stated that she is aware of this concern.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 pm