

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Executive Summary

April 21, 2015

1. Call to Order

Chair Zonderman called the thirteenth meeting of the sixty-first session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3 p.m.

2. Remarks and Announcements

Chair Zonderman thanked everyone for their support during his two-year term as Chair of the Faculty. He also welcomed new senators and thanked retiring senators for their services in faculty governance.

Chair Zonderman presented a plaque to Vice Provost Betsy Brown in honor of her work with the faculty.

3. Approval of the Minutes, Meeting No 12, April 7, 2015

A motion passed to approve the minutes.

4. Remarks from Chancellor Woodson

Chancellor Woodson stated that a number of deans have announced their retirement or intent to step down. Charlie Leffler, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business, has announced his intent to retire at the end of September. Provost Arden has agreed to Chair the search for his position.

Chancellor Woodson reported that Duke Energy announced a \$2.5 million grant to North Carolina State University to support research in renewable energy.

Chancellor Woodson commented on the Economic Study that the UNC System did in partnership with the Community College System and the private universities in the state. He stated that the overall impact of the UNC system is substantial. NC State's individual impact is very strong, accounting for between 25 to 30 percent of the overall economic impact of the whole UNC system.

Chancellor Woodson reported that a ground breaking for the Gregg Museum took place last week. The financing for that project was a major gift from a member of the Board of Trustees, Thomas Cabaniss, which was matched by a bequest from the Adam's Family. The Wake County Board of Commissioners also contributed \$650,000 toward the project.

Chancellor Woodson announced that there will be a celebration of Centennial Campus' 30th anniversary on Friday afternoon, with a number of people coming back including Bruce Poulton who was Chancellor when the university acquired and began the development of Centennial Campus.

Chancellor Woodson reported that in the last thirty years, Centennial Campus has grown to having more than 45 buildings, with more than one billion dollars invested in infrastructure. Most of which have come from outside the university and outside of the state.

5. Presentation

Alumni Association

Benny Suggs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Alumni Relations, and Chancellor Woodson recognized Chair Zonderman for his services as Chair of the Faculty by presenting him with an NC State Alumni Association chair.

Suggs stated that Chair Zonderman has been an incredible leader throughout campus. He has also been a tremendous supporter and advocate for the Alumni Association.

Associate Vice Chancellor Suggs commented on some things that the Alumni Association does that add to the NC State experience. This past academic year they awarded more than \$700,000 in scholarship support to 750 students, which included 75 Caldwell scholars. Last week they recognized 26 faculty members with Distinguish Faculty Awards and Chair Zonderman was among those awarded. He noted that this past Sunday the Alumni Association was able to support the Phi Beta Kappa ceremony.

6. Remarks from Provost Arden

Provost Arden stated that he is delighted to announce the second round of the Chancellor's Excellence Hiring Program. He reported that in the first round 38 individuals were hired into twelve clusters. In the round that has just been announced there are eight clusters that are going to be funded for a total of 33 faculty coming into the university.

Provost Arden stated that he reviewed the data and looking back over the last several years it is very clear that one of the few times out of the last fifteen years that the needle has moved on tenured tenure-track faculty numbers in the institution is during the peak years of hiring into the Faculty Excellence Program.

7. Old/New Business

Committee Reports

Chair Zonderman announced that all the committee reports will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

Department Mergers in CED

Dr. Paola Sztajn, Department Head of Elementary Education/Curriculum and Instruction and Counsel Education, informed the Senate that the two departments are merging. She stated that they are a complex department and will have five areas of study and the name being proposed is the Department of Teacher Education and Learning Sciences.

Chair Zonderman noted that the Faculty Senate was informed and has no concerns with the change.

Elections

Faculty Assembly

Hans Kellner, Professor of English, was elected to serve a two-year term on the Faculty Assembly. Kevin Oliver, Associate Professor of Education, was elected to serve a two-year term as alternate.

Athletics Council

Tommy Holden, Department Head and Teaching Associate Professor of Health and Exercise Studies, and James Mickle, Associate Professor of Plant and Microbial Biology were elected to serve on the Athletics Council.

Ballots for Executive Committee

Ballots were distributed to the 2014-2015 Senators to choose candidates to run for the 2015-2016 Executive Committee.

Resolution on Board of Governors Teaching Award, 2nd Reading

The resolution passed with a vote count of 19 yes, 4 no, 1 abstention.

Resolution on Funding Library Collections, 2nd Reading

The resolution passed. There was one abstention.

Resolution on Funding Library Resources, 2nd Reading

The resolution passed. There was one abstention.

Discussion of Revised Post Tenure Review Policies

After much discussion, the Senators voted on the recommendation to decouple the determination of “exceed expectations” from any discussion of raises, merit, or anything of that nature.

The recommendation passed with unanimous support.

Chair Zonderman suggested voting on two alternatives of where the department and Dean disagree and the Dean is unpersuasive, that one model is to refer it to the Provost. Another suggestion is to refer it to a college faculty PTR Committee that would be assembled on an as needed basis. There are four choices.

- 1) Keep the policy as in the draft - 0 votes
- 2) Where the Dean and department disagree it should go to the Provost for final decision – 0 votes
- 3) Where Dean and College disagree it should go to a college faculty PTR Committee – 15 votes
- 4) Send the two options of Provost or College Committee to the working group and let them decide – 5 votes.

The Senators voted for the second alternative: Where the Dean and Department disagree, to refer it to a college Faculty PTR Committee that would be assembled on an as needed basis.

8. Adjourn

The 61st session of the NC State Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
April 21, 2015

Regular Meeting No. 13 of the 61stth Session: Administrative Conference Room April 21, 2015

Present: Chair Zonderman, Secretary Daley, Chair-Elect Moore; Parliamentarian Fath; Provost Arden; Senators Allaire, Ash, Banks, Barlett, Bernhard, Bird, Borden, Byrnes, Cabbage, Davidian, Devetsikiotis, Fleisher, Gunter, Holden, Knopp, Krause, Levy, Lunardi, Nfah-Abbenyi, Orcutt, Scarce, Smith, Sotillo, Spontak, Williams

Excused: Senators: Auerbach

Absent: Senators: Baumer, Brady, Bullock, Edwards, Fuentes, Heitmann, Laffitte, Moore, Steer

Guests: Eileen Goldgeier, General Counsel; P.J. Teal, Chancellor's Office, Randy Woodson, Chancellor; Betsy Brown, Provost Office; Jon Harbor, ACE Fellow; Paola Sztajn, College of Education; Paul Huffman, Associate Professor/College of Sciences; Lucian Lucia, College of Sciences; Marc Hoit, OIT; Jesse Manciaz, Director of Employee Relation-HR; Sue Carson, Plant Microbial Biology/ DASA; Marina Bykova, New Senator, CHASS; Sheila Smith McKoy, New Senator, CHASS; Helmut, Hergeth, New Senator, Textiles

1. Call to Order

Chair Zonderman called the thirteenth meeting of the sixty-first session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3 p.m.

2. Remarks and Announcements

Chair Zonderman thanked everyone for supporting him during his term as Chair of the Faculty.

Chair Zonderman presented a plaque to Vice Provost Betsy Brown in honor of her work with the faculty.

Chair Zonderman welcomed new senators and thanked the retiring senators for their service in faculty governance.

3. Approval of the Minutes, Meeting No. 12, April 7, 2015

Minutes of the April 7th meeting were approved as submitted.

4. Remarks from Chancellor Woodson

Chancellor Woodson announced that a number of deans have announced their intent to retire or step down. Dr. Jane Fleener will be stepping down as Dean of the College of Education. Ira Weiss, Dean of the Poole College of Management, plans to retire at the end of the next academic year. Charlie Leffler has announced his intent to retire at the end of September and Provost Arden has agreed to Chair the search for his position.

Chancellor Woodson stated that Duke Energy announced a \$2.5 million grant to North Carolina State University to support research in renewable energy and efforts to attract and retain underrepresented groups in the university's College of Engineering.

Chancellor Woodson commented on a summary of the Economic Study that the UNC System did in partnership with the Community College System and the private universities in the state. The overall impact of the UNC system is substantial. NC State's individual impact is very strong, accounting for upwards between 25 to 30 percent of the overall economic impact of the whole UNC system. The economic impact that comes from spin off companies and startup companies, system-wide equals to approximately \$1.4 billion annually and \$1.2 billion of that is accounted for by NC State's activity in this space. He said that lets you know how important this university is in terms of job creation and the creation of new opportunities across the state.

Chancellor Woodson reported that there was a ground breaking last week for the Gregg Museum and noted that the new museum location is going to be a great front door for the campus. The financing for that project was a major gift from a member of the Board of Trustees, Thomas Cabaniss, and that was matched by a bequest from the Adam's Family. The Adam's family gave an undesignated gift of one half million dollars to NC State and it was designated to the Gregg Museum as a challenge. The Wake County Board of Commissioners gave \$650,000 toward the project. He stated that the city has been generous in terms of the university's relationship, because of proximity of Pullen Park and the work that we have to do collaboratively to build out the Gregg Museum. The Pullen Baptist Church has been a great partner in terms of being excited about the project and a great cheer leader.

Chancellor Woodson announced that there will be a celebration of Centennial Campus' 30th anniversary on Friday afternoon, with a number of people coming back including Bruce Poulton, under whose leadership the university acquired and began to develop Centennial Campus.

Chancellor Woodson reported that in the last thirty years, Centennial Campus has grown to having more than 45 buildings, with more than one billion dollars invested in infrastructure, most of which has come from outside the university and outside of the state.

Chancellor Woodson reported that two big projects are currently under construction on Centennial Campus and no state funds are being used. They are breaking ground tomorrow on a new hotel and conference center on Centennial Campus. The hotel on Hillsborough Street will be a big addition as well. That is going to be a Marriott Autograph Collection hotel. He explained that the uniqueness of the Marriott autograph collection is that it doesn't fly the Marriott flag, so it will be branded as an NC State property with the benefit of the Marriott rewards and their reservation system. He stated that it is a great marriage that is all privately financed. The hotel will have 164 rooms, 9,000 square feet of conference space and a sea water swimming pool.

Question and Comments

Chair Zonderman stated that he has heard from the Faculty Assembly that the four/four teaching bill is still alive.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the author of that bill is trying to keep it alive and he has tried to keep it alive by rewriting it to exclude NC State and Carolina. He has been reassured that this bill will not see the light of day. He said his argument is not one about workload, it is one about

governance. We have a Board of Governance and Board of Trustees to understand the individual nature of each of the campuses.

Chancellor Woodson ended his comments by thanking Chair Zonderman for his leadership.

5. Presentation

Alumni Association

Benny Suggs, Associate Vice Chancellor for Alumni Relations, presented Chair Zonderman with an engraved chair.

Associate Vice Chancellor Suggs stated that Chair Zonderman has been an incredible leader throughout campus. He has also been a tremendous supporter and advocate for the Alumni Association. He understands how important the work of the Alumni Association is in everything that it does to support our students before they even get here.

Suggs commented on some of the things they do to add to the NC State experience. This past academic year they had the opportunity to award more than \$700,000 in scholarship support to 750 students, including 75 Caldwell scholars. Last week they recognized 26 faculty members with Distinguish Faculty Awards and Chair Zonderman was one of them. This past Sunday the Alumni Association was able to support the Phi Beta Kappa ceremony.

Suggs stated that it takes faculty support and noted that the Chancellor helps as much as possible, with salaries, outreach, and magazine support. He said two thirds of operating funds come from folks just like you, so please lead by example like David has done so well, so we can continue to elevate the NC State Brand and reach even more people in a more significant way. Let's step up and support the Alumni Association.

6. Remarks from Provost Arden

Provost Arden stated that he is delighted to announce the second round of the Chancellor's Excellence Hiring Program. In the first round 38 individuals were hired into twelve clusters. In the round that has just been announced there are eight clusters that are going to be funded for a total of 33 faculty coming into the university. Those searches will begin in the coming academic year. Most of those folks will begin to come on board the following year.

Provost Arden stated that he reviewed the data and looking back over the last several years it is very clear that one of the few times out of the last fifteen years that we have actually moved the needle on tenured tenure-track faculty numbers in the institution is during the peak years of hiring into our faculty excellence program. We as an institution are spending a lot of time and effort and money, retaining and replacing the faculty. Last academic year we had 79 faculty leaving the university, for one reason or another. About nineteen of those were retirements, which left 60 faculty to replace. We have been working very hard to replace and also to retain faculty. We want to make sure that we attempt to add to our faculty numbers both through disciplinary and interdisciplinary hires, but the interdisciplinary hiring program does seem to be one thing that is really moving the needle, helping to recover some of the faculty positions that were lost over the last couple of years.

Questions and Comments

Senator Levy: We are all aware that there was a recent op-ed in the Times about the high cost of education and the conclusion was the ratio of faculty to administrators is changing in the wrong direction. How are we going to handle that here?

Provost Arden stated that if you look at our administrator numbers compared with many of our peers we are on the lower side. There is no doubt that most major institutions have been experiencing growth of administration to some degree or the other over many years and much of that is directly associated with increased federal compliance and increased state compliance. “If I look at the amount of ordered material and material that we have to submit almost on a monthly basis to the Legislature it is staggering. If I look at the amount of materials we have to submit to the Board of Governors academically and otherwise it is sometimes staggering. I think the amount of busy work that we have to do have significantly increased.”

Provost Arden stated that one thing that is misleading sometimes is how administrators are classified. Sometimes folks are put into that category if they are anything other than faculty and SPAs and that makes it very difficult to determine if we are hiring administrators or hiring other folks who help you get your work done in a more effective manner.

Provost Arden stated that he thinks NC State as a whole is in a good place. He and the Chancellor try to scrutinize it on a regular basis, they are both fervent believers that the way to move a great university forward is to invest into the core of the university which is the faculty who are delivering the whole mission of the university. That is part of the reason they are investing into the Faculty Excellence Program and part of the reason they are investing in startups, retentions, and being aggressive about replacing individuals who leave. He said there are some things that we have to do such as Title IX compliance. The reality is that the national microscope on sexual harassment, sexual violence, and Title IX is really ratcheting up and we are trying to approach it in a moderate and sensible way. All of those things are things that would appear to increase the number of administrators or folks who are classified as administrators on campus.

7. Old/New Business

Committee Reports

Chair Zonderman announced that all the committee reports will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

Department Mergers in CED

Dr. Paola Sztajn, Department Head, Elementary Education/Curriculum and Instruction and Counsel Education, stated that the two departments are coming together. She said this started with the revision of the PhD program within her college. Elementary Education is a relatively new program that did not have a PhD program so in the merging they are restructuring the PhD to include all the

faculty to one PhD. They are a complex department and will have five areas of study and the name being proposed is the Department of Teacher Education and Learning Sciences.

Chair Zonderman noted that the Faculty Senate was informed and has no concerns with the change.

Elections

Faculty Assembly

Hans Kellner, Professor of English was elected to serve a two-year term on the Faculty Assembly. Kevin Oliver, Associate Professor, College of Education was elected to serve a two-year term as an alternate.

Athletics Council

Tommy Holden, Department Head and Teaching Associate Professor for Health and Exercise Studies, and James Mickle, Associate Professor of Plant and Microbial Biology were elected to serve on the Athletics Council.

Ballots for Executive Committee

The current senators were asked to choose six candidates from a list of eligible senators to be placed on a ballot for next year's Executive Committee.

Resolution on Board of Governors Teaching Award, 2nd Reading

The resolution passed. The vote was 19 yes, 4 no, 1 abstention.

Resolution on Funding Library Collections, 2nd Reading

The resolution passed with one abstention.

Resolution on Funding Library Resources, 2nd Reading

The resolution passed with one abstention

Discussion of Revised Post Tenure Review Policies

Senator Cabbage moved that three criteria be used to revise the policy. The motion was seconded.

- 1) Faculty should retain power for PTR review final determination and whether they meet SMEs.
- 2) Department Heads should retain authority to determine whether faculty exceed SMEs and get merit raises.
- 3) Deans should retain authority to intervene in exceptional cases of egregiously poor faculty performance, and do make an evaluation of the faculty for each review as well, per BoG request. Senator Nfah-Abbenyi stated that faculty members who have spoken to her personally want the Dean to be the person who actually verifies that the process was fair at the level of the department. They don't want the Dean to be the person to say he or she can disregard the process completely and make the final decision.

Senator Borden stated that a point that came up at the Faculty Assembly is that a lot of faculty is agreeable with what Senator Nfah-Abbenyi stated, but the Board of Governors has said that the

Dean must provide an evaluative review. It has to be more than just saying that the process was okay. That is the interpretation.

Provost Arden stated that the difficult part is that none of this was requested or solicited by Deans and Department Heads or Provosts, it was the Board of Governors. However, it is what it is and now we have to develop a regulation that is consistent with the intent of the Board of Governors. He said having been a Dean and Department Head and having been through this process here, Deans are not looking to make things difficult here, so whatever you end up with in terms of recommendations, keep it as simple as possible. Let's not migrate this process to another tenure process, as is consistent with the BOG. He said his concern is if the intent of the BOG policies is to have the Department Heads and Deans play an evaluative role, what does that actually mean?

Senator Borden stated that because of that concern, some of the faculty that he has been working with suggested that they add the following:

In point 6.3 it says if the Dean's final determination differs from that of the department PTR Committee or the Department Head, the Dean shall provide an explanation for his/her determination. The Dean's determination shall be final.

His colleagues suggested striking out the "The Dean's determination shall be final" and replacing it with "In the event that the PTR committee and/or the department head find the Dean's justification for the determination that a faculty member does not meet expectations non-persuasive, the Provost will review the case, render a decision and present his justification to the PTR Committee, Department Head and Dean." The expectation should be that would happen in a very rare number of cases, because if we agree with what you suggested that the deans are not going to go out on a limb and pick a totally adverse opinion to the faculty then you would never get any calls, but if they do choose to do that then the faculty would have in the policy the knowledge that the Provost is required to look at it and then render his or her opinion.

Senator Borden stated that point 6.5 states - If the overall determination of the department PTR Committee is that the faculty member's performance *does not meet expectations*, the Department Head will prepare a written performance development plan as described in the next section.

Senator Borden said now it sounds like the department PTR committee is driving the answer and what we have said above, that is not the case. He wonders if it meant to say, if the overall determination of the PTR process, which is in 6.2 and 6.3.

7.5 says: If the Dean finds that the faculty member working under a development plan *meets expectations*, he or she will consult with the PTR Committee and the Department Head and make a final determination as to whether the faculty member will continue to work under the development plan.

Senator Borden stated that the Dean should make some recommendation as to whether the faculty member should continue to work under the development plan. He said if we want to leave the harsh language there, then both the department PTR Committee and the

Department Head feels that the person is in a position where they do meet expectations, then it should in that case revert to the Provost's review to see if this makes sense.

Senator Lunardi stated that sometimes it is the department that should take care of this development.

Senator Borden stated that as long as the Dean allows the department to take care of it, it will be fine. This is a regulation. If you have someone who is exercising authority, the faculty should have some recourse. It is a process that the Provost hopes no one ever comes to his office and we totally appreciate that this is not designed to do that, it is just providing a recourse for when the process is felt by not one or two people, but the committee that signed the review and the Department Head, that if the process is not working the way they think it should, positive or negative, based on the Dean's decision that it should get a higher level review because it's a very important thing.

The last one was 7.6 – If, after the duration of the performance development plan, the PTR Committee's and Department Head's determination is that the faculty member does not meet expectations—

Senator Borden stated that when the department PTR committee and Department Head are in agreement, the Department Head will share the PTR Committee and the head's written assessment with the faculty member with the option to provide a written response to the assessments.

7.6 - The Department Head will provide the department PTR Committee and Department Head's assessments and the faculty member's optional response to the Dean along with recommendations for any administrative action.

Senator Borden stated that, again what we thought is if the Dean does not concur that the faculty member meets expectations the Dean will consult with the department PTR Committee and Department Head and provide his justification. In the event that the department PTR committee and/or Department Head find that the Dean's justification for the determination of the faculty member does meet expectations, the Provost will review the case, render a decision and present his justification to the department PTR Committee, Department Head, and Dean. The expectation being that the Provost would very seldom ever be called, but it is the recourse if the Dean is choosing a position that is opposite to the committee and the Department Head whether it be positive or negative.

Chair Zonderman summed up Senator Borden's suggestion as stating, where there is disagreement between Dean and Department, the Provost will review.

Senator Cubbage wanted to know if Senator Borden's suggestion included merit raises.

Senator Williams stated that he doesn't think PTR should have anything to do with rewards or raises. He said there is a process for that, which is annual review and these two things are highly correlated. Someone who exceeds expectations in all likelihood could have been someone who has excelled on these annual reviews.

Vice Provost Brown stated that some institutions who have exceeded, have set aside a pot of money just for that.

Senator Williams stated that he just doesn't think this process should be connected to what is clearly the process that we have now for that determination.

Senator Fleisher asked, does anyone know, how the BOG in their infinite wisdom decided that bringing the Dean into this process, as essentially the final say, was a good idea? He said from his perspective the department PTR Committee and the Department Head know better than the Dean does. Why should the Dean be the person making the final decision?

Chair Zonderman stated that the BOG did not specifically say the Dean's review is the final review. They said there has to be a Dean's evaluative review.

Provost Arden stated that there are several things here that are unintended consequences. What is clear is that the Board of Governors want Department Heads and Deans to play an evaluative role. Immediately, the unintended consequences call into question the point that has been raised. Who is going to have the final say? If it mirrors the promotion and tenure process then the Provost will have the final say. He thinks their intent was that the Dean have the final say, but they didn't spell that out.

Provost Arden stated that the other concern was with the meets expectations/exceeds expectations, because in everyone's mind that is somehow connected to raises, when in fact, there is no connection there. "I think there are some unintended consequences. I don't have any answers other than to say, keep it simple. I believe this is a departmental issue, that the departmental faculty and Department Head have the best handle on it. The question is how can we now write something that is true to the intent of what the Board of Governors has passed without making it overly laborious or without significantly changing what we are fundamentally doing now."

Senator Knopp stated that with this disagreement between the Department Head and the Dean, who do you envision making the final decision?

Senator Borden stated that they don't want to make it into a mini tenure process, but the Provost is the Senior Academic Officer. It is logical that the buck stops with the person in that office.

Senator Cabbage stated that the rules for PTR in his department states that you have to meet the standards for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor, it is a tenure review. If you don't meet the standards for Assistant, Associate and full, then you are not meeting your SME. It is a mini tenure review.

Senator Williams stated that maybe we need to rethink that because the rules for PTR are adopted under the old process and now we are going to have a different process. Now the Dean has to have a set of criteria for deciding.

Secretary Daley stated that if you bring the Dean into this process, who decides to dismiss a faculty member, if he/she has been part of creating the evidence that justifies the case for dismissal.

Vice Provost Brown said that is a different process, that doesn't happen often relating to this.

Chair Zonderman stated that there are two proposals.

- 1) Insert in any place where there is a potential disagreement between a Dean and the department that if in the end the dean cannot persuade the department, the decision will be reviewed by the Provost.
- 2) Strike any language that links exceed expectation with any kind of raises, merit, or anything of that nature.

Senator Cabbage agreed with the second proposal. He stated that the current language says that the designation should be taken into consideration with respect to the nomination and determination of appropriate recognition and rewards and annual salary reviews.

On the first proposal he suggested that if there is an issue you send it back to PTR committee at the college level.

Chair Zonderman clarified that Senator Cabbage's suggestion is to create at each college a PTR Committee different than the RPT Committee to be invoked as needed.

Senator Cabbage agreed.

Senator Cabbage agreed to this substitution to his previous motion.

Chair Zonderman suggested voting on the recommendation to decouple the determination of "exceed expectations" from any discussion of raises, merit, or anything of that nature.

The recommendation passed with unanimous vote.

Chair Zonderman suggested voting on two alternatives of where the department and Dean disagree and the Dean is unpersuasive, that one model is to refer it to the Provost. Another suggestion is to refer it to a college faculty PTR Committee that would be assembled on an as needed basis. There are four choices.

- 5) Keep the policy as in the draft - 0 votes
- 6) Where the Dean and department disagree it should go to the Provost for final decision – 0 votes
- 7) Where Dean and College disagree it should go to a college faculty PTR Committee – 15 votes
- 8) Send the two options of Provost or College Committee to the working group and let them decide – 5 votes.

The recommendation to recommend a college PTR Committee to resolve it received the most votes.

Other Proposals for the Working Group

Where the BOG requires that there are three levels, the suggestion was made to set a quota for "exceeds expectations" to zero.

With small colleges you are going to run into problems with the number of full professors you have to serve on these committees.

Borden – percentage - distinguish professorship regulation—expected to be no more than 5% of the faculty—

8. Adjourn

The 61st session of the NC State Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.