



# Northeastern University

## Office of the Faculty Senate

**TO:** FACULTY SENATE  
**FROM:** Robert Hanson, Secretary, Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Minutes, 28 February 2018

Present: Professors Adams, Andrews, Barberis, Brooks, Dennerlein, Desnoyers, De Ritis, Erdogmus, Nyaga, Fox, Frader, Hanson, Hayward, Howard, Kaeli, Kanouse, Kelly, McGruer, McOwen, Portz, Powers-Lee, Silbey, Sipahi

Administrators: Brodley, He, Henderson, Hudson, Loeffelholz, Parish, Poiger, Wadia-Fascetti, Ziemer

Absent: (Professors) Barczak, Dencker, Monaghan, Kirda, Patterson, Stephens  
(Administrators) Bean

**CALL TO ORDER.** Professor Powers-Lee convened Senate at 11:47 AM

I. **MINUTES** of 14 February were approved.

## II. SAC REPORT

- A. Professor Powers-Lee reported that since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met four times. One meeting was with the Senior Leadership Team, where topics discussed included (a) the Campus Climate Survey and (b) food security for our students. Another of SAC's meetings was with Provost Bean and included discussion of a number of Faculty Handbook modules, including the Compensation module.
- B. Professor Powers-Lee listed the Handbook Modules that are in play: Statement of the Faculty Senate, Instructional Media, Conflict of Commitment and Interest & Tutoring by Faculty for Fees, Procedural Guidelines in the Appointment of University Administrators, Compensation, Presence at the University, Policy on Faculty Outside Professional Activities, Retirement, Patent & Copyright.
- C. In advance of the March 21, 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting, Prof. Powers-Lee held the first reading of the Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Bylaws to ensure that all senators have been sufficiently informed before any discussion occurs. Prof. Powers-Lee noted that this was the first distribution of the resolution and that at the March 21 Faculty Senate meeting, senators can suggest additional restrictions and or additions to that module. Prof. Powers-Lee continued that this was a lengthy process and can be frustrating with a 90 day waiting period once the resolution reaches the BOT particularly when the senate is in the midst of elections. If the body changes the make-up of the senate, the change will take place next year.

The complete SAC Presentation may be found at the Faculty Senate website.

Clarifying question in conjunction with presentation:

In regards to the slide noting the rules for making amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Prof. Brooks asked for clarification of the statement: "A two-thirds affirmative vote of all Senators voting 'yea' or 'nay' in a roll-call vote shall be necessary to propose a bylaw amendment to the faculty from whom the Senators are elected." The response was that any abstentions are subtracted from the total number of votes cast to yield the number of votes of which at least two-thirds must be affirmative to pass the amendment. Abstentions do count toward the required minimum of 25% participation if the amendment is passed by the Senate and sent out for faculty vote.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

Prof. Hanson read the following motion prior to Prof. Adams' presentation:

***BE IT RESOLVED* That the Senate accept the report of the Financial Affairs Committee.**

**Accepted by 28-0-0.**

The complete FAC Presentation may be found at the Faculty Senate website.

Questions and discussion in conjunction with the presentation.

Prof. Kaeli asked with a proposed 4% increase in salaries, how long will it take us to get where we need to be? Prof. Adams responded that we don't know what other schools are going to be doing next year and don't know what we are doing next year. It will take a few years to get there. These are moving targets. Biggest difference seems to be fringe benefits— seems to be a little more reluctance to raising them, than to raising salaries.

Prof. Fox asked what the 1% increase in fringe means? Will they add a benefit? Prof. Adams said that FAC did not specify how the increase should be implemented.

Prof. Erdogmus: Since he isn't getting health insurance from Northeastern, is there a plan to make payments to people who don't make use of health insurance? Prof. Adams said this was something we suggested to Jane Moyer last year. There was reluctance. She came from business not academia. She said that wouldn't work well.

No more questions on the report.

Prof. Hanson reads the following resolution.

***BE IT RESOLVED* That the recommended raise pool for merit for FY 2019 be 4.0% of continuing salaries starting on July 1, 2018.**

Dean Poiger noted that usually administrators abstain from voting on this issue at this point.

Motion carried, 23-0-6.

Prof. Hanson read the following resolution:

***BE IT RESOLVED* That there be a recommended increase of 1% (as a percentage of salaries) in fringe benefits starting on July 1, 2018 to bring us closer to alignment with our nearest competitor.**

Move to accept seconded.

Prof. Hanson offers a friendly amendment to change "with our nearest competitor" to "with our national ranking." Friendly amendment is seconded.

The resolution now reads:

***BE IT RESOLVED* That there be a recommended increase of 1% (as a percentage of salaries) in fringe benefits starting on July 1, 2018 to bring us closer to alignment with our national ranking.**

Prof. Hanson now indicates that discussion can continue.

Prof. Erdogmus asked where would the 1% increase go? Prof. Adams responded that the committee decided to leave that open and to not explicitly state that.

Prof. Hanson said fringe benefits have actually decreased and asked how the Committee came to the 1% figure. Prof. Hanson thought the committee would have taken a higher increase. Prof. Adams said there is a difference from total compensation and what you see in your check. We are looking at total compensation. Prof. Hanson responded if you look at your statements from 2013 to 2016, in some cases that total fringe benefit decreased by 10%. Prof. Adams responded that he was not sure what Prof. Hanson meant. Prof. Hanson asked is 1% sufficient? Prof. Adams said it won't get us there in one year. Thinking trying to get there in one year is unrealistic.

Prof. Hanson read again the amendment from agenda.

**BE IT RESOLVED That there be recommended increase of 1% (as a percentage of salaries) in fringe benefits starting on July 1, 2018 to bring us closer to alignment with our national ranking.  
Resolution carries 22-0-8**

Prof. De Ritis & Prof. Gardinier presented the report of the Senate Ad hoc Committee to Recommend Changes to Faculty Senate Bylaws Re: Composition of the Senate and Its Committees.

The complete Ad hoc Committee Presentation may be found at the Faculty Senate website.

Questions and discussions in conjunction with the presentation.

Prof. Dennerlein said his College has both 10 month and 8 month appointments. Are both considered full time? The answer verified by Dr. Deb Franko was yes.

Prof. McGruer said the Senate now has 11 models to consider and it might be hard to digest. These last 2 – Models A & B -- these are actually suggestions so that the discussion doesn't go infinitely wide but doesn't mean we have to limit ourselves to A & B. Prof. Powers-Lee said in coming up with these 2 models, SAC wanted to focus the discussion. We took into consideration routes incorporated in the top 5 models. A number of models differed in the number of senators. We kept the total number at 40, and increased the elected Senators to 33. We had a lot of discussion with elected senators, the Provost and SAC. It is our tradition to include administrators in the Senate membership so that there is shared governance at the start of Senate discussions and not just when they are complete. However, we didn't want so many administrators that we lose the faculty focus of the Faculty Senate. We are bringing in one more colleague that takes up two of these seats. The resolution represents the smallest number of changes we could make in the current Bylaws. When we discuss the resolution in March, we can make amendments without prior notice.

Prof. Fox said he prefers A. The problem with B is that sometimes it is difficult finding people to run for the senate and to constrain it in such a way makes it more difficult. Best thing is to leave something like Model A that makes it easy to select.

Prof. Parish said she really appreciates the amount of thought and effort that went into the report. The level of complexity is significant and she commends the committee. She adds her support for Model A. She agrees with Prof. Fox's points. If we are really interested in one faculty and acknowledge non-tenured faculty, Model B still has that separate but equal approach.

Prof. Kelly asked if it would be extreme gerrymandering if the Senate gave the School of Law 2 senators. Prof. Powers-Lee said it was giving the School of Law twice as much voice on the senate, given the number of School of Law faculty, but it can be up for discussion.

Prof. He asked how are joint faculty counted. Response was that currently joint faculty are allowed to be considered for election from the home college of where their tenure resides. Prof. McOwen asked if the Provost had been involved in any discussions regarding the reduction of administrators from 9-6. Prof. Powers-Lee said her understanding is that he thinks the two models we are discussing are good for shared governance.

Prof. Adamssaidheunderstandsthe differencebetweenA&B. Can someone describe differences in other models. Prof. Gardinier said in the other models the committee looked at other sizes of senate. They looked at fixed seats vs. proportional seats. Really wanted to do exhaustive inventory of varied pathways but also saw value of distilling down. Prof. Hanson said one of points that was discussed was whether administrators would be voting or nonvoting, and we wanted the administrators in the senate to be voting members.

Prof. Silbey remarked that it is such a complex problem. She thinks the one faculty model is a happy fiction because of the protections afforded T & TT. The lack of protection for NTT means there are different pressure points for NTT. How real is it that in all the colleges all NTT will be elected to senate and each college will empower their faculty in different ways.

Dean Poiger followed up on Prof. Silbey's question. She asked how in the different colleges, how college councils are organized. How has that looked internally?

Dean Parish agreed that vulnerability of NTT is real. At Bouve, she noted a majority of the faculty are NTT. She said they have had several successful interim chairs who were NTT. Our faculty council is currently chaired by a NTT faculty person.

Prof. Kelly said that according to her internal poll on NTT, they prefer Model B.

IV. **ADJOURNMENT.** The Vice-Chair adjourned the Senate at 1:25 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Hanson, Secretary  
Faculty Senate