



Northeastern University

Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Secretary, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Minutes, April 6, 2022

Present: Professors: Avalon, Beighley, Board, Bourns, Caracoglia, Carr, Chiou, Cisewski, Dau, Dennerlein, Ergun, Gonyeau, Gundavaram, Herlihy, Hertz, Landsmark,, Mages, Marano, McSherry, Molnar, Musselman, Rappaport, Smith, Spencer, Strange, Toledano Laredo, Willey, Wood, Zulick

Administrators: Streets-Salter, Reid, Ronkin

Absent: (Professors) Mukerjee, Nieves, Vollmer, Zimmerman,
(Administrators) Madigan, Abowd, Cohen, Sceppa

CALL TO ORDER: 11: 45 a.m.

I. The minutes for the 3.23.22 Senate meeting were approved.

II. SAC REPORT:

- Prof. Gonyeau noted that since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met with BOT Academic Affairs on 3.24.22 and discussed 4 major themes: effective communication with university community, DEI, the new academic plan, and the challenges and successes resulting from the pandemic. SAC had good engagement from members of the board and president.
- SAC continues to meet regularly and work on the newsletter.
- SAC will be sending out volunteer list for AY 22-23 soon; SAC wants to align with workload assignments in the spring semester.
- Only one more Senate meeting and it will be long!
- Finalizing committee searches and finishing senate elections for AY 22-23
- SAC continues to meet with Provost and Sr. Vice Provost regularly. Issues include COVID, FTNTT salary matchmate data. Three colleges undergoing equity requests will receive this data from Provost office soon. Also discussed administration's interactions with ombuds. (The SAC report can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Prof. Toledano Laredo asked how is the list of matchmate institutions put together whether for tenure track or non-tenure track faculty?

Prof. Gonyeau said there is something called the Colonial Group/G14. That group consists of B.C., B.U., Brandeis, George Washington Univ., Lehigh, NY Univ., Northeastern Univ., Southern Methodist, Syracuse, Tufts, Tulane, Miami and Notre Dame. This is the group that the administration has been working with to obtain this information.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said this is a fairly complex process for FTNTT with having 7 types of FTNTT faculty. Many universities have multiple titles that fall under that umbrella so being able to compare

across institutions is complex. Unlike on the tenure stream, where essentially there is uniformity. FTNTT titles differ widely. A request went out to those G14 institutions to ask if they would be willing to share FTNTT salary data. Provost Madigan was very supportive reaching out to the Provosts of those institutions and 7 institutions agreed to participate. Assoc. Vice Provost Rana Glasgal, University Decision Support and Institutional Research Office, worked with those institutions to create similar titles so that we are able to do comparisons. Vice Provost Glasgal got the data in mid-March. Her group has done the analysis. Vice Provost Franko will be providing the information to the three college Deans who are up for equity requests this year.

- Prof. Toledano Laredo asked what is the degree of participation for the tenured salaries? I don't think I understood how the list was put together. What group in the university decides who goes into this G14 list?

Vice Provost Franko said this was done long ago. There was a group created by the Provosts of those institutions. They have similarities across those institutions and some differences. Some are smaller, some larger. And that is a group where the Provosts of those 14 institutions have been meeting regularly starting before Vice Provost Franko's six years in her office. There are no good databases that can be pulled from. We are not a AAU institution so don't have access to that salary data information.

- Prof. Gonyeau asked how do we get tenured matchmate data. Is it from the same group?

Vice Provost Franko said she believes it is the same group. She would have to follow up with Rana Glasgal. Because the titles are uniform across that is a less complicated process.

- Prof. Musselman asked – as member of CSSH – when will matchmate data be available.

Vice Provost Franko said the information would be going out sometime this afternoon.

III. PROVOST REPORT:

- Due to a scheduling conflict Provost Madigan said was unable to attend.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Prof. Zulick read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Professional Studies in Applied Logistics in the College of Professional Studies as approved by the Graduate Council Committee on 9 March 2022, (14-0-0).

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE to establish the Master of Professional Studies in Applied Logistics in the College of Professional Studies PASSED: 23-0-0.

B. Prof. Ergun read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in Internet of Things in the College of Engineering as approved by the Graduate Council Committee on 9 March 2022, (14-0-0).

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Arnold Mages said he thought this was exciting and he thought the design program may be able to contribute. He said COE faculty could reach out to him.

Prof. Ergun noted one correction. In the description of elective courses, OR7245 is actually a Mechanical Engineering course.

The VOTE to establish Master of Science in Internet of Things in the College of Engineering PASSED: 25-0-0.

**C. REPORT OF THE ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS POLICY COMMITTEE
VICE PRESIDENT SUNDAR KUMARASAMY
PROF. ANN MCDONALD
PROF. ROBERT O’HAVER
PROF. JENNY VAN AMBURGH
PROF. DARIEN WOOD
PROF. ELIZABETH ZULICK**

(The EAPC report can be found on the Faculty senate website.)

Prof. Vanf Amburgh reviewed the committee’s charges and the committee’s recommendations. This presentation focused on charges 1, 2 and 6. Highlights include that the committee learned there will be a new centralized admissions process that will be implemented this fall. The committee felt charge 1 should be moved to next academic year until the new admission system is implemented. And the committee feels the Senate should charge a special task force to deal with this charge.

In regards to Charge to 2, the committee met primarily with undergraduate academic deans and co-op advising teams across colleges. The committee noted that combined majors are a key Northeaster differentiator and value for students and co-op employers.

The committee report captures the advisors’ dedicated work to support students with combined majors that cross colleges; it also outlines concerns and suggestions to create more sustainable structures communication clarity and equitable access to information and resources.

This year the committee heard ongoing inconsistencies in student academic advising practices and access to advisors on both sides of their degree and so the committee put forward a resolution.

In regard to Charge 6, the committee reported 21 new academic advisors were hired that salary floors were created to retain advisors and promotion guidelines developed for advisors.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Prof. Arnold Mages said not in regard to this presentation but to the factors this presentation surfaces – with growing amount of emphasis on combined majors, with this resolution we increase advisor workload, but concerned as we move forward with more cross-college, cross-dept way - have to think about not doubling workloads. See it already with search committees and search hires. Is there a way to think about how we manage the labor as we move forward?

Prof. Wood noted, as a member of the committee, he is absolutely right. In conversations with advisors, rule of thumb for workload for combined is 1.2x for a single major. Most colleges do

assign two advisors but wanted consistency, hence the resolution.

Prof. Arnold Mages said he fully supports the resolution and interesting combined work but need to think about long-term, tenable workload as we move forward.

Prof. McDonald said there are more nuances in the final report about this including more compensation.

Prof. Van Amburgh said they were creating the plane while flying. A strategic plan is needed for this. As students leave, did they reflect back that they got what they wanted. More work needed across the university in all its communication. Also, some degrees not easily combined and not getting attention; the university needs to look at this.

D. Prof. Zulick read the following:

WHEREAS combined majors across colleges represent a large and increasing percentage of the undergraduate student population and students pursuing combined majors should not face unnecessary impediments due to college boundaries.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate recommend that the Office of the Provost works with Administrative Advisory Group and Associate Deans across colleges to implement a policy where a student is assigned two academic advisors, one for each side of a combined-major (perhaps a primary and secondary advisor to maintain developmental relationships), so that students have direct access to timely information and advisors for both areas of their degree and consider the required effort when allocating resources.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Prof. Dennerlein noted that the resolution seemed very specific. He wondered about another option. Wondered about conflict resolution between what advisors say. He asked for some background on the resolution.

Prof. Ann McDonald said this topic was over last year's committee as well and academic colleges (all but CPS) and came up more this year. Heard some inconsistencies in practice. Committee did not want to overstep so asked key players to work together. Put this as it is already a practice done in Khoury this way. Having a primary advisor was noted across the campus but want to leave it open for the experts. But students need to know who these experts are for them.

Prof. Van Amburgh said students can determine where they want home to be and can switch it. Hard for the advisors working with them if that happens so want the advisors working together all along from a workload perspective.

The resolution PASSED: 27-0-0

E. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

PROF. HEIDI KEVOE-FELDMAN

(The AEOC presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

Prof. Kevoe-Feldman noted the committee found persistent themes in their review of administrator evaluations.

- Leadership concerns: overwhelmingly faculty feel disconnected from upper administration. They feel there is a lack of transparency and inclusion and they are not included in college goals.
- Low Morale: isolation and “making do” has impacted morale. Pandemic “stuff” not changing. Loss of department community and culture; varying degrees of comfort. Faculty want a sense of community brought back.
- Lack of voice: a lot of top-down management here. Felt no faculty advocacy and having no say.
- Poor communication: There is a gap between unit head and faculty; poor decision making and workload allocation. And NTT faculty voice feel this unequal and hypocritical stance of “one faculty”
- Lack of resources: lag of staff and resource support with increased enrollment with units stretched; contributes to low morale and lack of voice.

Prof. Kevoe- Feldman noted There are opportunities for improvement here: improve morale, increase performance, identify shared goals across units and colleges, encourage teamwork and collaboration. Administration should value faculty expertise – and provide updates on college business plans, invite faculty feedback, and Assistant Deans of Faculty should meet with departments.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Prof. Gonyeau wanted to thank AEOC for all their work this year. He noted that committee has given SAC some good recommendations about improving the administrator evaluation process.
- Prof. Landsmark said he thought this was an outstanding report and thanked the committee for its work.
- Prof. Herlihy echoed that sentiment. He appreciated the committee identified issues and created actual paths to address them.
- Prof. Dennerlein added to the accolades. He said this is possible because the structure has changed so now entire AEOC coming together to see the results collectively. The question in these surveys often only ask what is wrong – recommendation -- can we ask what is working well and what can we build on. This could be an opportunity to describe workplace well-being. Are there any components where things are working well.

Prof. Kevoe-Feldman said the survey included positive and negative feedback. The committee could parse out individual complaints versus systemic problems. In regards to extracting best practices, there is not much echoed in these types of evaluations. An Individual department can do this. She is an **org-comp** scholar so has lots of experience in this. Doesn't want faculty voice to not be heard.

- Prof. Caracoglia suggested might be good to rank the questions to see which themes more

common. We are getting more complex with more administrators and assistants; often when faculty are asked to evaluate them it's usually about one and not the team. Perhaps do an evaluation for the team; help identify global problems and individual ones.

E. REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

PROF. LORI FERRINS

PROF. KIM HOLLOWAY

PROF. NEEL JOSHI

PROF. DEIRDRE LOUGHRIDGE

PROF. STEVE LUSTIG

PROF. ERIC STEWART

PROF. MADHAVI VENKATESAN

(The RPOC report can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

The committee members reviewed their charges and recommendations.

F. Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost and Chancellor's offices, College Deans and Department Chairs review the results of the Faculty Senate survey and the 2021-2022 RPOC report and develop an action plan for next academic year to increase efficiency of current research related processes discussed therein.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 24-0-0.

G. Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the office of the Provost adopt the template for research charter agreements for all shared resources, including shared space and equipment from the 2021-2022 RPOC report.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Caracoglia asked how can we create this repository for faculty? SAC could help with the newsletter and include the research template on it. Or another publication type of information sharing.

Prof. Arnold Mages asked if these were the same charter agreements from last year's committee?

Prof. Lustig said yes.

Prof. Arnold Mages asked since they were approved last year, why were they not adopted?

Prof. Gonyeau said it was a recommendation and not a resolution.

Prof. Wood said it was a resolution (he read the resolution.) What was the response to that resolution?

Prof. Lustig said the wording is slightly different this year.

Prof. Gonyeau said we brought it again since didn't see any movement with it.

The resolution PASSED: 25-0-0.

H. Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost's Office should support, and advocate for, expansion of the HSRP personnel to deal with the increasing demands of the University in alignment with our R1 status.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 24-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Prof. Rhonda Board
Senate Secretary