

**Final Report of the 2016-2017 Senate Ad hoc Committee  
for Assessment of the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Survey  
April 3, 2017**

**Committee Members**

Ann C. Golub-Victor	Associate Clinical Professor, Bouvé College of Health Sciences
Kathleen Kenney	Assistant Director of the ADVANCE Office of Faculty Development
Yiannis Levendis	Distinguished Professor, Department of Mechanical & Industrial Engineering, College of Engineering
Robert McOwen, Chair	Professor, Department of Mathematics, College of Science
Janet Randall	Professor, Department of English, College of Social Sciences & Humanities

## Introduction

In Fall 2015, the Senate Agenda Committee convened an Ad hoc committee to examine the Northeastern University faculty's relatively high levels of dissatisfaction on the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey. In their March 2016 final report, this Ad hoc HERI Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate convene another Ad hoc Committee this year to further review the results of the survey and address key concerns revealed in their report.

Three members of the previous year's committee continued on this year's committee (Professors Golub-Victor, Levendis, and Randall); they were joined by Professor McOwen, who was appointed Chair, and Kathleen Kenney from the ADVANCE Office of Faculty Development. The Committee was charged to:

- 1) Identify specific areas of concern pertaining to job satisfaction, professional satisfaction and work climate.
- 2) Identify probable causes of these areas of concern.
- 3) Identify barriers to improving these areas.
- 4) Make recommendations for improving these areas.

The Senate Agenda Committee further requested that, in accomplishing this task, the Ad hoc HERI Committee convene a series of University-wide meetings during the 2016-17 academic year for faculty and administrators to discuss issues highlighted in the previous year's report.

The Committee held a series of meetings in the fall to discuss how to fulfill our charge. We decided:

- i) To conduct an online survey of all Northeastern University faculty to more deeply understand points of dissatisfaction;
- ii) To convene several focus groups to discuss the reasons for dissatisfaction, particularly themes identified on the survey.

(We decided that focus group meetings just for faculty would be more productive than University-wide meetings that included both faculty & administrators.)

We revisited the HERI survey analysis by the 2015-2016 committee and identified twelve areas of concern. Focusing on these areas, in December 2016 we distributed a new faculty survey to all 1384 benefits-eligible NU faculty: 547 tenured (T), 215 tenure-track (TT), and 622 full-time nontenure-track (NTT). The survey's questions were coded on a seven point Likert scale and included areas for comments.

- 1) Extremely satisfied
- 2) Moderately satisfied
- 3) Slightly satisfied
- 4) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 5) Slightly dissatisfied
- 6) Moderately dissatisfied
- 7) Extremely dissatisfied

We received 355 responses, a 25.7% response rate. (Of the 355 responses, 20 did not indicate academic rank.) Amongst all academic ranks, the ratings showed strong satisfaction with autonomy over research & teaching and with health & dental plans. There was also general satisfaction with job security and teaching loads. However, in all academic ranks, a significant portion of the questions in other areas revealed a high level of dissatisfaction. Those questions for which the combined dissatisfied responses exceeded 40% are displayed in **Table 1**.

To learn more about these responses, we conducted three focus groups: on January 31 (NTT faculty), February 2 (T and NTT faculty), and February 7 (TT faculty). The discussions were lively and far-ranging, covering many possible causes of dissatisfaction and several recommendations for addressing them.

Below are the quantitative results of our survey. The survey also solicited comments, which appear as quotations in endnotes together with comments made in the focus groups. (In one instance, a lengthy comment made on the survey has been edited; no quotation marks are used in this case.) Following the results, we summarize our conclusions and list several recommendations for addressing the issues that we have identified.

## Tenured Faculty

The quantitative results and the comments of the 167 tenured faculty at NU who took our faculty survey identified major dissatisfaction in several areas:

**Compensation** was the area of most widespread and serious dissatisfaction.

**Merit/equity:** 50-51% of the respondents were dissatisfied with merit and equity raises (if their unit gives them – some units don't). They believe that the merit and equity pools should be separate since merit is inconsistent from one year to the next, which means that there is no reliable cost-of-living compensation. Many note that they don't understand the relationship between merit and equity and some said they didn't know that NU had a system for equity. Many say that the merit process is not standard. For the rewards it brings, the process is much too time consuming, and merit in their units is often determined by people who are unable to judge them, because they have different kinds of appointments (e.g., clinical vs. research).<sup>1</sup>

**Cost of Living:** 53% are unhappy with the failure of salaries to track with the relatively high Boston cost of living, and the high rate of inflation driven by the housing market. They note that a 2-3% annual raise does not keep pace with a 10% increase in the price for health care and similar increases in transportation, parking, tuition, child care, etc.<sup>2</sup>

**Travel Professional Development Funding:** Half feel that they receive insufficient -- or no -- travel (50%) or professional development funds (51%) for themselves or their graduate students and find it a problem that (a) the budgets are at the discretion of the chair or the dean, and (b) are often combined, because if they use all their funds for travel, they have nothing for development. They find the disparities across departments in how these funds are distributed to be unfair. Many are expected to find these funds externally, even when the sources do not exist in their fields.<sup>3</sup>

## Other compensation issues

**Compression and Inversion:** The faculty cite serious problems with salary compression across the ranks (full professors paid less than associates) as well as salary inversion, due to generous salary packages offered to new hires and they see no systematic attempts to remedy either of these problems.<sup>4</sup>

**Gap between NU and Peer Institutions:** The faculty note the salary gap between NU and peer institutions, especially other Research 1 schools.

**Salary Discrepancies across Units and for Interdisciplinary Faculty:** Many felt inequities across departments/programs and the different criteria for interdisciplinary faculty, which prevents them from receiving fair raises.<sup>5</sup>

**Gender Pay Gap:** Some faculty are very disheartened – even embittered --by a gender pay gap which they feel is being ignored.<sup>6</sup>

A number of comments cover more than one topic related to compensation.<sup>7</sup>

**Value of Research:** The University/central administration's failure to value faculty research is a second major source of dissatisfaction (42% of respondents). There is a perceived lack of respect for non-STEM fields, especially the humanities and arts. Even those in STEM fields feel that their basic science research is not given the respect that "use-oriented" (i.e. applied or translational research) is. Many feel an overall lack of support for research that doesn't bring in grants; others note that even in their department research is never discussed, and faculty don't know what their colleagues are working on. The climate is not conducive to creating an interchange of ideas.<sup>8</sup>

**Interdisciplinary Faculty:** Over 40% of tenured faculty were not satisfied with evaluations of interdisciplinary efforts in their units. 50% felt that there was insufficient funding for interdisciplinary teaching. Many felt that interdisciplinary evaluations including tenure evaluations were not fair, that logistics like calendars and computational capabilities stood in the way, and that the budget model discouraged cross-disciplinary teaching.<sup>9</sup>

**University Administration:** The tenured faculty largely (61%) do not feel like they have direct access to the layers of university administration that they need. 63% believe that the administration does not manage in a way that helps faculty do their work. Faculty across the colleges expressed dismay in the Provost's declaration that he not be contacted by the faculty. They feel demoralized and disrespected.<sup>10</sup>

**Support for Research and Teaching:** Institutional support was felt to be lacking for both research and teaching by 55% and 49% of tenured faculty, respectively. Needs for additional support ranged from space, equipment, staff, dissemination costs, licensing and patenting costs, and supplies.<sup>11</sup>

**The lack of availability of TAs and graders** was seen as a problem for 51% of the faculty. The comments paint a picture of faculty who cannot do research because they are hampered by too little teaching assistance (TAs, graders) and overly large classes. Some faculty members hire their own TAs. There is also a problem with adequate TA training.<sup>12</sup>

**RCM Budget Model:** The budget model, RCM is seen as a major impediment. 56% find that it negatively affects research, 62% teaching, and 71% the goals of the entire unit. Faculty who commented on RCM in the survey wrote in extremely negative terms. They see it as undercutting the mission of the university.<sup>13</sup>

## Tenure-Track Faculty

The quantitative results and the comments of the 35 tenure-track (TT) faculty at NU who took our survey indicated the following major concerns:

**Compensation:** Large percentages of the TT faculty are dissatisfied with Equity (50%) and Merit (42%) compensation, particularly in view of the high cost of living and high cost of living increases in the Boston Area (57%). The cost of rent, transportation, parking at NU, health insurance, car insurance, childcare, utilities, and the rate of yearly increase in such expenditures surpass the small merit raises, shrink salary values and make home ownership extremely difficult.<sup>14</sup>

**Faculty Development Funding:** Large percentages of the TT faculty are dissatisfied with the lack funds or the low level of funds available for faculty development (41%) and travel (44%), and from the comments a lack of uniform university-wide policy is evident. We are not on par with other institutions.<sup>15</sup>

**Criteria for Tenure and Promotion:** Naturally, TT faculty are preoccupied with tenure and promotion and a significant percentage (40%) finds the criteria for tenure and promotion unclear, particularly those who

engage in interdisciplinary research. Criteria are perceived to be a moving target as the university is rising in the ranks.

There are also complaints about **Double Standards**.<sup>16</sup>

**Research support** could be better.<sup>17</sup>

**External Funding:** As expected, TT faculty are preoccupied with securing funding from external sources.<sup>18</sup>

**Administration:** A large number of TT faculty (48%) are dissatisfied with the managerial top-down approach of the administration, echoing the even larger number of FT faculty (63%). Also, they feel that they do not have direct access to of the upper levels of university administration that they need (45%).<sup>19</sup>

**Support for Research and Teaching:** A significant number of TT faculty are dissatisfied with support for research (54%), with the instructional support/supplies (49%), the availability of teaching assistants (44%) and classroom quality (49%).<sup>20,21</sup>

**RCM:** A large number of TT faculty are dissatisfied with the particular hybrid RCM model, under which the University operates, including its impact on their teaching (63%), research (47%) and goals of their unit (56%).<sup>22</sup>

**ORAF and Departmental Administrative Support:** Many TT faculty complained about ORAF (pre-and post-award)<sup>23</sup> and the lack of administrative support<sup>24</sup>.

### Full-time Nontenure-Track Faculty

The quantitative results and the comments of the 133 full-time nontenure-track (NTT) faculty at NU who took our survey indicated the following major concerns:

**Compensation:** A significant percentage (between 43% and 60%) of the full-time non-tenure track faculty is dissatisfied with almost all aspects of compensation including merit, equity, cost of living adjustment and funding for professional development. NTT faculty commented that they are poorly compensated for their work compared with those in other institutions. Many did not know the processes surrounding merit or equity. Their merit/equity pool has been consistently low, does not keep up with cost of living increases, and has led to salary erosion.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, there appear to be extreme inconsistencies and inequalities in merit increases<sup>26</sup> and funding for professional development. The total annual professional development funding that responders mentioned ranged from \$500 to \$800 to \$1000 to \$2000.<sup>27</sup>

**Benefits:** The fact that NTT faculty are not eligible for sabbatical was an important area of dissatisfaction (41%). This lack of availability of some form of supported time away to pursue professional development, and expand teaching expertise and resources to conduct scholarship/research, and service was viewed as shortsighted and counterproductive.<sup>28</sup>

**Value of NTT Faculty Work:** Based on the survey results, NTT faculty expressed dissatisfaction with the central administration's value of all aspects of their work: scholarship/research, teaching and service.<sup>29</sup> Over 42% of NTT faculty was dissatisfied with the value central administration placed on their scholarship and research<sup>30</sup>. Similarly, 45% of NTT faculty felt dissatisfaction with central administration's value of their teaching which is remarkable given that this is a primary role of this rank. However, close to 75% indicated satisfaction with the level of appreciation that is provided by their unit heads/dean. This trend was similar for service.<sup>31</sup>

**Promotion and Advancement:** The process for promotion of NTT faculty is generally clear, after recent important efforts by the Provost. However, 42.5% indicated dissatisfaction with the clarity of the criteria for promotion. Many NTT faculty who provided comments reported that there were inconsistencies in access to information at the unit and Dean level.<sup>32</sup> A number of responders commented that too much value is placed on TRACE. Moreover, there appear to be inconsistencies between colleges, much dissatisfaction about promotion process at CPS, and uncertainty about promotion process for faculty co-op coordinators.<sup>33</sup>

**Interdisciplinary Pursuits:** Less than 20% of NTT faculty were satisfied that they have necessary budgetary support for interdisciplinary research; 42.5% were dissatisfied with budgetary support or interdisciplinary teaching. However, some comments revealed inconsistencies in support. Some identified that NTT faculty are “expected to be well-behaved silos” whereas others highlighted positive opportunities (e.g within COE, across COS and CCIS). Nevertheless, the overwhelming sentiment is that interdisciplinary research is supported but interdisciplinary teaching is not. This is not only true in terms of funding but also with regard to infrastructure, including accounting.<sup>34</sup>

**Access to University Administration:** NTT faculty feel that they do not have access to University administration (48%) and that management does not help them do their work (42%). The overarching sentiment expressed by those who submitted comments is that University administration (President and Provost-level) establish priorities without much input from faculty and staff. This unilateral decision-making hinders collaboration and fosters a climate of mistrust and under-appreciation.<sup>35</sup> However, a few respondents indicated recent improvements, specifically at CPS.<sup>36</sup>

**Institutional Support for Research and Teaching:** The trend of dissatisfaction with University support of NTT persisted in this area. A large number of NTT faculty were dissatisfied with institutional support for research (45%) and teaching (46%) in terms of infrastructure, space, and supplies. Teaching rooms are woefully inadequate in facilitating teaching and learning in wide-ranging aspects, from too few seats to outdated classroom and teaching technology. Though there have been significant improvements such as the presence of a desktop computer and projector in every classroom, spaces are poorly designed to enable teaching in more than just lecture style. Collaborative spaces for more dynamic, contemporary learning situations such as problem-based learning or team-based learning for large classes are lacking.<sup>37</sup> Faculty noted the lack of supplies and well-trained teaching assistants to support student learning.<sup>38</sup> Overall, there is remarkably inadequate focus on teaching and teaching resources at the university.

**Support for Teaching:** Only 37% of NTT faculty are satisfied with the availability of teaching assistants (TAs) and only 33% are similarly satisfied with availability of graders. Faculty commented that the need for graders and/or TAs is even more pronounced with large class sizes as well as multiple sections of a course (to comply with 19 students/class). Without sufficient access to qualified TA's and graders, faculty members are unable to expand student instruction, particularly for those in need of significant support. Furthermore, there is a missed opportunity to develop new instructors.<sup>39</sup>

**RCM Budget Model:** A large percentage of NTT faculty are dissatisfied with the impact of RCM on their ability to teach (48%) and achieve overall goals of their unit (54%). Indeed, many NTT faculty indicated a complete lack of knowledge of what RCM is. Others felt that this model forces colleges to only look inward, leading to a reluctance to do interdisciplinary work and leads to a duplication of efforts (i.e. courses and programs). There is a feeling of competition for students and dollars both between colleges and across various programs within particular colleges.<sup>40</sup>

## Summary Conclusions

1. A great cause of dissatisfaction amongst the entire faculty is that raises are not keeping up with cost of living increases in the Boston Area. This causes salary erosion, compression, and inversion. Dissatisfaction is also caused by insufficient funding for faculty development and travel. (The problem of faculty salaries not keeping up with cost of living increases in the Boston Area has also been addressed in the Faculty Senate's Financial Affairs Report this year.)
2. Faculty at all ranks and in all fields feel under-appreciated by, and cut-off from, the higher administration. This is exacerbated by a feeling that there is insufficient institutional support for research/scholarship, especially grant support and release time for NTT faculty, and for teaching, especially in classroom quality and in interdisciplinary fields. All this undermines the loyalty and trust of the faculty.
3. The criteria for promotion, especially amongst TT and NTT faculty, are unclear and/or inconsistent. The process for equity raises is also not clear to all faculty in all departments, and decisions about equity raises are not communicated clearly.
4. There is wide-spread dissatisfaction with the RCM budget model.

## Recommendations

1. **Compensation:**
  - a. Make sure that faculty compensation accurately reflects the high cost of living in Boston.
  - b. Review funding for faculty development and travel.
2. **Recognition, Access, Support, and Trust:**
  - a. Provide more recognition in University publications/announcements for faculty (including NTT) accomplishments in research/scholarship and teaching.
  - b. Make sure all faculty have direct access, outside the normal chain of command, to higher levels of the administration when necessary.
  - c. Provide more experienced grant administrators, including at the department level (not just College/University).
  - d. Provide some release time for research/scholarship for NTT.
  - e. Make sure classrooms have upgraded technology and space that is appropriate for all types of instruction.
3. **Tenure, Promotions, Equity:**
  - a. More clarity and consistency in criteria for tenure and promotions.
  - b. More transparency in equity raises.
    - i. All faculty should receive department-specific matchmake salary data.
    - ii. Faculty who request an equity adjustment should be informed of the final decision.
4. **The Faculty Senate should form an action committee to oversee these changes.**

<sup>1</sup> "Faculty merit pools are tiny (2%) compared to the high salaries of upper administrators. This alone breeds resentment. The process of merit reviews is also unfair in many units. Faculty come away feeling demoralized and angry that their work was so poorly valued by their peers and Chair. This engenders an undercurrent of negative morale and job dissatisfaction."

The managing of merit and equity has been increasingly a black hole where faculty labor in good faith to produce merit rankings that are routinely ignored and/or modified by deans with no accountability, no reporting back and no moment for appeal. One must wait for one's contract to see how the numbers work out, yet there is still no way to tell merit from equity in the new salary. THERE MUST BE SOME RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MERIT EXERCISE AND SALARY. Also it makes no sense for the faculty to have to apply for equity. If equity is now an annual exercise, then inequities in salary should be routinely addressed by chairs and deans, those in a position to see the big picture. The Merit/Equity report from the Dean should transparently show how and why the two categories yielded a salary change. They should showing salary averages within rank and by matchmate. And if faculty find the adjustments unfair, they should have opportunities for appeal.

"Separate merit raise from equity raise cap; do not cap merit raise; give up salary by years at rank, adopt salary by cumulative performance plus initial condition."

<sup>2</sup> "Merit raise pool has barely kept up with inflation. As a result, in inflation adjusted dollars, my salary has not increased much during the last decade."

<sup>3</sup> "Our travel and professional development funds have not increased in the last decade. Therefore, in inflation adjusted dollars, we have less travel money than a decade ago. The latter might be an unintended consequence of RCM."

"Travel and professional development funds--as far as I know--are at the discretion of the department. I pay for much of my professional travel out of my own pocket."

<sup>4</sup> "Faculty merit pools are tiny (2%) compared to the high salaries of upper administrators. This alone breeds resentment. The process of merit reviews is also unfair in many units. Faculty come away feeling demoralized and angry that their work was so poorly valued by their peers and Chair. This engenders an undercurrent of negative morale and job dissatisfaction."

"Unfair distribution to those with longevity."

<sup>5</sup> "I am joint appointed, and my two different home departments rated my productivity differently. I felt that this affected my overall merit raise poorly."

"There is ridiculously large variation among faculty across colleges; faculty who perform locally well in their departments can be getting salaries that are much higher than faculty that perform better than them, close to top in their department."

"Not listed here is how compensation in my unit compares to other units. I was hired tenure-on-entry and have a salary in the bottom quartile of faculty at my rank at Northeastern. I can't afford to buy a condo in Boston."

<sup>6</sup> "There is a huge gender/compression gap issues across the university that is being swept under the carpet under the guise of "we need to study it more" and "you are right, but we dont have the money to address it". NU is a hateful and competitive place."

"In my college there are large discrepancies in faculty salary where "rainmakers" -- those who receive >>\$1M large research grants -- receive significantly greater salary. I have a concern that there may be a bias towards higher compensation for **men** who are rainmakers."

<sup>7</sup> "This is all filtered through the Department or School. The huge endowment gains in the last few years have not been passed on to faculty. They have been sunk in buildings e.g., Columbus parking lot now is a "science center" and in fancy dorms for students. There is no sense of academic excellence in the air. The everyday reality here is NU news puffery."

"The budget model leaves no room for equity raises to address severe compression for longstanding and still research-productive faculty, while the paltry amounts divided up through merit system basically add up to peanuts. Lavish start-up packages for highly compensated new faculty overshadow stagnant and paltry professional development and travel funds available to long-serving faculty whose disciplines lack access to external grants that generate sufficient overhead. In short, senior faculty in social sciences, humanities, and arts get short shrift despite years of hard work and service to the University. Oh, and did I mention that too many of these highly compensated new hires won't do service?"



<sup>8</sup> "The exclusive focus on use-oriented research makes my own research in basic science feel extremely marginal at NEU even though it has been and continues to be consistently funded by the NSF."

"Who knows what the central administration cares about except their salaries and manipulating the US News ratings? There is no sense of what a University is about here-it's all smoke and mirrors around a center filled by bureaucrats. The senior team, controlled by Aoun and the Board, have no contact or commitment to faculty well-being or research."

"Unit head seems to value media appearances and blog posts more than scholarship."

"The Central Administration seems to have its own agenda, centered around brand development, and seems to value faculty activity only to the extent that it facilitates and aligns with that. For example the recent RV2025 (plus arbitrary "pre-selection" by the President) does not seem to reflect any real value being placed on anyone's research in itself."

"This university might consider sending an overall message of appreciation for teaching and scholarship based on the life of the university, rather than constantly emphasizing enrollments, awards, and other facile markers of achievement. This is a major difference between this school and the last place I worked, and it contributes to a low level of job satisfaction or trust here. The lack of respect for teaching and intellectual life here is cultivated by the administration's language of a constant need to innovate, transform, and up-end what we faculty have spent our lives on and the value we place on the ongoing, difficult, rewarding work of teaching and research. Faculty here are poorly used and not given adequate support or appreciation of their work. If you're going to hire and tenure us, treat us well and let us actually do the work we are best at and by which we best serve the school's overall ambition of being a world class university."

"NU is now completely focused on research, and only research in the areas identified by the strategy of the University. If you don't fit the strategy and/or are not a "rock star" researcher, then the SLT doesn't care. It's about PR and funding."

"The university is not simply indifferent to work in the humanities, the president has repeatedly expressed contempt and even hostility toward any non STEM related, non-future directed research. My work is literary and historical. There is no place for either in any of the university's self-descriptions or mission statements. In my view any university that ignores the humanities and training in historical and critical thinking cannot protect the STEM sciences, as the outcome of this most recent election has made abundantly clear."

"The university/central admin. only values professional activity that brings in external grants. Very demoralizing."

"Nobody appreciates anyone's work in my department. We never talk about other people's work or celebrate it or do anything with it other than count it up at the end of the quarter to send in our numbers to the great and mighty Oz."

"I am an artist who also writes and publishes, but my primary research is creative production. This is not valued or understood as a form of knowledge production at all - at least not by my dean or the central administration. I have been buried in service, mistakenly called "leadership" but is actually a lot of uncompensated labor. My comments are entirely directed upstream - my chair is supportive and just as overworked/undervalued as the faculty."

"The Dean is terrible. The central administration (as it is) has no ability to judge or value research. They are like trout looking for shiny things which they then place on the website. The university administration is a marketing organization with no understanding of true quality...they are thus not "academics" anymore (if they ever were once, the trait is now vestigial). Just count the number of people in the marketing group. It is disgusting."

"The central administration could care less what I do. I don't bring in massive external grants, am more book-oriented than journal-focused (which screws up their precious metrics), and am essentially orthogonal to their priorities."

9 "Interdisciplinary efforts are more talked about than acted on because infrastructure and rcm budget get in the way."

"We need a process to ensure that interdisciplinary faculty, especially tenure-track junior faculty, are appreciated and promoted appropriately."

"We need better structures to support interdisciplinary teaching and co-teaching opportunities At moment we are left with *ad hoc* scheduling courses at same time."

"Interdisciplinary research is going well. Interdisciplinary teaching between colleges is atrocious. Even between departments is not good. Everyone is running their own fiefdom because of teaching load and budgetary inflexibility."

"Having seen some tenure outcomes in other units, it is my opinion that the University recruits for interdisciplinarity but then punishes junior faculty who are not outstanding in just one field. I know of several tenure cases that failed because the University did not really know how to evaluate an interdisciplinary person properly."

"Interdisciplinary teaching is actively discouraged. This is an unfortunate feature of the RCM model, and of the disincentive structures that make team teaching or teaching outside of one's unit impractical."

"Logistically extremely difficult (there is not even any shared electronic storage space across departments which makes collaborations difficult) and the university doesn't seem to understand that legal research doesn't require expensive lab equipment but rather time (i.e. Course buyback or waivers)."

"There are struggles between units over who teaches what and how syllabi are created. Students have hard time enrolling in course outside dept or college. Colleges' own financial problems hinder interdisciplinary work."

"RCM is completely at odds with interdisciplinary teaching and research efforts. Low level admins run around trying to make sure students are "registered" with their units to make sure RCM credits are kept local. It is beyond comprehension and will turn the university into a series of silos. Not smart."

10 "The provost has sent emails saying he does not want faculty to contact him. The administrative organization is very corporate and not very democratic.

"The administration is mostly a hamper to my work,[ ... ]. The ongoing invasions of department control of governance and curricula are not only demoralizing, distracting micromanagement, but they reduce our intellectual creativity and professional role to make our own plans and set directions for our unit, which is an essential component of our job. We are increasingly given time-consuming bureaucratic tasks as if we were staff members and not faculty, which utterly corrode the time and energy we should be spending on our teaching, research, and crafting an intellectual world at NU that would continue to draw great students and new faculty. The administration is, in other words, making our lives harder and leading to us doing less of the work we are most qualified to do."

"NU has become an authoritarian organization where the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) determines the strategy and everyone below is simply supposed to implement it without any real discussion. There is a huge disconnect between the SLT and those of us on the ground doing the day-to-day work to make the University run."

"Distant, money-oriented to a fault, dictatorial, laying burdens and deadlines on departments, often on short notice. I've been alienated for years. I know that higher education is just another corporate endeavor but it is really hard to get used to that. Everything is for image and marketing."

"The school is run autocratically. One cannot gain access to anyone but to one's immediate supervisor, but if the supervisor is a sycophant, the employee has nowhere to go."

"Get rid of Hybrid RCM."

"Very top-down. For example: 1) Senior and other hires blocked by the Provost after 2nd and even 3rd visits. 2) Directive from the Provost that no one in COS email him. 3) Budget/tax model to ensure COS runs a negative balance."

"What is going on with the administration? My new Dean is a nightmare. The whole department hates her, strange because most of us have never met her. Ok, we only hear news about her from our Chair, but she is the most distant, distracted Dean we have had, and that is saying a lot given our last disaster of a Dean that was fired. She has a closed door policy. All decision making has been taken from the faculty in our department from hiring to daily decision making and class schedules. I feel like I am teaching in high school sometimes because it is so regimented. The Admin only uses the handbook when it suits them and when something comes up that it doesn't like, it just changes the handbook. I have personally witnessed an upper administrator in the Provost's office change the entire FLMA system in HR due to a personal grudge against one employee. These are hardly protections if upper admin can just change them when and how they see fit. The admin actually hinders me from doing my work. Plus, there are a whole bunch of self-centered people who seem to care nothing for the STUDENTS at this university. They are just rankings and \$\$\$."

- <sup>11</sup> "There is inadequate space for the mission of the university. Rooms are at 100+% occupancy for many years now."  
 "RAF is not responsive and seems to actively seek to prevent funding from coming through to PIs. Space is managed in a way to prevent researcher interaction - every inch of space must be paid for under RCM making lounges and other interaction spaces extremely rare. This is not a good way to facilitate interdisciplinary research and collaboration."  
 "Lack of university support for core facilities puts us at a huge disadvantage. Our competitors make significant and sound investments in core facilities and yet we follow the outdated model of satellite-ing our research capacity in individual labs and tying up all the investment in startup funds. When we do have access to core facilities - like confocal microscopes etc. - the model isn't cost effective or competitive. Essentially, I can run all of my work at Harvard or Tufts for less money than on campus because Harvard and Tufts subsidize (i.e. support) their research facilities."  
 "Grant submission processing help is great but budget support once a grant is obtained is a disaster. If you want cost-sharing on a grant proposal, the central administration demands college input, but the college is in debt. Resources for research need more support. There is a general morale problem."  
 "It is extremely difficult to find adequate classroom spaces that allow flexibility in lecture, small team exercises and project base learning. Spaces that allow collaborative teamwork in research and administration are also sorely lacking."  
 "There is no support for research at NU. RAF is a mess. There is NO support for teaching. The classrooms are out-of-date. We have no smart boards, document cameras and the classrooms are outfitted with old computers, projectors, with no capability for active learning work. Most of the classrooms lack electrical outlets. There are no studio classrooms or other support for faculty who want to do modern pedagogy. The institution provides no support for software or hardware for faculty for teaching purposes. We have no licenses for faculty engaged in online learning eg Articulate."  
 "RAF is totally dysfunctional, completely in chaos. Preaward is moderately improved since a few years ago, postaward is hopeless. It takes 10x the time it should to do anything. The contracts system is arcane, OGC gets in the way more than it helps. I feel that I want to give up research every time I have to do something related to grants/contracts paperwork and deal with all these levels of administration doing nothing. If this were a business, we'd have been bankrupt long ago. These people are supposed to support the faculty, helping us with research, not getting in the way. If the Provost thinks he will transform NU into a research powerhouse as proposed in the 10 year plan, he needs to fix all this infrastructure."  
 "Limited support for research and highly bureaucratic process for managing travel and reimbursement. e.g., Concur has increased the time spent on reimbursement to about 2hrs/trip by requiring a detailed account of every transaction."
- <sup>12</sup> "Graders/TAs are essential for upper level mathematics courses, but we don't seem to get any."  
 "Very little teaching support - typically only in intro courses."  
 "Graders? We need them, but they do not exist for our courses."  
 "Our TA allocations have not kept up with credit hours taught."  
 "Teaching assistant support is poor. One 3-credit course I teach has 150 students, and I am fighting to get a single TA. It's outrageous. TAs should be assigned based on enrollment and/or total credit hours. I may have to shift my PhD student to do some TA work (even though she is supported full time on a federal grant) due to this. This will put her at a disadvantage and borders on unethical since she is paid by a research study to work on that study.  
 "There is no support for TA training, which they need. Teaching schedules need to be revised. Classes are too large. Classrooms are poorly designed and have been retrofitted for Powerpoint delivery. There are no electrical outlets."  
 "'Graders' may be OK for introductory Freshman courses. But, not grading your own essay assignments/quizzes means that you don't get to know your students. Better teaching loads is the solution [to overlarge classes]. Not graders..."  
 "We do not have enough TAs. I cannot understand where all the money has gone: there are 4x more students in my field than 5 years ago, but shockingly the same resources and budget for teaching them. I have to turn away students because 1 instructor cannot handle 75 graduate students at one time and keep the quality high."  
 "My TAs are greatly overworked so I take on the load, which impacts my research productivity."  
 "I have only had TA's for labs, never lecture courses. Most research universities use TAs to support faculty in both. I have never had a grader, and have only had assistance I hired myself, even for classes with 200 students."  
 "Class sized have doubled in two years, and there has not been an increase in support for teaching and grading."

<sup>13</sup> “Mysterious admin-grounded system that few understand. It's basically a move to consolidate power in central administration. There is no evidence that it works. More money goes to the center to be arbitrarily re-distributed.”

“The Hybrid RCM system has been a disaster for Northeastern. The administration originally that it would empower the Deans and move the University forward. Instead, it has created huge budgetary constraints for the colleges and created silos. [Because of RCM,] colleges compete for resources instead of collaborating to develop new interdisciplinary curricula and make interdisciplinary hires. [And it prevents colleges from working together to hire] high-level senior faculty. This is having a negative impact on research. In the teaching arena, RCM has motivated the development of a new NU core course requirement. While presented under the guise of pedagogical improvement, this new requirement reflects an attempt by the humanities to increase enrollment in their classes for budgetary reasons. Budget is driving course requirement in each college rather than what is best for the students.”

“The University has increased the tax rate per College since RCM started. The University takes so much money that the Colleges are always in the red. I would bet that it is the budget system that has led to the University's inability to keep Deans of Colleges. Who would want this system? When the SLT says that each College gets all its revenue, that is a joke.”

“Every college is looking out for their own interests. Each is offering courses that really should be offered by other departments and colleges. Our department doesn't offer lab experiences that ethically we should be offering to non-majors. There is no funding from the administration for laboratories, undergraduate research, honors courses, etc. Everything is about getting overhead-return. Faculty are having their labs taken away - that is ridiculous”

“I hate it. The University should try to work together, not college against college. It looks good on paper only, in practice it just prevents us from being innovative and interdisciplinary. If the President, Provost and Trustees really want to transform the University as they describe in the long range plans, RCM will inhibit this process not catalyse it.”

“A disaster. What was promised as decentralization has revealed itself to be the company store. We pay high taxes to the administration and have far less control than was promised. Cross-college cooperation and teaching are disincentivized, betraying the interdisciplinary claims of the university. So much institutional reduplication was made necessary by breaking down Arts and Sciences, and we've created these orphan colleges that can barely support themselves. I have seen no benefits to the system and many problems.”

“The hybrid RCM system is designed to pit colleges against each other for scarce resources, perhaps with one exception (Engineering). Furthermore, the upper levels of the administration are putting extreme pressures on colleges to offer on-line courses to offset their budget shortfalls. No one knows where the money goes that is sopped up by the administration. For example, this University has a long-time bad habit of shortchanging faculty while it sets up off-campus campuses that are supposed to bring in millions, but in fact are really cost centers. Also, the former Provost allowed Engineering to hire multiple faculty, and take over space across the University and it favored Engineering applicants for admission by offering them rich scholarship packages. Meanwhile, he starved the other colleges.”

“Too much money is taken back, leading to a deficit budget and very little autonomy for COS. RCM disincentivizes collaboration in research and especially teaching between colleges. RCM model makes it more likely that laboratory classes will be cut because they are "expensive" (this has happened, it is easy to see we have many fewer labs than even 3 years ago). RCM puts money above pedagogy. RCM puts too much power into the office of the provost.”

“Divide and conquer, right? I feel like I am working at Enron. "F\*\*\* your neighbor, I would step on his throat to get ahead" that is a quote from an Enron employee.”

“I am in COE; engineering research is expensive. I am certain despite my best efforts, I might be barely paying for my total cost, or even not that... However, if NEU thinks solid COE research and teaching is beneficial for the entire brand, then deficits should be not only compensated, additional resources should be given to our dean. This principle applies to all units (uniformity is key; uniformity is not necessarily "equal"). RCM had a significantly disturbing effect on video streamed sections. It took COE 4 years to figure out a system that works; still the set up of CPS that we used until around 2010 was better. That happened because, I heard, CPS and COE couldn't agree on the tuition split! CPS wanted 50% I think. Our video sections suffered for years as a result! Do not let colleges and units enter petty cash fights that disrupt operations. When such situations occur, intervene as fairly as possible - but not sacrificing teaching and research quality.”

<sup>14</sup> "Boston is extremely expensive city to live. Rent and transportation (either parking or T) are the biggest problems and there is no support. As a young faculty, I have no idea when I will be able to start mortgage to own a residence."

"I'm frustrated: though our salaries are similar to peer institutions, those comparisons don't account for realistic cost of living differences between, say, Boston and Ann Arbor. Housing, utilities, childcare, etc. are all so much more expensive here, and our base salaries and benefits offer little relief on these differences. Health insurance just rose by almost 10%. No merit raises can keep up, which means that my salary just shrank. And the cost of living here just keeps increasing."

"I don't even know what an equity raise is, only that it eats into the funding pool for merit raises."

Open Forum: Problems with Communication regarding Equity Raises & Promotions

<sup>15</sup> "We are expected to publish and compete with our colleagues at other private institutions who are receiving significantly more travel and professional development funding."

<sup>16</sup> "Again. Research expectations for tenure are very ambiguous and seem in flux. Number of different reports equals almost as many sources."

"As Northeastern has risen in the rankings, it's become less and less clear what the criteria are. No one will tell junior faculty where the goalpost is (i.e., a number of articles, in what journals). It places extreme anxiety on them."

"While there are workshops and mentorship, criteria are still unclear and double standards are often visible. The criteria for tenure are completely unclear and inconsistent - they have changed for me as I've moved through my career, and they are different for me and my colleagues in similar positions."

<sup>17</sup> "I am uncertain about shifting tenure standards."

"The tenure process is opaque, and is harder for faculty such as myself engaged in interdisciplinary research. Senior faculty in my departments do not understand what I do, and have conflicting expectations. I feel that faculty who engage in core disciplinary research are more likely to achieve tenure than I am."

"The publication bar for tenure is aspirational, but the research support is not always commensurate. That imbalance creates concern for achieving the tenure bar."

<sup>18</sup> ".. still struggling to find money because the funding climate is poor and promises to get worse in the coming years."

Open Forum: Mid-course evaluations need to be meaningful (to allow for improvement before tenure consideration)

<sup>19</sup> "The top-down approach here was unexpected. I think its trickle-down effects hurt faculty productivity."

"There seem to be a lot of reaction and not much clearly communicated vision; the University uses a lot of vague buzzwords about interdisciplinarity, experiential education and the like, but as long as salary, tenure and promotion are tied to old-fashioned research production, we have almost no incentive to invest our time in this stuff. So it makes the administration either seem clueless or disingenuous, which does not give one great confidence in their ability to manage. Also, the registrar and the grants office seem incapable of managing even minor requests on a timely basis."

"The higher administration seems utterly disconnected from the work that I do every day, save for handing down occasional unsupported mandates and a lot of breezy PR."

"There is a lot of talk of openness and listening but decisions are seldom made in the interests of faculty."

<sup>20</sup> "Need much more TA support."

Focus Group: Classroom space is inappropriate for the type of teaching being asked to do

Focus Group: Junior faculty being asked to teach large classes (elsewhere given only small classes)

Focus Group: "Smart" classrooms are not very smart; projector screens are in front of blackboards

<sup>21</sup> "Regarding teaching: more TA support needed."

"Courses are taught all over campus, often in classrooms that are either too large or barely large enough for the students."

"Classroom space is abysmal. This year, I've had to summon someone from IT services to fix the audiovisual equipment before class can begin on 6 occasions. The room also reeks of mildew. I've also had experiences where small classes were booked into huge lecture halls with fixed seating configurations that were not conducive to discussion and group work."

"There is nowhere near enough space for my to perform my research. Everything I request seems to take forever to go through various bureaucratic channels. It is hard to recruit students and staff because of this".

<sup>22</sup> "Has completely poisonous effects on student enrollment. Has distributed enrollment inequitably across the colleges. Creates HUGE headaches for trying to forecast teaching needs. Almost impossible to plan for how many students we will have; we make sure to have core requirements staffed, but it is otherwise impossible to develop interesting courses that will excite them and meet their needs."

"Hybrid RCM has led to a competitive atmosphere among units, to the detriment of pretty much everything we do."

"This model makes it difficult for humanities and social science to thrive. Being financially profitable is not the only way to value intellectual contributions."

"I believe this model is seriously squeezing department's and college's budgets."

Focus Group: RCM creates obstacles for interdisciplinary teaching

<sup>23</sup> "Ramming CONCUR down our throats, great idea, good job. The COEUS roll-out, good times."

Focus Group: Problems with Administrative Support for Research Grants

Focus Group: Pre-grant support in College/Dept is lacking in experience & competence (quality)

Focus Group: Post-grant support from ORAF is poor: need better Head (quality) and more staff (quantity)

Focus Group: Problems transitioning from pre-grant to post-grant support

Focus Group: Difficulties dealing with NSF and with interdisciplinary grants

Focus Group: IRB does a good job but need more people

Focus Group: In one department have only 1 administrator/secretary for 30 faculty members

Focus Group: In another, the growth in faculty exceeds the growth in administrative staff

<sup>24</sup> Focus Group: In one department have only 1 administrator/secretary for 30 faculty members

Focus Group: In another, the growth in faculty exceeds the growth in administrative staff

<sup>25</sup> "I don't know where to begin on this. There is much inequality and confusion regarding compensation. There is no consistent salary structure that rewards individuals for years of experience, education, qualifications, publications, or merit of any kind. Salaries for non-tenure track faculty at Northeastern are entirely out of line with other Boston and regional university salaries of similarly situated faculty members and do not reflect cost of living, which results in very difficult situations for faculty. Faculty are yet expected to work miracles and engage in professional development and presentations to benefit the university, but reimbursement and funding for such travel and professional development is sporadic, inconsistent, subjective, often hostile to obtain, and procedurally difficult."

"The merit is 2-3% and equity is a hidden process that looks at data to fit their needs, not necessarily comparative data for people doing similar jobs at other institutions."

"The expense of living near a major city is not offset by an increased salary. I could do better elsewhere."

"Merit and equity raises have been consumed by increases in health insurance and other benefits resulting in decreasing salary each year."

"FTNTT (at CPS) are paid a base salary and, at the discretion of administration, may receive additional compensation for projects or teaching overload. Retirement contributions are based only on base salary; yet in order to have a livable wage, CPS faculty have to do additional projects or take on additional classes...."

- 26 “Inequality among faculty with similar backgrounds is what bothers me most, not the actual levels of compensation.”  
 “Men in my department make more than the women. It’s frustrating.”  
 “The compensation for a faculty co-op coordinator is laughable. I have over 15+ years experience in industry and am making 75K. I am making less than the students who go into a coop job.”  
 “There is no transparency nor access to these funding options for non-tenure track faculty in CPS.”  
 “Co-op faculty are very poorly paid compared to research-active who can develop grant funding.”
- 27 “Other than \$1000 a year for my professional development (which includes travel so doesn’t cover even one conference event outside my local area), it’s often a major effort to apply for other funding.”  
 “...funding for (travel) and professional development is sporadic, inconsistent, subjective, often hostile to obtain and procedurally difficult.”  
 “At my rank and in my college, I receive \$800 toward professional travel and faculty development/year. This covers approximately one conference. Last year, I presented at five conferences. Faculty at MIT at my same rank get \$2000/yr.”  
 “In CSSH we receive an annual total of \$500 professional funding. I hold a PhD from an Ivy League university and cannot possibly present at a respected conference with this funding.”  
 “No increases in travel funding for 10+ years. Increases in salary for merit are non-existent for my area. Professional development funding is minimal.”
- 28 “As a teaching professor, I am not qualified for a sabbatical. But some time off to think, engage in research, do some writing, would be a wonderful change of pace. I do feel I am burned out (sic) teaching, and a change once in a while, would keep me fresh and coming to class with a new perspective and ideas.”  
 “I would like to see some (limited, perhaps partial-pay) sabbatical provision for non-tenure track faculty that nonetheless add measurable value to the university’s research agenda (and whose research would clearly benefit from the sabbatical opportunity.”  
 “Sabbatical time would be appreciated.”  
 “Sabbatical would be a great benefit for non-tenured faculty.”
- 29 “My chair is excellent, and an advocate. I have no criticism of my chair whatsoever. I feel very under supported and unappreciated by the institution, largely.”  
 “I don't know what the University administration thinks (if anything) of my research and teaching.”  
 “Teaching professors and Lecturers are treated as second-class citizens. We aren't allowed to vote for College or University level bodies, and we aren't paid what we are worth. We are expected to do research (and it is mentioned in our merit reviews) despite the fact that it isn't part of our job description. The culture on campus is one that doesn't truly value my service and contributions to the university.”  
 “I feel like teaching professors are treated like 'also rans' in a lot of the policies. We hear all sorts of announcements when tenured folks do stuff, but if we come up with an innovative teaching practice or a paper in a teaching related journal or something nobody cares.”  
 “After almost 15 years here at the university I've never felt so unappreciated as I do this year.”
- 30 “My scholarship brings in no external grant funding so central administration likely doesn't even regard my research.”  
 “As always, research "productivity" takes priority over teaching innovation and excellence. This won't change.”  
 “The university doesn't care about anything unless you're bringing in large funds or writing books. The university has limited understanding to what non-tenure track faculty offer and do not recognize their contributions.”

<sup>31</sup> "I (am) confident that my chair values my teaching and service but I can't say the same for my dean and up. Overall, quality teaching seems to be of less importance in this University, which is disheartening because the faculty all benefited from great teachers and we just want to be supported as we try to be the same to future generations."

"To be honest, I don't really know if my teaching is valued by the administration and my boss. There (is) no acknowledgement of it. My only indication is if my contract is renewed but that's it."

"Teaching professors and Lecturers are treated as second-class citizens. We aren't allowed to vote for College or University level bodies, and we aren't paid what we are worth. We are expected to do research (and it is mentioned in our merit reviews) despite the fact that it isn't part of our job description. The culture on campus is one that doesn't truly value my service and contributions to the university."

"The University says they value co-op. But they don't empower and support us. They just give us "more to do" without raising our salaries. They like our "outcomes", but don't support us. (i.e. there has not been a Coop Faculty member award for almost 6 years, our raises are small, our workload is increased without compensation - and often without consultation). Our deans seem to value us, but their "hands are tied" with budget to help with compensation or hiring more help, etc."

"Teaching is not valued at University level only funding is."

"I have no idea what the University/central administration values about my teaching and service."

"It is hard to tell, with the exception of simply always saying yes when asked, what service is actually valued."

"Even though 60% of my workload is teaching, I feel like merit and promotion criteria focus heavily on scholarship which is 20% of my workload."

<sup>32</sup> "We are working to create procedures but numbers required are a mystery."

"Criteria skewed away from professional/practitioner accomplishments."

"I believe that at the University level, promotion guidelines are clear for clinical faculty. However at the department/unit/school level there are conflicting opinions between administrators, in some cases, running counter to the university guidelines. This creates tension and unease when seeking promotion, especially if one does not receive maximum support from the department/school despite meeting university expectations." "Specifically, I was advised that the criteria for promotion has been a moving target and that the committee for Rank, Promotion, and Tenure has been redesigning the criteria as they go and I have been caught in the gears." "Criteria such as desired number of publications vs. peer-reviewed presentations; number of courses taught, etc. are not provided. The process for promotion of clinical faculty/NTT is clearly documented."

"Process is clearly written but criteria are in flux."

"This is not clear at all across the colleges or even within the college."

<sup>33</sup> "CPS faculty follow tenure/TT promotions yet do not get the same appreciation or recognition when promoted."

"The promotion process in CPS is an unclear morass of conflicting criteria supported on a bed of outright lies. The new Dean is attempting to clear it up I believe but she will be actively undercut by her underlings, HR, and Finance."

"While promotion criteria and process are clearly laid out for NTT faculty, some of the people who evaluate (mostly T/TT faculty) still rely on the "easiest" criteria, namely TRACE scores. TRACE can be gamed and are only one side of the story. There should be a more holistic, continual evaluation process – e.g., class visits by peer faculty should be required"



<sup>34</sup> “...there are even more roadblocks such as who gets paid from where; lack of communication about other initiatives; and lack of input from faculty on ways to build interdisciplinary collaboration.”

“We as faculty members – and particularly non-tenure track faculty members are expected to be well-behaved silos. Interdisciplinary pursuits, e.g. publication and scholarly interests, research, teaching, collaborating with faculty outside our ‘assigned’ teaching silos are discouraged unless there is a specific mandate by administration in the university’s interests.”

“Interdisciplinary within COE is very good; and across COS and CCIS it is good as well.”

“Fair distribution/accounting for interdisciplinary teaching has yet to be developed/implemented in my college.”

“The current budget model makes doing interdisciplinary things more difficulty. There is massive ambiguity in hiring and evaluating interdisciplinary faculty.”

“Interdisciplinary is great but again, the support tends to be for the tenure track folks, and teaching profs aren’t really encouraged to do any interdisciplinary work.”

“Research in an interdisciplinary model is encouraged but teaching in the same model is not valued in workload and merit considerations.”

<sup>35</sup> “The Administration does what they want in a way that hinders collaboration and which breeds mistrust.”

“The administration does what it feels is in its best interests at any given moment, without regard for transparency, furtherance of best interests of faculty/support for faculty being able to do their jobs best, or access to faculty.”

“I do not feel I have access to anything beyond the Dean level in my college....”

“The central administration (provost and president’s office establish priorities without buy-in from faculty and staff... The obsession with global and off-campus experiences does not necessarily align with the best interests of the students.”

“There is opportunity for more collaboration, better communication and support.”

<sup>36</sup> “...I would have strongly disagreed just a few months ago. I’m confident that things are changing in CPS. So far with the shifts in administration, I’ve had much more access and support.”

<sup>37</sup> “Often I have been assigned to rooms that barely have enough chairs for the students. This past semester I was in a room that had no desk for me to teach from (just a podium with media plugs). The cables for connecting to projectors are almost always too short, so that I have to shove a table into a tight corner just to connect my computer to the system.”

“Teaching spaces have improved dramatically. However, most teaching spaces that I’ve been assigned to are still using old technologies – a computer and projector. When do the Smartboards arrive? When can we have spaces in which students can sit in collaborative groups with table space on which to work? Students still have to balance laptops on small desk chairs while juggling other documents on their laps. When will teaching spaces be assigned with consideration for the specific needs of the course/ (Collaborations? Whiteboards accessible while the computer and projector are in use?)....”

“The facilities (practice rooms, studio space) for CAMD students are deplorable.”

“Some classrooms are downright embarrassing with old chalkboards, cobbled together A/V equipment and clunky software.....As a NTT faculty, if there were space and support for research, I would be more motivated to propose research projects for undergraduates – research that could eventually lead to publications, fellowships, and external funding or at the very least would increase interest in inquiry and the scientific enterprise, and who knows where that could lead?”

“...there is ZERO teaching space for innovative teaching methodologies such as TBL or PBL for large classes (>140 students). While we have a center to promote creative and evidence-based teaching, we don’t have appropriate classrooms designed to conduct LARGE class teachings in the model. Additionally, there is TREMENDOUS pressure to decrease instructor/student ratios in fall semester (for US News/Report) but not to promote true student learning. What’s the true mission...student learning or meeting metrics? And what do these really mean?”

“Currently struggling to obtain university support to update 15 year old AV in specific rooms in Behrakis. Other rooms have been updated however.”

<sup>38</sup> “Budget cuts are creating decrease quality of instruction. Lacking lab supplies and well trained TA’s to support student learning has been absent in the last 5 years.”

- 39 “We are not allowed teaching assistants (despite the fact that such individuals could help us extend our ‘reach’, help develop new instructors, and improve instruction for students in need of significant academic remediation.)”  
“Teaching upper division courses for non tenured faculty come with no support. Teaching lower discussion intro courses come with support. Makes no sense.”  
“There are significant needs for teaching assistants and graders that are not realize within the school of pharmacy.”  
“We need TAs and Graders, especially for larger classes – a huge loss of expensive faculty time!”  
“No graders allowed.”
- 40 “I have no idea what the Hybrid-RCM budget system is” “No clue” ?”What is Hybrid-RCM” (many more of the same)  
“From my perspective the model doesn’t allow for adequate acknowledgement of how many disciplines (particularly liberal arts and humanities) contribute to the vibrancy of the university and the well-rounded education of its students. And when RCM is combined with NU Path, many colleges jockey to keep their students from taking courses outside their college, the students’ potential detriment. In my view the Hybrid-RCM along with NU Path creates its own incentives and rewards, and becomes an accounting system that itself overpowers elements of the University’s stated mission.”  
“The hybrid model forces colleges to silo and look inward. This leads to less interdisciplinary work and also to lots of duplication of courses and programs because that is only way to fit into the budget model.”

**Table 1. Faculty Survey Results (>40% Dissatisfied)**

#	All Satisfied %	All Dissatisfied %
<b>Q2 - How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your compensation:</b>		
<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
Merit raises	43%	51%
Equity raises	36%	52%
How your salary keeps up with cost of living increases	40%	53%
University funding for your professional travel	35%	50%
University funding for your professional development	34%	51%
<b>Full-time Tenure Track</b>		
Merit raises	35%	42%
Equity raises	29%	50%
How your salary keeps up with cost of living increases	37%	57%
University funding for your professional travel	50%	44%
University funding for your professional development	50%	41%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
Merit raises	33%	56%
Equity raises	28%	47%
How your salary keeps up with cost of living increases	28%	60%
University funding for your professional development	40%	43%
<b>Q5 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements around appreciation of your work:</b>		
<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
The University/central administration values my research.	42%	42%
The University/central administration values my service.	43%	41%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
The University/central administration values my research.	31%	42%
<b>Q6 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements around promotion and advancement:</b>		
<b>Full-time Tenure Track</b>		
The promotion criteria are clear.	51%	40%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
The promotion criteria are clear.	47%	43%
<b>Q7 - How satisfied are you with support for the following aspects of interdisciplinary pursuits:</b>		
<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
Evaluations of interdisciplinary efforts in your unit	34%	41%
University budget/funding support for interdisciplinary teaching	19%	50%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
University budget/funding support for interdisciplinary teaching	19%	43%
<b>Q8 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements around University administration:</b>		
<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
I have direct access to any layer of university administration that I need.	32%	61%
The administration manages in a way that helps me do my work.	23%	63%
<b>Full-time Tenure Track</b>		
I have direct access to any layer of university administration that I need.	45%	45%
The administration manages in a way that helps me do my work.	33%	48%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
I have direct access to any layer of university administration that I need.	34%	48%
The administration manages in a way that helps me do my work.	35%	42%

**Table 1. Faculty Survey Results (>40% Dissatisfied)**

**Q9 - How satisfied are you with institutional support for the following:**

<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
Research (space, equipment, staff, dissemination costs, licensing and patenting costs.)	31%	55%
Teaching (space, equipment, supplies, licensing costs, etc.)	44%	45%
<b>Full-time Tenure Track</b>		
Research (space, equipment, staff, dissemination costs, licensing and patenting costs)	43%	54%
Teaching (space, equipment, supplies, licensing costs, etc.)	46%	49%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
Research (space, equipment, staff, dissemination costs, licensing and patenting costs)	30%	45%
Teaching (space, equipment, supplies, licensing costs, etc.)	43%	46%

**Q10 - How would you describe the impact of the Hybrid-RCM budget system on the following aspects of your job:**

<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
Research	14%	56%
Teaching	9%	62%
Overall goals of my unit	13%	71%
<b>Full-time Tenure Track</b>		
Research	16%	47%
Teaching	11%	63%
Overall goals of my unit	11%	56%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
Teaching	21%	48%
Overall goals of my unit	21%	54%

**Q11 - How satisfied are you with the following benefits:**

<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
Sabbatical (if applicable)	22%	41%

**Q12 - How satisfied are you with the following aspects of teaching:**

<b>Full-time Tenured</b>		
Availability of teaching assistants	36%	51%
Availability of graders	28%	51%
<b>Full-time Tenure Track</b>		
Classroom qualities	46%	49%
Availability of teaching assistants	38%	44%
<b>Full-time Non Tenure Track</b>		
Availability of teaching assistants	37%	52%
Availability of graders	33%	52%