



**Northeastern University**  
*Office of the Faculty Senate*

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Robert Hanson, Secretary, Faculty Senate  
SUBJECT: Minutes, 7 December 2016

---

Present: (Professors) Adams, Andrews, Bickmore, Brooks, Crittenden, Dencker, Fox, Hellweger, Hanson, Howard, Kanouse, Kelly, Kruger, Lerner, McOwen, Nelson, Nita-Rotaru, Ocampo-Guzman, Piret, Portz, Powers-Lee, Sceppa, Silbey, Sipahi, Vicino

Administrators: Bean, Ambrose, Courtney, He, Loeffelholz, Paul, Ziemer

Absent: (Professors) Barczak, Brodley, Frader, McGruer, Nyaga, Patterson  
(Administrators) Poiger, Hudson

I. **CONVENED.** Provost Bean convened the Senate at 11:46 AM

**II MINUTES**

- II.1 The minutes of 11/16/16 were approved as amended.
- II.2 The minutes of 11/30/16 were approved as amended.

**II. SAC REPORT**

- II.1 Professor Sceppa reported that SAC met three times since the last regular meeting of the Senate as well as once with the Provost.
- II.2 SAC is pleased to announce the election of Professor Gilbert Nayaga from DMSB to the Faculty Senate. Professor Nayaga will complete Professor Faleye's two-year term.
- II.3 Nominations for the Klein Lectureship are due on 12/8/16.
- II.4 SAC continues negotiations with the UCC on their proposed new Bylaws
- II.5 The HERI survey has been delivered. Please remind colleagues to complete this important survey.

**III. PROVOST'S REPORT**

- III.1 The LRP included most all input received at town meetings. Building a conference center was not included. Senate involvement in continuing development of the LRP is important as much of it is a trajectory of development rather than apropos of one project.
- III.2 A revised RCM model has been rolled out to the Deans and will be used during fiscal 18. It creates a budget for central administration with a more stable set of taxes on Schools and Colleges. The model is simplified but does not preclude more work in upcoming years.
- III.3 The new Academic Plan is in the prioritizing stage.

#### IV. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

- Professor Bickmore inquired when faculty will see the final LRP. Following some discussion on past practice, Professor Kruger assured the Provost that it was distributed to the Senate ten years ago.
- Professor Lerner inquired of the 20% tax on Colleges. The Provost explained that it is mostly distributed back to the Colleges. Some allocated costs however leave academics for other areas.
- Professor Sceppa asked for a presentation of the new RCM model in January; Vice Provost Rini agreed.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

##### V.1 INTERIM REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE FOR ACADEMIC POLICY

Professor Kanouse read a motion to accept the report into the record and it was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Professor Kaeli was recognized and reported that the interim report on workload is an update on progress to date. There is considerable variability on the definition of workload. Many policies did not include full-time non-tenure-track faculty and there are inconsistencies between colleges and units. The Committee perused the 2004 workload policy which was never incorporated into the Faculty Handbook (FHB) and is now twelve years old.

Professor Fox suggested that a workload policy must directly tie to merit. He noted, too, that merit is distributed on the calendar year but workload is based on academic year assignments. Professor Kaeli said that while the Committee discussed the latter issue, they did not resolve it.

Professor Hanson wondered if the alternative workload policy would be applicable into the future or would it need to be updated every five to ten years. Professor Kaeli explained that the Committee report defines a process rather than a specific policy.

Professor Andrews asked if there was to be a new process at the unit level. Professor Kaeli responded in the affirmative and that it must be consistent at the College Level. Provost Bean added that the Provost's Office would need to vet policies which proposed by faculty and approved by the Deans and the Provost. More discussion may be needed regarding the chain of responsibility. The Provost wondered if there might be privacy issues with having workloads available to all faculty. Professor Kaeli clarified that individual workloads would not be public, only workloads at the College level.

Brief discussion took place regarding the possible relationship of definitions to tenure and promotion and the need for consistency.

Professor Fox inquired whether the original university-wide two-course relief for new tenure-track faculty is still intact. Professor Kaeli said that the goal is to provide flexibility for variation among departments/colleges. Professor Kruger said that the 2004 policy provided a floor and suggested that a University-wide minimum be retained.

Jeremy Paul liked the framework approach but noted that there are some things which set policies. Dana Brooks suggested that this had both peer and hierarchical elements. Professor Kaeli responded that there is a process and set of elements which could be included in consideration of the policy.

## V.2 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE FOR FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

Professor Adams read a motion to accept the report and it was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Professor Adams presented the Committee's report on university-wide match mates which are Colonial Group plus three approved by the Board of Trustees based on recommendations from external consultants. These have been more or less stable over past three to five years. The purpose of match mates is to provide reference points in comparing salaries across the University. The match mate quality is good; they are now peers rather than aspirant universities. Cost-of-living (CoL) is an issue as the Boston area is high. Another problem is the manner in which salaries are reported: median versus mean. More subtle are mean salaries among colleges which are ranked higher with lower salaries. When corrected for CoL, things change: rather than being sixth, NU is now fifth from the bottom. There is no universal way to adjust for CoL; the Committee averaged the CoL corrected and the uncorrected salary.

Another more subtle effect is who is included in the data and how different faculty groups are categorized. Many universities hire substantial numbers of full-time non-tenure-track faculty whose salaries are considerably less than tenured and tenure-track faculty. There is a wide variety of titles and categories and further categories within those. The AAUP recording system has merely five categories into which all faculty members must fit. "Instructors" may include all full-time non-tenure-track faculty, such as at Northeastern University, but what do other universities do? NU has the highest percentage of "instructors". Professor Adams visited the websites of those with very low percentages of "instructors" and found that what NU labels an "instructor", those institutions put in a different category. The inference is that their classifications have artificially lowered their average salaries. This seems obvious when reviewing highly ranked institutions where salaries are lower.

Dean Paul noted that NU's mix includes business, engineering, and others. Professor Adams responded that there are college-specific match mates but NU does use them.

Professor Adams reported that the average tenured/tenure-track salary at NU is \$137,600 whereas "instructor" salaries average \$76,000 constituting 29.7% of the total.

Professor Fox noted that data on CoL on the metropolitan area outside of Boston can make a difference.

Professor Adams suggested that, when reevaluating college-specific match mates in the future, institutions which report data in a similar manner to NU should be chosen.

Total faculty compensation: The past year saw a 9.4% increase in the enhanced medical plan and 9.4% in dental. This affects raises. In addition, co-pays have increased.

#### V.2.1FAC RESOLUTION #1

Professor Adams read the following and Professor Crittenden seconded.

***BE IT RESOLVED That the funds for the salary increase for promotions (currently 10%) are funded at the University level separately from the merit and equity pool in each college/school.***

Professor Adams explained that it is misleading to report that the merit pool is 3% when it includes promotion. The Provost explained that the challenge is that central money is non-recurring. The deans are supportive of removing promotion monies from the raise pool for the first year. Professor Adams noted that the promotion pool includes full-time non-tenure-track faculty.

Professor Crittenden expressed support for the idea that the Provost take 10% from the funds allocated [by the Board of Trustees] and distribute the remainder to the Schools and Colleges. The Provost was not sanguine that this is consistent with the wording of the resolution.

Professor Fox motioned to amend by substitution "funded at the University level separately from the merit and equity pool in each college/school" with "funded at the university level from the raise pool approved by the Board of Trustees." The motion was seconded.

Professor Adams asked what the BOT's nomenclature for these monies is and the Provost reported that they approve a percentage to be spent on salaries. He also

noted that every College would have same raise pool under the amendment wording.

VOTE to amend by substitution: PASSED, 29-0-0.

Professor Bickmore made a motion to amend by deletion the word "currently" and this was seconded. Professor Adams spoke against by explaining that it was not the intention of the FAC to dictate what that percentage [for promotion] should be. Ten percent is recognized practice.

VOTE to amend by deletion the word "currently": FAILED, 3-22-1.

There being no further discussion, the vote was called. As amended, the motion is:

***BE IT RESOLVED That the funds for the salary increase for promotions (currently 10%) be funded at the University level from the raise pool approved by the Board of Trustees.***

VOTE on the motion as amended: PASSED, 26-0-0.

#### V.2.2FAC RESOLUTION #2

Professor Adams read the following and it was seconded:

***BE IT RESOLVED That the recommended raise pool for merit and equity (with promotion excluded) for fiscal year 2018 is 4.0% of continuing salaries beginning on July 1, 2017.***

GA presented the Committee's rationale noting that salaries are merely 13% of budget.

Due to the time, a motion to adjourn was offered, seconded and passed.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT:** 1:25 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Hanson, Secretary, Faculty Senate