



Northeastern University
Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Robert Hanson, Secretary, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Minutes, 17 February 2016

Present: (Professors) Adams, Andrews, Barczak, Bickmore, Caligiuri, Cokely, Crittenden, Daynard, Devlin, Hanson, Hellweger, Howard, Kelly, Kruger, Lerner, Leslie, Ocampo-Guzman, Patterson, Piret, Portz, Sceppa, Suci, Vicino, Young
(Administrators) Ambrose, Bean, Aubry, Brodley, Courtney, Hudson, Loeffelholz, Poiger, Reynolds, Tilly

Absent: (Professors) Brooks, Gouldstone, Hajjar, Kanouse, McOwen, Nelson,

I. CONVENED: 11:44 AM

II. MINUTES: 1/27 minutes were approved as written.

III. SAC REPORT

III.1 Professor Sceppa reported that SAC met three times since the last Senate meeting. SAC has also met with the Provost once, with the senior leadership team once and with two representatives from the Student Government Association. A meeting with representatives from the Graduate Student Government is scheduled soon. SAC will meet with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees on 3/17.

III.2 Senate elections have been scheduled beginning 23 February. SAC members will be making brief presentations and answering questions just prior to the elections.

III.3 Excellence in Teaching Awards and Klein Lectureship Award selection committees are now meeting to make final selections.

III.4 Dates for the 2016-2017 Senate meetings are as follows. These will be on the website soon.

September 21
October 5 and 19
November 2 and 16
December 7
January 18
February 1 and 15
March 1 and 22
April 5, 19 and 26

III.5 SAC has been authorized to convene a chair search committee for the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology in the College of Science. This is an external & internal search. An election is scheduled.

IV. PROVOST'S REPORT

IV.1 Provost Bean reported that he has spent considerable time learning about and discussing the merit increase process, resulting in more familiarity and has gained appreciation for the intent. He noted that the motion passed on 9 December, which

encouraged units to formalize procedures for consideration of merit, which should have been underway all along. Processes have not been audited since the 1990s. The Provost is developing set of rubrics as to what kinds of things he will consider when looking at proposals for increases. The entire matter is complicated so the Provost is reluctant to make changes before understanding the impact, although he is in agreement with SAC that rewriting is needed.

- V. ACADEMIC PROGRAM PROPOSAL: Professor Cokely read the following and it was seconded (Professor Leslie):

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the BS in Professional Communication in the College of Professional Studies as approved by the UUC on 8 October 2015.

Dean LaBrie was recognized and explained that the CPS undergraduate program is a result of their change in semester, conversation with faculty, the needs of students, and conversations with CAMD and others. Special Advisor for Undergraduate Education Pantalone noted that CPS is assuring that such programs focus on adult students.

There were no questions.

VOTE: PASSED, 32-0-0

- VI. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS RESOLUTION

Professor Adams addressed the resolution of 9 December which was postponed to 17 February. He explained the different functions and procedures of merit and equity, the relevant Faculty Handbook sections, and noted the clear parameter that merit procedures are the prerogative of the faculty. Merit is performed without regard to current salaries, is performed on annual basis, and is intended to be an increment on salary. Equity is to address salary inconsistencies that happen over time.

The recommendation of an 85/15 split between merit and equity contains no magic formula and is based on data collected for the past four academic years. For the last six academic years the annual raise pool provided only 1/3 devoted to merit.

Professor Daynard, noting that one of the purposes of equity is to address market trends, asked whether the resolution would prevent modifications in situations where a different may be required. Professor Adams responded that the wording indicates a default but does not prohibit modification when needed.

Professor Lerner asked the reason for impact changes over the years. Professor Adams responded that the last four years did not indicate obvious change. Provost Bean added that many faculty members were hired in the last six years.

The Provost expressed concern in several areas: 1) if department faculties are unfair among themselves, how does this become rectified? Response: this is not typically an issue; 2) A single tier of subjective evaluation does not acknowledge that a dean may have more relevant input than faculty. Professor Adams submitted that typically the department chair is a member of the review committee and would provide the added information. In addition, there is nothing to prevent a department chair from speaking with the dean. Professor Adams suggested that these are overstated difficulties.

Professor Kruger asked if there had been a broader discussion about the entire merit process, or just concerning the proposed split. Professor Adams confirmed that the discussion was focused on the split only. Historically, before one-third of the raise pool went to equity, a 3% raise pool resulted in no remaining funds for merit. This proposal is a reasonable guide. Professor Adams noted the excellent collaborative process between the FAC and the Provost.

Further debate concerned how current market pressure drives what is needed and the perception that control over merit was lost due to the large equity pool. Professor Adams noted that the tendency to associate merit with cost-of-living is not the intent, rather, merit provides difference in reward based on performance. The recent trend toward a larger equity pool was done in lieu of merit which is not the intent of FHB. Dean Tilly said that the equity process must be defined beforehand. Professor Adams noted that considerations for equity are stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Young wondered if faculty departures could be attributed to salary and Vice Provost Loeffelholz responded that those matters are responded to and NU faculty members are in demand.

Dean Tilly noted that the Faculty Handbook discusses “when” but not the “how” of equity. Professor Adams said that in recent years this has been handled by the dean with the department chair. At DMSB, faculty members pass along their concerns to the dean by letter.

Professor Suciu noted that the raise results are too narrow and better distribution might address this. The Provost noted that this matter is being investigated as the Faculty Handbook states that merit must be broad.

Following further brief discussion, Professor Adams read the following and it was seconded:

BE IT RESOLVED That, although the percentage of the raise pool devoted to merit may vary among the academic departments (or the relevant academic unit where departments do not exist), it should be clearly defined and communicated to the faculty. It is proposed that merit not be less than 85% of the raise pool in any department/unit with the difference (no greater than 15%) going to equity.

VOTE: PASSED, 15-13-4

Provost Bean noted that the deans have quite a bit of concern about this and that, even if they do not go along with the proposed split, the conversation has been helpful. There is a fundamental difference of opinion about control of money. The Senate has delivered on its responsibilities to help make improvements.

VII. ACADEMIC PLANNING

Provost Bean noted that much information has been garnered at town hall meetings and thanked the steering committee. He turned the meeting over to Vice Provost Loeffelholz. Turn gavel over to Carmen to adjourn to presentation.

A motion to *adjourn for a group activity* was passed.

ADJOURN 12:37 PM

NB: Information gathered during the group exercise will be posted to the Provost's Academic Plan website by the end of the week.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Hanson, Secretary
Faculty Senate