



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

**TO:** FACULTY SENATE  
**FROM:** Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary

**SUBJECT:** Minutes, 9 January, 2019

Present: (Professors) Adams, Barberis, Bart, Beauchesne, Bourns, Brooks, Carr, Cisewski, Dau, Desnoyers, Dyal-Chand, Ergun, Erdogmus, Gonyeau, Hayward, Herlihy, Kaeli, Kelly, Kevoe Feldman, Lerner, McOwen, Onan, Powers-Lee, Shefelbine, Stowell, Vicino, Wahl, Wertheim, Wood

Administrators: Bean, Echambadi, Hackney, He, Isaacs, Loeffelholz, Poiger, Ronkin, Wadia-Fascetti

Absent: (Professors) Stephens

(Administrators) Parish

**CALL TO ORDER:** Provost Bean convened Senate at 11:48 a.m.

**MINUTES** of 28 November were approved.

**I. SAC REPORT January 9, 2019**

Welcome to new senators:

- Michelle Carr, CAMD
- Michael Gonyeau, BCHS
- David Herlihy, CAMD

Since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met 4 times. One meeting included Provost Bean and focused on the Faculty Handbook Compensation module.

**Compensation Module Acknowledgements**

Faculty Handbook Review Committee:

- Rhonda Board, BCHS
- Nancy Kindelan, CAMD
- Marina Leslie, CSSH
- Jessica Silbey, SOL

2016/17 SAC:

- Carmen Sceppa, Chair
- Timothy Bickmore
- Louis Kruger
- Neal Lerner
- Robert Hanson
- Antonio Ocampo-Guzman

2017/18 SAC:

- Susan Powers-Lee, Chair
- Peter Desnoyers
- Robert Hanson
- Elizabeth Howard
- Nicol McGruer
- Jennie Stephens

## Informational Items for the Senate from the Graduate Council

Pilot of a flexible, non-cohort-based version of the CPS Doctor of Law and Policy Program at the Seattle campus

- Will continue the current 2-year program
- Will pilot the option of taking fewer courses per term, allowing more time to complete, and reducing the work experience requirement to 3 years (from 10)
- No changes in curriculum

Inactivation of the BCHS Occupational Ergonomics and Health MS Program

SAC is working with departments/colleges on staffing 3 search committees:

- Applied Psychology Chair (internal search)
- Chemical Engineering Chair (external & internal search)
- Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Chair (external & internal search)

Administrator Evaluations Completed. Thanks to the 5 Evaluation Teams

- Carla Brodley, Dean, CCIS:
  - Paula Caligiuri (DMSB), Ryan Cordell (CSSH), Hicham Fenniri (COE)
- Ken Henderson, Dean, COS:
  - Hanchen Huang (COE), Susan Roberts (BCHS), Ron Sandler (CSSH)
- Anthony Braga, Director, School of Criminology & Criminal Justice:
  - Ennio Mingolla (BCHS), Magy Seif El-Nasr (CCIS/CAMD)
- José Buscaglia, Chair, Cultures, Societies and Global Studies:
  - Tad Hirsch (CAMD), Dana Brooks (COE)
- Mike Pollastri, Chair, Chemistry and Chemical Biology:
  - Emanuela Barberis (COS), Sumner Barenberg (COE)

Thanks also to the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC)!

- George Alverson (COS)
- Elizabeth Dillon (CSSH)
- Jacqueline Isaacs (COE Dean's Office)
- Carmen Sceppa (BCHS Dean's Office)
- Thomas Wahl (CCIS)
- Deniz Erdogmus, SAC liaison

## II. PROVOST REPORT:

The Provost noted the appointment of Deanna Raineri as Vice Provost for Digital Learning and Mobility Strategy. She will largely be taking on the online experiential learning which is the distance learning function and N.U.in function. Vice President Raineri comes from being the number two person at Coursera. Prior to that, she was in charge of all online programs at University of Illinois where she had earlier been a tenure track Chemistry professor. She brings a very strong traditional academic background along with a lot of experience with one of the highest regarded online learning organizations. She is taking a fresh look at N.U.in right now and coming up with quality aggressive models.

The New College of the Humanities partnership is still going well as we work through red tape in the UK. Right now working on the first program which is a program on Information Ethics. The Provost noted he was glad to see the compensation module brought forward.

The Provost also noted the first pairing of students with co-op opportunities using Co-op Evolution had finished. It was successful in terms of student placements. A vast majority of students were happy to

be able to choose from opportunities across the university. While a more detailed report will be issued at a later date, one number that was notable was that 47% of students placed got jobs for this January that were not from their home college.

### **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

Prof. Adams asked regarding the 47% number if those were placements or offers. Provost Bean noted that his understanding was that percentage represents placements. He noted that the Faculty Senate's Co-op Evolution Evaluation Committee will have exact details when they present a report to the senate at a later date.

Prof. Adams asked if it was true the university is claiming the FTNTTF are managerial employees and are not eligible for unionization. Provost Bean said he has not been involved in those discussions in detail. He said that reasoning is an argument that has been made in those areas and had been settled by previous NLRB's. The provost said he doesn't think the discussions have gotten to the point yet where the university would make that claim. This would be at the NLRB level and that has not occurred yet.

Prof. Kelly wondered about the rationale for the email that was circulated to all FTNTT faculty that discusses union efforts. Prof. Kelly asked why the administration was intervening. Provost Bean stated the administration was not intervening but that the referenced email raises pertinent points for consideration.

Prof. Cisewski noted that the COS NTTF would be proposing a town hall meeting to discuss the pros and cons of having a union. They will be inviting all NTTF.

### **III. PRESENTATION BY Dan Cohen, Vice Provost for Information Collaboration and Dean,**

#### **University Library:**

“What's New at the Library: An Update on Services and Platforms, Open Educational Resources and Collections, and Renovated Space”

### **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION IN CONJUNCTION WITH PRESENTATION:**

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

Prof. Kaeli asked how the library was addressing one of the concerns of students which was the course packs with a one time cost. Dean Cohen said that the library now has a digital repository which a lot of professors are using for their supplemental materials. A lot of text book sites link to these things.

Prof. Brooks asked if there were video lectures available. Dean Cohen responded that if a faculty person finds a video lecture they would want to use, the library can link to it from the Leganto system. (There is an introductory Quick-Start Guide on the Snell Library website for this course reading list tool.)

Prof. Kevoe asked who would faculty contact to seek out help with open resources? Dean Cohen said that the first point of contact should be the subject librarian for a professor's department or school. The subject librarian can help a faculty person integrate these materials more seamlessly into a syllabus. Dean Cohen said faculty should also feel free to reach out to him. He added the feedback from students was wildly positive. Students feel they see the efforts around open source materials as a good faith effort by the university to help students out.

Prof. Kevoe followed up with another question asking how do faculty find the quality for the open educational resources. Dean Cohen said faculty would not take advantage of the system if they didn't feel the quality was good.

#### **IV. ELECTION FOR SAC MEMBER TO REPLACE PROFESSOR JACK DENNERLEIN, BCHS**

Prof. Neal Lerner nominated Prof. Lorna Hayward (BCHS) who accepted the nomination. Prof. Dave Kaeli nominated Prof. Thomas Wahl (KCCIS) who accepted the nomination.

After all votes were tabulated, Prof. Lorna Hayward (BCHS) was selected to join SAC.

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **FACULTY HANDBOOK RESOLUTION: COMPENSATION (PROFESSOR POWERS-LEE)**

Prof. Sue Powers-Lee read the following and Prof. Neal Lerner seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED that the proposed module entitled "Compensation" replace the current module entitled "Compensation".**

Prof. Powers-Lee yielded the floor to the Handbook Committee chair, Prof. Rhonda Board who identified herself as chair for two years (2016-2017, 2017-2018) and identified fellow members Prof. Jessica Silbey and Prof. Marina Leslie. Prof. Board noted that when the Committee was first charged Prof. Carmen Sceppa was the SAC Chair. She noted that the committee spent about a year and a half on the Compensation module before finally sending the module to SAC in February, 2017. She said the primary goal with this module was to look at the merit evaluation and make it more substantive and more transparent and to make sure the process was clear for both faculty and administrators. She said the committee also wanted to preserve the equitable considerations in the module and that they were asked to streamline them. The draft before the Faculty Senate largely honors the final draft the committee submitted but Prof. Board noted there were some differences that the committee wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate.

The first item not included in the draft version is on p. 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (under Communication of Merit Evaluation, a. Academic Unit Level). The committee's original module stipulated that faculty would also be told what their unit head had recommended for salary increase. The committee had that in the paragraph that starts "At least one week prior to the point when....". The committee also had that in the paragraph that starts "At the same time, all faculty members....". Prof. Board asked if SAC or someone could say why that salary determination has been deleted.

Provost Bean responded that the deletion was a result of a substantial discussion. It is the peer group in a department that makes assessments of the achievements in research, teaching, and service, and the initial recommendations of salary increases. Those go forward to the dean. In the provost's office, they don't consider that there is a raise recommendation until final approval by their office. The countering alteration now says for the first time that if a dean changes the recommendations from the department that must be communicated to the provost's office so that they can look at the pattern of changes. In the past, the provost's office would get recommendations from the deans that may not be the same as the department chair and they didn't know that they were changed. Now the whole series of recommendations – the chair's and the dean's -- will go up for review at the provost's office.

Prof. Board said she believed the original module that is online does have salary recommendations in there. So basically what is being taken out is faculty ever knowing what raise their unit head

recommended. Faculty are pulled out of the process. Provost Bean disagreed saying, no they are still making salary recommendations up through the process. Prof. Board responded that faculty are not being notified what those salary recommendations are so faculty won't know until they get their letter. Provost Bean responded that what they might be told throughout could be very different from what they get in their letter.

Prof. Board said that is the transparency the committee had put in there, because they wanted faculty to see what their peer group (whatever that committee is called in each unit) and unit head think in terms of the overall evaluation and recommendations for salary increase before it went to the college level, since at the college level there could be changes that are counter to what the unit recommended. Provost Bean said that the actual raise is a function of a number of things that your peer faculty don't have any reason to know about; things such as whether faculty have been involved in other colleges or institutes. The foundational component is what your peers determine. The job of the dean and provost office is to make sure all that is integrated.

Prof. Board stated that the second point of difference was that Provost level appeal had been an option for both merit and equity and that is now removed.

Prof. Board stated that a third point of difference was that an intended footnote is missing that noted base contracts might contain salary arrangements for extra compensation that would supersede the general handbook statement on salary for extra compensation.

Prof. Brooks asked how the timing and process will work with separation of equity and merit raises?

Provost Bean responded that in the budget letter that he and Tom Nedell send each year to the deans, they recommend how much of the raise pool should be held out for equity. Last year, the recommendation was 10%. The deans have some flexibility in deciding what they actually hold back. The new legislation, consistent with the old legislation, has a maximum of 15% of the raise pool being used for equity. The deans would hold that out for equity raises and rest would be part of the merit pool. Discussion with SAC and the deans indicated that the merit and equity processes are currently so stacked on top of each other that there just isn't time for the desired appeal timing.

The Provost recognized Prof. Silbey, who said, the equity process is defined as only every three years. The Provost said there are equity applications every year. Prof. Powers-Lee noted there are two approaches to equity, and one can happen every year in every unit. Prof. Silbey thought this needed to be clarified.

Prof. Lerner offered that perhaps in the interest of clarity that sentence could read "a request for equity adjustment may be made on an annual basis." A friendly amendment to insert the phrase "on an annual basis" into the sentence in question was proposed by Prof. Hayward. Prof. Lerner seconded. The friendly amendment was accepted.

As amended, the sentence now reads (p. 4 - B. Equity, 1. Process, par. 4):

A request for equity adjustment may be made **on an annual basis** by a college dean, a unit head, or an individual faculty member based on factors above (B.1.a-f).

Prof. Wertheim asked about the role of the unit head. Prof. Vicino added that, as a unit head, he thought it was somewhat unclear what the role of the peer evaluation committee was and what the role of the unit head was. Can the unit head reach an independent recommendation from whatever the merit committee decides? Does the recommendation leave the merit committee and go to the unit head? In most units, the unit head serves on that committee.

Provost Bean responded that in some colleges, yes, and in some colleges, no.

Prof. Hayward noted that in her department appeals are made to the committee of peers that do the merit review. Appeals don't go back to the unit head. It is a peer to peer process. In response to Prof. Hayward's comment, Prof. Board noted, while the committee kept the process broad, the academic unit heads are supposed to be part of the process. The committee wanted to make sure there was peer involvement and unit head involvement, but left it up to the unit how that would be done.

Prof. Herlihy asked if this module applied to FTNTTF or if this is only for FTTTF, because there is language in the document that states salary data is pulled from college matchmates, but this data set would not include FTNTTF. Provost Bean responded that the policy did apply to all faculty. He added that they were wrestling with issue of FTNTTF data on a national level.

Prof. Adams noted that, in the current module, the faculty in a unit have a procedure for translating merit into dollar amount or percentage raises, and that is no longer present in the draft module. He recommended that this feature be retained to avoid reducing the role of faculty in merit raises.

The Provost recognized Deb Franko, who noted that the paragraph on p.2, #2, the second paragraph demonstrates faculty are very involved in how, for their particular unit, the merit process will work. She added, it certainly was not the intention to pull faculty out of the process, but to keep faculty working together.

Professor Silbey emphasized that the original departmental merit committee determination was the anchoring of that original determination. At each level there would be more information added for consideration. It became hard for the committee to figure out how to protect transparency, both up and down, for what would be eventually added or subtracted. What we understand the reality to be is that transparency is not going to be perfect. The salary part is gone in this version. The qualitative metrics' transparency is very much in this document.

Noting the time, Prof. Bean asked for either a calling of the question or a motion to table discussion until the next meeting. Prof. Adams moved to table discussion until the Jan. 23<sup>rd</sup> Faculty Senate meeting. Prof. Gonyeau seconded the motion.

The VOTE to table discussion PASSED 37-0-0.