



Northeastern University

Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary
SUBJECT: Minutes, 23 January 2019

Present: Professors Adams, Barberis, Bart, Bourns, Brooks, Carr, Cisewski, Dau, Desnoyers, Dyal-Chand, Ergun, Erdogmus, Herlihy, Kaeli, Lerner, McOwen, Onan, Powers-Lee, Shefelbine, Stephens, Stowell, Vicino, Wahl, Wertheim, Wood
Administrators: Bean, Echambadi, Hackney, He, Isaacs, Loeffelholz, Parish, Poiger, Wadia-Fascetti

Absent: Professors Beauchesne, Gonyeau, Hayward, Kelly, Kevoe Feldman
Administrators: Ronkin

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Bean convened Senate at 11:46 a.m.

MINUTES of 9 January 2019 were approved.

1. SAC REPORT 23 January 2019

- Since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met 3 times.
- One meeting included the Handbook Committee and one included Provost Bean, with both focused on the Faculty Handbook Compensation module.
- Shortly after determining the Feb. 1 distribution of full-time faculty (as mandated by the Faculty Senate Bylaws), we'll be informing the colleges of the 2019/2020 distribution of elected senators.

Informational Items from the Graduate Council:

- The KCCIS Information Science (IS) minor and four combined majors involving IS have been inactivated.
- IS & Business Administration
- IS & Cognitive Psychology
- IS & Environmental Science
- Computer Science & IS
- Inactivation of the parent Information Science major is one of today's agenda items.
- CCIS faculty approved this set of changes on 10/21/18 by a vote of 41-12.
- The rationale is that new Data Science options are a better fit to student interests.

Search Committee - Applied Psychology Chair (internal search)

- Jessica Edwards George (Applied Psychology)
- Judith Hall (COS)
- Chieh Li (Applied Psychology)
- William Sanchez (Applied Psychology; Chair)
- Lichuan Ye (Nursing)

Search Committee - Chemical Engineering Chair (external/internal search)

- Mansoor Amiji (Pharmaceutical Sciences, BCHS)
- Lucas Landherr (Chemical Engineering)

- Carolyn Lee-Parsons (Chemical Engineering)
- Lee Makowski (Bioengineering)
- Richard West (Chemical Engineering)

Search Committees

- SAC is working with departments/colleges on staffing 3 additional search committees:
- Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Chair (external & internal search)
- English Chair (internal search for a designated candidate)
- Sociology & Anthropology Chair (internal search for a designated candidate)
- We are also working with Provost Bean on staffing the COE Dean Search Committee.

2. PROVOST REPORT

The Provost noted two recent announcements that communicated the departures of Vice President Philly Mantella and of Dean Aubry of the COE. Vice President Mantella has been appointed president of Grand Valley State University in Michigan. The Provost wished Vice President Mantella well as he noted her 18 years of innovation at Northeastern. Dean Aubry has been appointed Provost of Tufts University. Both of these assignments begin officially on July 1.

The Provost said he is working with SAC to begin the process of selecting Dean Aubry’s successor. He will meet next week with the leadership in the COE to invite them and members of the COE community to offer suggestions for the position of interim dean. The Provost said he hopes to have the search committee, job description and search firm in place by the end of the academic year and hope to start interviewing by September.

Regarding V. P. Mantella’s position, the Provost said there will not be a replacement in the current structure. Instead, they will be looking at what has evolved over the last few years between the traditional schools and the many elements that have been developed through the LLN organization.

The Provost is hoping to have the organizational structure ready to release next week. One aspect of the new organizational structure is that CPS will join the Provost’s Office along with the other colleges.

The Provost noted that the President has remarked that every challenge is an opportunity. He added Northeastern is clearly being seen as a leader in the new models in higher education as other institutions are starting to look at us for their leadership needs and try to understand how we do things here at NU.

Questions and Discussions

Prof. Adams wanted to clarify that the role of the search firm for the COE dean search will strictly be an assisting role.

Provost Bean responded that there are some search firms that have a very strong opinion about who should be hired, and there are others who take a look at the institution and try to understand who would be a good fit. The process will be a continuous conversation between the provost office, the search committee and the search firm.

Prof. Brooks offered that when he served on the search committee for Dean Aubry, the search firm was very helpful. Provost Bean added that particular firm will be considered seriously this time as well.

3. PRESENTATION BY DAVID LUZZI, SENIOR VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH

Research Enterprise Services at Northeastern – Vision, Accomplishments, and Plans

The presentation was tabled until a later date due to Vice Provost Luzzi’s travel complications.

4. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Dean Loeffelholz read the following and Prof. Lerner seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in Human Resource Management in the College of Professional Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on 5 December 2018 (8-0-1).

The Senate voted to establish the Master of Science in Human Resource Management: PASSED 33-0-0.

- B. Professor Desnoyers read the following and Prof. Erdogmus seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University inactivate the Bachelor of Science in Information Science in the Khoury College of Computer and Information Sciences as approved by the UUC on 28 November 2018 (13-0-0).

The Senate voted to inactivate the Bachelor of Science in Information Science: PASSED 33-0-0.

5. CONTINUED BUSINESS

Professor Sue Powers-Lee read the following and Prof. Brooks seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED that the proposed module entitled “Compensation” replace the current module entitled “Compensation”.

Provost Bean acknowledged Prof. Board. He added that he does not understand the base contract language, and that there seems to be a wide variety of opinions about separating merit from equity.

Prof. Board thanked SAC for revisions to the module saying a lot of meaningful transparency was added based on feedback from the Faculty Handbook Committee and comments from the last Senate meeting. Regarding the base contract said that comes from the original module, footnote number 1. She said the base contract refers to what the faculty person was hired to do. The Handbook Committee wanted to keep compensation tied to base contract so that it didn't keep changing from year to year based on the letter that comes out in July.

Provost Bean noted that the contract is a finite entity and a new contract could have different terms. He wondered how an expired contract could remain in force. Provost Bean asked if they were saying the University could never change course loads.

Prof. Board said no, but that a change would have to be an agreement between the unit head and the faculty member.

Dean Poiger added that current contracts specify that departmental and college teaching loads are subject to change. So that is now what all faculty are signing and so references to the base contract are very problematic.

Dean Loeffelholz noted that she was hired under quarters.

Referencing the work done on the Workload Module, Provost Bean said that it seemed that should be the basis that should be considered. He added that personally he would not be able to support this without OGC commenting on whether a base contract has any validity today at all.

Prof. Board said looking at p.3, number 3, the third paragraph under Academic Unit, there was positive transparency about having the entire faculty of a unit see the range of salary recommendations in their unit. She added the committee was still questioning why there was not the same transparency to the individual faculty member of their own salary recommendation.

Finally, based upon comments from the last time, the Provost is still being left out of appeals processes at both merit and equity. She said the Handbook Committee had suggested adding some language that would say *except in unusual circumstances, the Dean's decision is final*. Some statement that would add justifiable circumstances that would allow an appeal up to the Provost.

The Provost responded that he thought that language was left out because at the Provost Office they don't feel they know disciplinary issues better than the colleges, and this could amount to 150 appeals cases winding up in the Provost Office. He added that he thought it was valid for appeals of the process to go to the Provost Office. Such language is in the module on p. 4 under number 4 the last paragraph.

Prof. Lerner said it makes him wonder what the role of the grievance procedure is.

Provost Bean said the addition of the process appeal to the provost was because of an example this past year that went the grievance route and wound up in the Provost's Office. He added for exceptional cases, there is always the grievance process.

Prof. Board said that the only other comment the Handbook Committee had involved the timing of the letter going to faculty. The Committee had originally put one month before the new fiscal year. Now there is no timeline as to when faculty will get their letter with their new salary. Provost Bean said the issue there was the implementability of the timeline not any disagreement with the concept. It was considered an unworkable limit.

Prof. Board said maybe a statement could be added so that people understand that even if they sign the contract, they can still appeal even though the next day might be July 1st. The Provost asked if faculty felt that once they had signed the contract, they would have no appeal? Prof. Herlihy said as a matter of contract law, once you have signed it, you have accepted the offer. Prof. Dyal-Chand suggested a friendly amendment that would say clarify this for the faculty.

The Provost suggested the following - *Signing your contract for July 1 does not eliminate any of the appeals in this document*. He said he would have no problem with that.

Dean Poiger said as far as she sees, the current document allows for 3 appeals procedures. It allows for the appeals of the merit scores, the salary number and equity decision. She urged that the Senate think about a more simplified process. She said this proposal has departments and colleges thinking about salaries from about February to November. She added she didn't consider that healthy for a university culture.

She said she was concerned with the length and workability of these processes. She said she also remains unsure as to why merit scores and salary numbers are grievable since salaries are confidential. She asked for clarification on what was the intention of such a 2nd grievance process. And she added that she she would still like to hear clear explanation of the distinction between equity and merit.

Provost Bean said we had gotten ourselves into a situation where the words equity and merit were being used in

very non-traditional ways. He added that the Handbook Committee did a great job readdressing merit as to what it should be -- the primary part of the raise that is a layered process with input from peers, deans and provost office. Since that is a complicated process, the transparency passed along is an important addition. He added equity should now return to what it should be that is an opportunity to review a salary over several years and if necessary, adjust it. The process in the new way should be 90% on merit and all layers should be involved in making that merit determination. But also be involved in equity discussions to the extent possible. That should now be a small part for special corrections.

Prof. Kaeli said as part of the merit evaluation, faculty committees are formed and come up with recommendations that the unit head takes forward. They are not assessing equity in any way. So having a process that at some later stage mixes those two without the visibility of seeing what goes forward out of the unit or what comes back down from the dean is confusing to faculty. He added separating these two and having merit handled separately, cleans up the process.

Prof. Vicino wondered about the 10 month time period.

Prof. Bournes noted that NTTF don't get the matchmate data. Provost Bean said they are working with the Colonial Group to get a set of data for FTNTTF. He said it will be another year before we get there.

Provost Bean said what he was hearing was that different cultures between different colleges in what equity means there and so this is a good conversation to hold.

Dean Poiger invited others to comment on the practicality on separating these processes and how they see it working for their college or unit.

Prof. Dyal Chand said that regarding the 10 month piece, that was a number that seemed right but not one that any constituency was wedded to. She added the temporal and substantive separation of merit and equity combined with increased transparency will give both administrators and faculty a better understanding of the situation.

Provost Bean asked what would people think of proposal to go either way in a college based on college's choice.

Prof. Brooks suggested equity requests happen every three years.

Prof. Lerner said he supported Prof. Brooks idea that equity requests happen every 3 years. Provost Bean added, with new data every time.

Prof. Lerner said in terms of the timing, his sense was that some Deans were feeling too rushed and so leaving it up to the college to make that call, makes some sense.

Dean Loeffelholz said the operational issues that impinge upon retroactive letters and salary adjustments may be problematic from an HR operations perspective.

Prof. Kaeli said he had been a unit head as an Associate Dean and had seen the amount of pressure and the timelines that merit/equity decisions are done under. The amount of time is not enough to do this in a thoughtful way. He agrees that maybe for each unit, we allow the unit some flexibility.

Provost Bean said that similar to the workload policy, each unit would have to submit to the Business Office their process for doing this.

Dean Poiger said she was quite worried about this. She said units are very diverse and that they reach equity at the college level, not at the unit level.

Provost Bean said there was never an attempt to make units handle this. It was meant to be at the college level and

so a college would have to submit a plan not a unit.

Prof. Adams noted that merit is year to year and equity more long term.

Provost Bean asked if the Senate was comfortable going to the equity-once-every-3-years model? This way all equity considerations are done based on new data in the year a college receives new data. He added that joint appointments can be easily handled by declaring that equity requests are done through the tenure home college.

In response to a straw vote there was a strong majority that seemed to agree that we should go for every 3rd year.

How many would prefer their equity be temporally aligned – approx. 10 hands raised. How many would prefer their equity be temporally separate – approx. 6 hands raised. How many flexible by college – approx. 8 hands raised.

After these results, the Provost said there seemed to be advice to the committee that we allow separation and that the committee can discuss whether we require separation.

Provost Bean asked what about the base contract topic? Prof. Lerner proposed that the footnote tie to the workload policy. A straw vote indicated strong support towards workload policy. (There were no votes for the base contract.)

Prof. Carr noted the removal of language that said if you teach above and beyond your contract it was 1/6 of your salary. Now it says it is per the guidelines. She asked if those guidelines are somewhere that faculty can access? She added for Dialogues, their payment was based on the wording that was in the handbook. Prof. Powers-Lee said that language was replaced by a resolution back in 2009. Provost Bean said if the language is not specific enough for Dialogues they will have to have a conversation about that.

Prof. Adams said concerning this same issue there was considerable concern among his colleagues concerning the fact if you want to buy out of a course it is 1/6 base, and if you are teaching in summer it is 1/8 base or less. He said there should be some symmetry between those two.

Provost Bean responded that in practice that is not the case at many places he knows.

Prof. Adams noted that at Northeastern we have mandatory courses that are sometimes taught in the summer.

Prof. Kaeli agreed with Prof. Adams and noted that they are being pushed by their administration to offer classes in the summer. He asked if courses offered in the summer less valuable than the ones in fall and spring?

Prof. Herlithy asked a question regarding the NTTFT union and One Faculty interactions. He asked if there could be an anonymous mechanism to take a survey of NTTFT and find out about their concerns and address those through the senate instead of a union?

Provost Bean said people can talk to their colleagues but at this stage administration cannot (legally or under legal advice) do anything that may interact with ongoing unionization efforts.

Prof. Kaeli suggest the NTTFT could be in touch with Senate FTNTT standing committee.

Provost Bean emphasized the administration is not allowed to interact but the faculty can talk to their colleagues.

Prof. Adams suggested the Senate could look at the HERI committee report to see what the issues are.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Deniz Erdogmus
Senate Secretary