



Northeastern University

Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary
SUBJECT: Minutes, 27 February 2019

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

Absent: Professors Cisewski, Kelly
Administrators: Loeffelholz

CALL TO ORDER: 11:48 a.m.

MINUTES of 13 FEBRUARY 2019 were approved.

I. **SAC REPORT 27 February 2019.**

- Since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met 3 times; one meeting included Provost Bean.
- Topics included the compensation module, recent reorganizational changes, staffing of the dean search committees, and implementation of the revised background check policy.
- Staffing is in progress for search committees for the COS dean, Health Sciences chair and Physical Therapy, Rehabilitation and Movement Services chair.
- Search Committee -- College of Engineering Dean
 - Lee Makowski, Bioengineering – Chair of Search Committee
 - Carla Brodley, Khoury College of Computer Sciences
 - Luca Caracoglia, Civil and Environmental Engineering
 - Eno Ebong, Chemical Engineering
 - Susan Freeman, COE First Year Programs
 - Olivia Hutchins, Bioengineering BS student
 - Sinan Muftu, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
 - Taskin Padir, Electrical and Computer Engineering
 - Akash Tripathi, Industrial Engineering MS student

Compensation Module Logistics

- Thanks for the thoughtful discussions at the recent Senate meetings.
- Thanks also to the Deans Council for providing multiple rounds of input.
- Please be assured that there is no intention of voting on the module today, given the brief time that you have had to review the document that is intended to share with you that cumulative input on the originally-proposed module.
- SAC is, however, looking forward to productive discussion of the module at today's meeting.

Prof. Powers-Lee noted that today's presentation by the Vice President of Enrollment Management is an example of an effort to address concerns that had been raised in the following resolutions over the last couple of years.

EAPC Resolutions, 2015/2016

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) collaborate with each of the colleges, which have experienced substantial declines in fall freshman enrollments during the last several years, for the purpose of devising a satisfactory plan for increasing the fall freshman enrollments in these colleges; and
BE IT ALSO RESOLVED That EMSA report annually to the Faculty Senate on the design, implementation and outcomes of these enrollment improvement plans.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate discuss at the earliest date in the fall of 2016 the University's strategies and processes for shaping the undergraduate student cohort in light of the university we want to be and, seek out the information it requires to have these discussions.

BE IT RESOLVED That Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) provide more transparency into the process of determining admitted undergraduates, including information to the Senate as to how particular elements of an application are weighted.

EAPC Resolutions, 2016/2017

BE IT RESOLVED that EMSA work with each college, as appropriate, to expand the current holistic admissions review process to include college specific criteria for evaluating excellence and potential.

BE IT RESOLVED that Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) and all other relevant University offices account for and split the number of students in combined majors 50/50 between the two colleges providing the combined major and acknowledge this distribution in university communications.

BE IT RESOLVED that EMSA and University Decision Support provide information to each college regarding student migration between colleges for each semester and class year, as well as graduation outcomes (# of students per major) for each academic unit on an annual basis in order to give enrollment

credit to each academic unit on the basis of all students, not just Fall Freshmen.

BE IT RESOLVED that EMSA and the Associate Deans within each college collaborate to organize a forum and process for sharing best practices for enhancing yield.

II. PROVOST REPORT

The Provost said a lot of what his office has been working on the last couple of weeks is reviewing a number of tenure dossiers. He noted that the senators' colleagues are spectacular and this is the greatest set of letters he has ever seen.

His office has also been working on the establishment of the Chancellor's office. He said there are a lot of details to work out from now until July 1st. The Provost and Chancellor Henderson have met with department heads, chairs and a number of smaller groups. They will be setting up a number of open faculty and staff town halls in March. He also announced the establishment of an Integration team that is co-chaired by Breann Fortier in the Provost's Office and Kerry Gallivan in Chancellor Henderson's office. Questions or concerns about the reorganization, can be sent to either of these two people who will accumulate and classify the concerns.

The Provost said they are not going to be changing titles or moving people physically until probably around July 1st. They want to approach HR changes all at once. The Provost added that they will come and talk to the Senate about how the reorganization will work once things start to firm up.

The Provost thanked SAC for moving quickly and effectively in regards to the staffing of the COE and COS Dean search committees. He added that they wanted the search firms hired, the committees in place and the position descriptions completed in this academic year so that the search firms can work over the summer and can really accelerate things in the fall.

The Provost said that he is working with Dean Loeffelholz to arrange a meeting with the CPS faculty to welcome them into the Provost Office.

The Provost recently had a meeting with the Full Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee (FTNTTFC) and felt it was very constructive. He added he looks forward to meeting with any of the other standing committees as interest arises.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

As a point of information, Prof. Lerner asked where are we with the partnership with New College of the Humanities (NCH)?

The Provost said that the actual business deal of buying them from their previous owners is done. He said they have permission from UK authorities to

continue the accreditation process. The Provost also noted there are a whole bunch of startup activities now including a semester in London, a pop-up on Brexit in March and some programs being developed with the School of Law. He added it is still not at a situation

where the NCH faculty and students are part of our faculty and students. Those things will be discussed and evaluated when they get their accreditation.

Prof. Herlihy asked who is on FTNTTFC? Prof. Powers-Lee responded that committee consisted of a member from every college and that Carlene Hempel was the chair. She also directed him to the Faculty Senate website where a list of all committees and their members can be found.

Prof. Adams asked for an update concerning the search firms for the two Dean searches and hoped there was faculty input into the choices. The Provost responded that Russell Reynolds Associates has been chosen for the COS search. He added that they have a target for the COE search but that contract has not yet been signed.

III. PRESENTATION BY SUNDAR KUMARASAMY, VICE PRESIDENT OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

The following are questions and highlights from the presentation.

In noting the high quality of the applicant pool, V.P. Kumarasamy said Northeastern is competing for the best of the best. He added that students come here because of the academic rigor, the faculty and the type of programs we have.

He said there had been a considerable increase in combined majors from last year to this year and as a result combined majors are making big impact. Combined majors are mentioned at every part of the funnel, from prospect to admit and are a key element of how we serve students.

The Provost added from a strategic perspective combined majors are seen as one of the primary tools to transfer our curriculum to a humanics curriculum meaning every student has both STEM and Humanities based input in their education.

V.P. Kumarasamy said Enrollment Management makes combined major information available to the Colleges for planning and budgeting purposes. He added his committee was looking at how the increase in combined majors was impacting the advising model.

In regards to the combined majors slides, Prof. Hayward asked since Bouvé doesn't have a large number of combined majors like other colleges, is Bouvé missing out on an opportunity?

Dean Parish noted the presence of Carmen Sceppa, Sr. Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and said that Dean Sceppa has been working since the summer 2017 on developing combined majors with Bouvé faculty. Dean Parish added that they have 3 undergraduate programs and most of Bouvé's programs are graduate programs. The Provost added that Bouvé probably leads the university in joint faculty appointments.

Looking at graduate programs, V. P. Kumarasamy noted the growth in programs was driven by international students. He added there is a new International Enrollment Management division within Enrollment Management devoted to international development.

Prof. Kaeli asked what was the plan for increasing the enrollment of domestic students in STEM fields? V. P. Kumarasamy said they were looking into it. He added the market and available students looking for degrees may not always correlate.

Prof. Desnoyers asked how much of the Khoury growth is due to the ALIGN program? V. P. Kumarasamy said he didn't know but it is one of fastest growing segments for the domestic market.

Vice Provost Wadia-Fascetti said there is something significantly different between the undergraduate and graduate admissions processes. She added in the undergraduate world, there are a lot of factors that come into the holistic review. Whereas in the graduate world, unless a committee makes a conscious decision on strategy, the admissions decisions tend to follow the demographics of the application pool.

Prof. Herlihy said he has worked closely with Jon Bernstein (CAMD/Dir. Of Enrollment Management) and the admissions people there. He said he likes collaborating with them to review portfolios particularly for students that don't at first necessarily seem like a perfect fit for Northeastern but that he believes will do well here. He added he hoped this kind of collaboration can continue and expand.

V.P. Kumarasamy said we need technology to support the admissions process. Currently, we have at least ten different systems of application. He said they plan to advance forward a one application concept that will provide a unified experience and that can maximize services.

He said they have begun the work on a prototyping exercise adding this is about people and processes. He said they will keep the Senate updated. The Provost said that this is important to our view that becoming a student at Northeastern is a lifelong subscription.

Prof. Gonyeau asked if there was there a timeline to change the application process?

V.P. Kumarasamy said a basic prototype was seen last week and that over the summer we should make faster progress.

Prof. Kaeli asked if this application system would be for graduate programs as well? And would the new system result in getting rid of all the individual college systems currently in use?

V.P. Kumarasamy said yes – anyone who wants to learn at Northeastern will be able to use this one application system. And yes, he added they hope to dispense with duplicative application efforts.

Provost Bean added that one of the big drivers behind this effort was that with multiple home grown systems across colleges, we have serious security concerns.

IV. CONTINUED BUSINESS

Prof. Sue Powers-Lee read the following and Prof. Stowell seconded.

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

Prof. Sue Powers-Lee said that the Senate would most probably not reach a consensus today but would discuss the module. After noting there had been a lot of back and forth between the Deans and SAC, the Provost said he wanted to suggest a core area of the module that needs additional discussion – the appeal issue. To encourage discussion, the Provost offered two extreme positions and a position in the middle on appeals. The Provost added he was not pushing any of these ideas.

He said one position could be that faculty should be able to appeal at every step of process. The Provost noted this option is not favored by the deans who see it as an administrative nightmare.

A second option could be that faculty should not be able to appeal raises at all. In fact that is what the equity process is about. And you have equity every 3 years.

A middle option could be that the merit evaluation done by faculty peers could be appealed. The Provost offered an example of where a faculty person might be deemed average in research because the faculty person had one paper during the year. But the faculty person could then counter that this was incorrect stating they had three papers. It would seem reasonable that that information should be brought forward to someone.

The Provost asked how do we want to allow for appeals so that we have a transparent process that will correct for the few mistakes that will inevitably happen without bogging down department chairs, deans, and SR. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Prof. Powers-Lee noted that in the current draft of the module, there are two appeals that are possible. One is at the academic unit level and one is at the college level.

The Provost responded that the only way that would differ from the third option he mentioned, is that you don't appeal at the college level, you appeal when you get the raise letter which is after the Provost has approved what the college level said.

Prof. Powers-Lee suggested that maybe we should rename that.

Prof. Kevoe Feldman said every unit has its own culture and way of evaluating merit. In the interest of transparency, will the module specify or require an explanation for how merit evaluation maps to the percentage raise?

The Provost responded that what the draft says is that when you get the raise percentage, you also get the language that says, for example, “in your unit, the low was .2% the high 4.2%, the program was 2% and you got 1.2%.” At that point, that would be a time faculty person could ask someone to explain the percentage they

received. What we want to get away from is the chair going to the dean when it hasn't been baked yet. It might be something we are going to correct in the process before you get the decision.

The Provost said they had added language from two meetings ago that made it clear when you get your annual employment contract, the appeal option is not dead.

And he added that initial point where a faculty person's peers give a qualitative ranking is the foundation of this entire process.

Prof. Stephens said that on the appeals issue, she thought how the information is presented matters a lot – the percentage vs. median. Also, in some cases people with higher salary already getting a higher percentage raise and are going to be getting more. Or people who could be very successful and have a high pay wind up with a lower percentage because of an equity concern. There are some complexities here that still need to be thought through,

She added while she thought these discussions had been very good for the past few Senate meetings, but she got sense from some chairs who would be responsible for implementing this, that they haven't been as involved in the discussions as they should.

While SAC and the Faculty Handbook Committee have done a lot of good work, given the complexities and nuances involved she was wondering if there should be an ad hoc subcommittee of people who are actually involved in doing this. Maybe it would be more efficient to try to hash out some of the differences with a smaller group.

Prof. Vicino mentioned a concern around the timeline stated in section 3 A. The unit heads usually have a few business days between the time raise pool is announced and when unit heads need to make salary recommendations.

He said in 2017 they had 3 business days to turn around and last year, they had 4 business days. Those types of details are really not feasible with the timeline the way it is written now.

The Provost asked if this was an issue with other colleges as well?

Assoc. Dean Isaacs said they had big turn-around issues as well.

Prof. Kaeli said that separating the merit and equity processes should help. Equity tends to be more complicated than merit. We've tried to make merit as straight forward as possible so that merit should happen fairly quickly versus equity which needs time to be heard, thought and reflected upon. He suggested the merit process start in December.

The Provost asked does it make sense to have a few department chairs look at the date sequence and recommend adjustments before the next Senate meeting?

Professors Darien Wood, Jennie Stephens and Sue Powers-Lee agreed to meet. (Prof. Kristin Greenwood joined this meeting.)

Prof. Gonyeau: said as a former department chair, he agreed with the concerns around a tight timeline. He said they would start their process in December. The evaluations are then done by January. He still had the same issue with the next step of the process which was determining the monetary raises for faculty because if you don't know the percentage of salaries that you have to be divided amongst your department that is where the getting that information and making a determination is where the time crunch was.

The Provost asked what was the timeline around when deans were given raise pool information? Dean Poiger agreed it was a very tight timeline. The information comes out some time after the April Board meeting.

The Provost entertained a motion to table the discussion. Prof. Kaeli seconded the motion. The motion PASSED: 36-0-0.

Adjourned 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary, Faculty Senate