



# Northeastern

TO: Senate Agenda Committee

FROM: FTNTT Committee

DATE: March 13

SUBJECT: Final report for FTNTT committee

The FTNTT committee had 10 meetings via Teams during the academic year. The committee carried out the specific charges assigned by SAC. The charges were addressed as follows with recommendations:

**Charge-1:** Solicit survey feedback from faculty regarding the One Faculty model (AY 2018-19 Senate Resolution #14 and AY 2020-21 Resolution #28), including faculty perceptions of:

1. Overall effectiveness of the One Faculty model
2. Teaching assignments
3. Workload distribution (i.e., Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activities, Service)
4. Leadership opportunities
5. Faculty development funds
6. Other areas the committee deems appropriate to explore

**Charge-1:** Solicit survey feedback from faculty regarding the One Faculty model (AY 2018-19 Senate Resolution #14 and AY 2020-21 Resolution #28), including faculty perceptions of:

## **History of One Faculty Model**

For history, here are the various resolutions and recommendations regarding the One Faculty model starting in 2016:

Northeastern University's "One Faculty" Initiative Legislation approved on 4/27/16, "The Faculty Senate at Northeastern University seeks to move toward "one faculty" by minimizing the difference (with the obvious exception of tenure) in the rights and responsibilities among the various classifications of full-time faculty in the Faculty Handbook."

Following this, the 2017-2018 Senate Agenda Committee charged an ad hoc committee to recommend changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws regarding the composition of the Senate and its committees, and that the ad hoc committee include full-time faculty representatives from each college, including equal representation of tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

At the 2/28/18 Senate meeting, the ad hoc committee presented its report and proposed two models regarding the composition of the Faculty Senate for the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty. At the 3/21/18 meeting, the following was discussed and voted upon:

WHEREAS it was the sense of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate that all full-time faculty, including tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track, be eligible to run for, be elected to, and serve on the Faculty Senate, and that the College of Professional Studies be included in the colleges and schools that have representation on the Faculty Senate, BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the revised Faculty Senate Bylaws as presented in the draft marked 3\_21\_18 revision, to be submitted to the tenured/tenure track faculty for a ratification vote.

The proposed model and Bylaws change were discussed, and the resolution passed 28-2-1.

Since that time, the Faculty Senate also resolved the following:

- BE IT RESOLVED that informal or ad-hoc mentoring activities, as described in the best practices, be made more visible to faculty, and colleges or units should be proactive in making those mentoring opportunities available to FTNTT faculty. Approved 5/25/22: -0-0
- Whereas not all colleges have developed written college-level FTNTTF promotion guidelines, and some colleges have detailed guidelines for what qualifications are necessary for promotion, and whereas this level of detail seems desirable in the interest of transparency (See Appendix A from the FTNTTFC report for an example from CPS.) BE IT RESOLVED that all colleges work to develop written college-level FTNTTF promotion guidelines and make them accessible. Approved 5/25/22: 30-1-0
- Whereas the Provost's Office indicates that they have begun the process of polling the Colleges about what college-level administrative positions are available to FTNTT faculty, BE IT RESOLVED that administrative and leadership positions shall be open equally to all faculty, TT and FTNTT alike, unless specifically designated in writing otherwise, and that a list of leadership positions that are and are not open to faculty members shall be made available to all faculty on each college's website, identifying the ranks to which positions are open. Approved 5/25/22: 28-2-0

### ***1. Overall effectiveness of the One Faculty model***

The data and conclusions outlined below were addressed by formulating questions as a committee which were included in the Fall faculty survey. The questions addressing the overall effectiveness of the One Faculty model (#1 of charge 1) were centered around the following:

- a. My experience over the past 6 years is that differences between faculty classifications have been minimized (I.e., the One Faculty model is successful).
- b. I have an overall positive perception of the One Faculty model.
- c. The One Faculty model has been implemented effectively in my department/unit.

- d. The One Faculty model has been implemented effectively in my college.
- e. The One Faculty model has been fully embraced by my department/unit/college leaders (chairs, Deans).
- f. My department works to minimize differences between tenure/tenure-track and non-tenured faculty.

Demographic data are in Appendix A

Question	Strongly disagree %	Disagree%	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
a.	18.98	25.30	28.31	21.99	5.42
b.	15.02	16.52	29.43	30.3	9.01
c.	13.11	20.73	32.01	25.0	8.0
d.	15.60	23.85	35.47	19.88	5.2
e.	15.80	19.02	36.50	24.0	0.0
f.	13.80	17.48	31.29	26.38	11.04

In reference to the results of the survey regarding the **overall effectiveness of the One Faculty model** our findings are summarized below:

Overall, the One Faculty Model's effectiveness is mixed, but a large number of faculty indicates that it has not been effectively implemented. Specifically, 44.28% of those responding indicated that they do not believe the model has minimized the differences between FTTT and FTNTT faculty. While 39.01% found the One Faculty Model to be positive, 31.54% had a negative perception, with 29.43% had a neutral perception. Within separate departments, there was variability in how faculty perceived the minimization of differences, with 31.28% reporting dissatisfaction within their department, while 37.42% reported satisfaction. Additionally, there appears to be variability in its implementation across departments and colleges. In regard to departments, 33.84% were not satisfied with how the model was being implemented, with 32.01% feeling neutral, and 33% reporting satisfaction. Regarding the implementation of the model in the various colleges, 39.45% reported dissatisfaction, with 35.47% feeling neutral, and 25.08% reporting satisfaction. Furthermore, the perception of how university leadership (department chairs, Deans, Senior Leadership) is embracing the model, 34.82% of the respondent's reported dissatisfaction, with 36.5% feeling neutral, and 24% reporting satisfaction.

In summary, over one-third of faculty responding to the survey found the One Faculty Model to be ineffective. Upon analyzing the data, it became clear that one of the factors that may be contributing to this is that there is no formal document or policy specifying what the One Faculty Model is. The only documents are from Senate minutes and resolutions.

As such, while it appears that the Faculty Senate has started the implementation of the One Faculty Model via resolutions, it only has addressed leadership opportunities, Senate

composition, promotion policies, and workload policies. Without other resolutions, the One Faculty Model is vague and can be interpreted in various ways, which is likely causing variability in the perception of the effectiveness model.

Furthermore, when examining responses from FTNTT and FTTT faculty, there was a similarity in responses, and thus it appears that regardless of being tenure-track or non-tenure track, faculty have similar dissatisfaction with the model.

Another issue with the One Faculty Model is the lack of communication. Many respondents to the survey indicated that they have not heard of the model. For those that were aware of the model, the way in which it was communicated varied, with some hearing it from other colleagues, HR, or when being hired. Since there is no specific document highlighting what the One Faculty Model encompasses, it is likely that faculty are receiving varied information. As such, it is recommended that the model be posted publicly and made easily accessible so faculty can refer to it as needed, and that it be part of a new hire's orientation.

Comments regarding the One Faculty Model are in Appendix B. Of the most common concerns that were raised were significant pay discrepancies between FTNTT and FTTT faculty, job insecurity among FTNTT faculty, FTNTT feeling like "second class citizens," lack of office space for FTNTT, increasing workload expectations for FTNTT faculty, and lack of assistance in hiring international FTNTT faculty.

***Recommendation: This committee recommends that Senior Leadership, along with the SAC, require each college and department to create a One Faculty Model with specific policies regarding the following: development funds, sabbatical, office space, computer allocation, mailboxes, etc. This can be implemented in the same manner in which units/departments were required to create workload policies, promotion guidelines, and merit reviews. Once developed, the Deans and Senior Leadership can approve the policy.***

***BE IT RESOLVED that the faculty handbook committee of 2023-2024 be charged to add language to the faculty handbook outlining the one faculty model.***

***Additionally, this committee recommends that the salary data availability and discrepancy between FTTT and FTNTT faculty be explored and addressed within the language of the One Faculty model. Our committee, in agreement with conclusions and recommendations made by the two previous FTNTT senate committees (see 2020-2022 reports charge 3 conclusions and recommendations pgs. 4-8), concluded that none of the faculty senate committees, through the mechanism of formulated charges can address salary data and analyze discrepancies. Also, recommending efforts to obtain more G14 data or trying to assess such issues through faculty surveys will not address the issue while at the same time deepening pay discrepancies and inequalities among colleges, gender, ethnicity, and peer institutions will continue. It is the sense of***

*the current committee that these issues will continue to stand and seriously impede any efforts of equity requests from NTT faculty. The current committee supports the previous recommendations for active leadership intervention and proactive action in these matters (see FTNTT committee reports 2020-2022).*

## **2. Teaching Assignments**

The questions addressing teaching assignments of the One Faculty model (#2 of charge 1) were centered around the following:

- a. I receive my teaching assignments within a reasonable timeframe to plan my courses.
- b. I feel I have departmental or college-level support for teaching new courses.

Question	Strongly disagree%	Disagree%	Neutral%	Agree%	Strongly Agree%
a.	6.19%	7.96%	10.91%	42.18%	32.74%
b.	9.82%	11.01%	24.40%	34.23%	20.54%

In summary, most faculty (both tenure and non-tenure track) who responded indicated that they were pleased with the teaching assignments (74.92%) and departmental and college support (54.78%). The one faculty model seems to be equitable in regard to teaching assignments and support.

## **3. Workload Distribution**

The questions addressing workload distribution of the One Faculty model (#3 of charge 1) were centered around the following:

- a. Compared to my colleagues, my annual workload has been fairly assigned.
- b. My annual workload has been adequately distributed to give enough time to perform my duties/interests in teaching, professional development/research/scholarly activities and service

Question	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %
a.	10.71%	11.01%	15.77%	42.36%	20.24%
b.	13.43%	16.42%	20.60%	32.84%	16.72%

In summary, most faculty (both tenure and non-tenure track) who responded indicated that they were pleased with the workload assignments (62.6%) and workload distribution (49.56%) The one faculty model seems to be equitable in regard to workload assignments and distribution.

## **4. Leadership Opportunities**

The questions addressing workload distribution of the One Faculty model (#4 of charge 1) were centered around the following:

- a. Are you aware that, in accordance with the faculty handbook and One Faculty model, “Each full-time faculty member is eligible to vote and to serve as Senator?”
- b. Do you receive communications about department or college-level leadership opportunities?

Question	Yes %	No	Unsure
a.	86.22%	13.78%	0%
b.	55.75%	29.79%	14.45%

Overall, there is wide awareness of the range of service and leadership opportunities available for both TT and FTNTT faculty under the auspices of the One Faculty Model. This includes both the ability to serve as a Senator as well as receiving communication about both department and college-level service opportunities.

- c. How likely are you to seek out leadership opportunities under the guise of the One Faculty model?

Question	Much More Likely %	More Likely %	No Effect %	Less Likely %	Much Less Likely %
c.	9.06%	23.26%	56.50%	5.14%	6.04%

In general, the data reveals that faculty members, regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, or tenure status are either more or much more likely (32.32%) to seek out service opportunities, or they responded, "no effect" (56.50%). In this regard, the one faculty model seems to be effective in communicating leadership and Senate opportunities. However, the number of "no effect" responses could be in part due to lack of clear understanding of exact parameters of One Faculty Model.

***Recommendation: To better assess the One Faculty Model's impact on leadership from both TT and FTNTT faculty, a clear definition of the model should be considered by the Senate and adopted into the Faculty Handbook.***

### 5. Faculty Development Funds

The questions addressing faculty development funds of the One Faculty model (#5 of charge 1) were centered around the following:

- a. Have you requested any faculty development funds in the past from your college?
- b. Did you have difficulty with the process?
- c. Do you feel like the faculty development fund provides enough to cover your activities?

Question	Yes %	No %	Unsure %
a.	49.41%	50.59%	0%
b.	12.57%	83.23%	4.19%

c.	38.08%	61.92%	0%
----	--------	--------	----

The results indicate that over half the faculty (50.59%) have not requested any development funds, which is concerning since professional development is necessary for promotion. However, the majority of the faculty that did request development funds (83.23%) found the process to be relatively easy. Despite this, the majority of the faculty (61.92%) found the amount allocated was insufficient to cover the costs of their professional development endeavors. Additionally, the amount allocated varied significantly, ranging from \$0 to \$5000.

***Recommendation: The development funds are not consistently allocated to faculty, with discrepancy between the amounts given to FTTT and FTNTT. There is also a discrepancy between units/departments and colleges. As such, to support the One Faculty Model, there should be clear guidelines from each unit on how development funds are allocated to ensure equity in terms of type of faculty, as well as to ensure equity across colleges and departments.***

**6. Other areas the committee deems appropriate to explore:**

***Office Space Allocation***

The questions addressing office space allocation of the One Faculty model (#6 of charge 1) were centered around the following:

- a. What kind of campus office/workspace do you have?

Personal Office	Shared Office Space	Space to Reserve	No Space
69.65%	20.81%	4.34%	5.20%

One theme that was identified in the comment section of the survey pertained to office space and the discrepancy between FTTT and FTNTT faculty. Whereas 95.5% of the tenure-track faculty have personal offices, only 56% of non-tenure track faculty do, with 33.8% sharing an office, 7.5% able to reserve a space, and 8.5% having no office. Additionally, 34% of non-tenure track faculty indicated that they were likely to lose their office, with 46.6% being unsure, compared to 16% of tenure-track faculty indicating a loss of their office space, and 42% being unsure. Thus, it does appear there is a discrepancy in office allocation between FTTT and FTNTT faculty. As NTT faculty, offices are necessary to hold office hours, record and prepare lectures, and complete other services and professional services. However, it appears that office space allocation is not equitable when comparing tenured-track and non-tenure track. This is contributing to the negative perception of the implementation of the One Faculty model, since it appears FTNTT faculty are being treated differently than FTTT faculty regarding office space allocation.

***Recommendation: To minimize differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, office allocation should be equitable for all faculty. This should be a part of the One Faculty Model policy that each unit/department in each college should develop.***

**Charge-2:** According to the One Faculty model, the faculty handbook, and AY 2020-21 Resolution #30, NTT faculty should be provided salary information for equity requests. Given the complexity of this process, and despite the good faith effort and improvements to this process on the part of university administration, the Committee, in collaboration with the FAC and University Decision Support, shall:

- a. Survey faculty to collect data related to faculty satisfaction with current equity process
- b. Examine NTT faculty titles and provide recommendations for broad based categories to provide salary data in aggregate form to maximize the number of faculty that may benefit from the current equity process
- c. Identify how other match mate universities provide salary data to their faculty for the purposes of equity review

**Charge-2:**

- a. Survey faculty to collect data related to faculty satisfaction with current equity process**

Overall, of the respondents, only 29.91% submitted an equity application in the past three years. Of those that did submit, 35.96% rated the process as very negative to negative, with 50.2% rating the process as neutral, and 13.83% rating it as positive or very positive. The ratings were similar regardless of tenure status.

Very Positive %	Positive %	Neutral %	Negative %	Very Negative %
1.58%	12.25%	50.20%	21.34%	14.62%

The questions addressing the equity process are as follows:

- a. I was provided with appropriate match data to inform my equity application
- b. I was provided adequate guidance to engage in the equity process.
- c. I was provided adequate time to submit my application after receiving data
- d. The application process was clear with adequate instructions
- e. The decision of my application was completed in a timely manner
- f. I was happy with the decision regarding my equity adjustment.
- g. The equity process was transparent in how application would be evaluated

Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a.	27.95%	20.52%	29.26%	20.09%	2.18%
b.	29.65%	19.91%	36.28%	12.39%	1.77%
c.	26.82%	17.27%	38.18%	14.09%	3.64%
d.	26.36%	21.36%	38.18%	11.82%	2.27%
e.	13.21%	8.96%	52.83%	20.28%	4.72%
f.	23.56%	17.79%	43.27%	10.58%	4.81%
g.	39.15%	20.28%	34.91%	4.25%	1.42%



Regarding the specific aspects of the process, 48.47% stated that they were not provided with appropriate match mate data, particularly for FTNTT faculty. Almost half of the respondents (49.56%) stated that they did not receive adequate guidelines for the process, with 47.72% saying the process was not clear. Additionally, 44.09% indicated that they did not receive adequate time to prepare the equity request, with most respondents indicating that the ideal preparation time would be 15 business days.

As for the outcomes of the equity process, most individuals indicated that the decision regarding the request was completed in a timely manner. However, 41.35% of the respondents indicated that they were unhappy with the decision. Of those who submitted an equity request, the majority (54.11%) did not receive an equity adjustment, with 27.27% indicating that they did receive an adjustment, and 18.61% preferring not to say. Additionally, most of the individuals (59.43%) stated that the process was not transparent, and of those that did receive an equity adjustment, 68.25% indicated that the equity adjustment was not differentiated from the merit increase. Of those that did not receive an equity adjustment, 91.86% stated that they were not provided with any information as to why their request was denied.

In summary, it appears that the majority of those that have requested equity adjustments in the past have found the process to be problematic. The areas that were most problematic include the following:

- Lack of match mate data
- Inadequate time to prepare request
- Lack of guidance and transparency with the process
- Poor communication in regard to why requests were denied
- Lack of transparency in regard to separating merit raise from equity adjustment

Comments regarding the equity process are in Appendix C.

***Recommendation: This committee recommends that the equity process be revisited and address the areas of concern. Given that the Chairs have salary information within the department, they should have a prominent role in equity requests. The University has tried to acquire match mate data for FTNTT faculty, but this has not been effectively implemented. It is recommended that the University resolves this issue.***

***It is furthermore recommended that those requesting equity adjustments receive at least 15 business days after receiving the data to submit the request. Once the request decisions have been made, transparent communication regarding why a request was denied is essential. Lastly, if an equity adjustment has been given, the adjustment and merit increase should be separately provided, instead of lumped together.***

- b. Examine NTT faculty titles and provide recommendations for broad based categories to provide salary data in aggregate form to maximize the number of faculty that may benefit from the current equity process**

As noted in the table below, the majority of FTNTT fall under four titles. As such, to make match mate data more consistent, the less common titles should be lumped with one of the four common titles, where the responsibilities are similar.

**B: Analyze to determine if there are significant differences in workload and compensation for similar titles and across demographics.**

In practice, NTT titles are fairly consistent across the University

Top 4 titles<sup>(1)</sup> account for >88% of NTT faculty. Top 8 cover over 97%.

See notes below

Title	Total	%	Cum %
Assoc. Teaching or Clinical Professor	180	32.7%	32.7%
Asst. Teaching or Clinical Professor	171	31.1%	63.8%
Teaching or Clinical Professor	86	15.6%	79.5%
Lecturer	51	9.3%	88.7%
Professor of the Practice	20	3.6%	92.4%
Assoc. Academic Specialist	12	2.2%	94.5%
Assoc. Research Scientist	7	1.3%	95.8%
Senior Lecturer	7	1.3%	97.1%
Principal Lecturer	4	0.7%	97.8%
Senior Academic Specialist	4	0.7%	98.5%
Clinical Instructor	3	0.5%	99.1%
Academic Specialist	2	0.4%	99.5%
Asst. Academic Specialist	1	0.2%	99.6%
Asst. Clinical Instructor	1	0.2%	99.8%
Professor of Design	1	0.2%	100.0%
	550	100.0%	

Top 4

Top 8

Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor, combined with Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor and Clinical Professor, respectively. Clinical titles are used BCHS, SOL, and to some extent KCCS.

On following slides these combined titles are often referred to as full professor rank or associate or assistant professor rank for brevity.

***Recommendation: This committee recommends that if a department has titles that are not of the top four, Deans and Department Chairs should determine which title it should be lumped with. Faculty can be involved in this process to determine which category fits best with their position to make equity requests and ameliorate the concern for confidentiality of salary data based on too few faculty in that position.***

**c. Identify how other match mate universities provide salary data to their faculty for the purposes of equity review**

In the survey, faculty were asked to identify if they have experienced the equity process at other institutions, and if so, document how the process was implemented. Of the respondents, only 6.86% of the faculty responded that they have experienced equity processes at other institutions. As such, most faculty are not aware of how equity adjustments are processed at similar universities. Of those that did report knowing of equity processes at other institutions, most reported it to be vague with poor transparency. The only exception were institutions with faculty unions, where the equity process was more transparent.

Comments regarding the equity process at other institutions is in Appendix D.

***Recommendation: Since faculty alone have found it difficult to obtain information of how other institutions implement equity adjustments, we recommend that senior leadership (e.g., Deans, Department Chairs) conduct a survey of similar universities to inform them as they amend the current process.***

**Other activities:**

- List any other activities or work done by the committee this past year. The committee discussed the findings and recommendations included in the Pullias Center for Higher Education report titled ‘State of the Faculty’ more specifically, some successful

alternative models implemented in neighboring institutions (WPI) for Non-Tenure Track Faculty discussed within the report (pg.13).

*A resource created by 'The Delphi Project State of the Faculty'*

<https://pullias.usc.edu/download/state-of-the-faculty/>

Respectfully submitted,

Vaso Lykourinou, Dawn Cisewski, (co-chairs), Ammar Aamer, Josie Flanagan, Justin Mellette, Sarita Singh, Stephanie Sibicky, Sarah Woodside (committee members).

## Appendix A: Demographic Data

**Table-1. Breakdown of survey participants by ranking**

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Full time non tenure track	62.02%	307
2	Full time tenured or tenure track	37.58%	186
6	Part time faculty	0.40%	2
	Total	100%	495

**Table-2. Breakdown of survey participants by ethnicity**

#	Answer	%	Count
1	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.20%	1
4	Asian	8.33%	41
5	Black or African American	2.44%	12
6	Hispanic or Latinx	3.25%	16
7	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.61%	3
8	White (not Hispanic or Latino)	68.29%	336
9	Two or more races/ethnicities	3.86%	19
10	Prefer not to answer	13.01%	64

**Table-3. Breakdown of survey participants by gender identity**

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Female	52.23%	258
4	Male	39.68%	196
5	Non binary/transgender/third gender	2.63%	13
6	Prefer to self-describe	0.20%	1
8	I prefer not to answer	5.26%	26
	Total	100%	494

**Table-4. Breakdown of survey participants by college**

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Bouve College of Health Sciences	12.63%	63
2	College of Arts, Media and Design	11.02%	55
3	Khoury College of Computer Sciences	7.62%	38
4	College of Engineering	14.63%	73
5	College of Professional Studies	7.21%	36
6	College of Science	14.03%	70
7	College of Social Sciences and Humanities	17.84%	89
8	D'Amore-McKim School of Business	10.42%	52

9	School of Law	1.40%	6
10	Mills College	3.41%	17

## Appendix B: Comments regarding One Faculty Model

Please provide any other feedback regarding the implementation of the One Faculty model below:

- As long as NTT are not allowed on promotion committees for TT faculty, there will never be a real "one faculty" model
- In Bouve the One Faculty model has resulted in NTT leadership almost exclusively. It has been a huge disservice to tenure track faculty and to grant writing and funding. My leadership doesn't understand TT faculty and their jobs b/c they have not been on the tenure track. The result is lower grant productivity which means less \$ for NU. Please have TT and corresponding NTT leadership in roles where necessary (e.g., associate Dean of faculty Affairs; department chair; school Dean)
- NTT are still second class citizens
- International tenured faculty get guided through the green card process right away. NTT faculty, even those who were promised help when negotiating their hiring, do not get any help at all.
- Parental leave policy that delays promotion is meant to help TT faculty, but may not be needed for NTT faculty. A colleague who was hired when I was took parental leave, and had to wait an extra year for promotion. Since promotion includes a raise, she had to work an extra year before getting it (pregnancy penalty). With extra comp courses, I think she had taught at least as many courses as I had by the end of our third year.
- The one faculty model is in part a designed university strategy to lessen the power of tenured faculty and weaken faculty governance. Non tenure track faculty are full employees of the university whereas tenured faculty are employees but much more protected. We do not have the same interests and this has created a lot of problems. The model is not implemented in a credible way.
- As we have added more NTT faculty, I feel things have become more, not less, coordinated. NTT faculty are increasingly seen as the people we can offload service on, while TT faculty focus solely on research and teaching. TT faculty, especially senior TT faculty, are increasingly unwilling to take on service roles because (a) they don't think the University wants them to do service and (b) they don't see the rewards in doing so. Meanwhile some research-active NTT feel marginalized by the TT faculty. Culture is a problem. Our college's Faculty Policy

Committee is exploring solutions to recognizing different faculty contribute in different ways.

- I currently share an office as an Assistant Teaching Professor and I can not imagine an Assistant Tenure Track Professor being asked to share their office - even though they may be in their office less than I am if they have a lab. There also seem to be constant pushes for teaching faculty to move even more into a shared office model which seems very much opposed to the One Faculty model. The assumption that I don't need a private office to discuss private matters with students and store student project work and class demonstrables is somewhat insulting since it feels like my tenure-track colleagues would never be put in this position.
- NTT Faculty are not the same as Tenure-Track Faculty. Much of what I've seen in this survey I'm seeing and learning about for the first time. NTT Faculty are essentially adjuncts with benefits. We are overloaded, offer "service" upward of 15-20 extra hours a week, and are not considered as having the same gravitas as tenured-track faculty. We also aren't paid equitably across peer institutions. Fact. We'd be better off unionizing, and several of us have begun talking about this.
- Imagine working 60 hours a week Mid-Augusts through Mid-June, then being reminded by Finance (because they represent HR) that your contract pays you for 35 hours/week for 9 months out of the year. Not great. I stay because of my program and program team, but I'll leave within the next year for sure.
- Faculty need private offices. It is not possible to serve students well without private space. I have had many conversations with students that could not have happened without private space (about health, family, or course performance matters, for instance). I would find it difficult to do research in shared space and would spend less time on campus if I were moved to shared space. Shared space is very bad model for a university.
- One Faculty is a joke until salaries and work load are equalized.
- Having a defined workspace for faculty that is separate from student workspace would assist in completing sensitive activities that should not be done in the open environment.
- The space I work in is unacceptable for the responsibilities I have - the same is true for my colleagues. We may be teaching at NEU for 10-15 years and still share an office, while the newest assistant professor is going to get a personal office (and work in their lab most of the time)
- I don't necessarily need the square footage of office I have, but privacy and securability is essential for my research program.
- I feel like One Faculty is just a slogan from administration to prevent unionization.
- We need offices that are permanent and where we can store our books, computer, monitor, etc.
- the hierarchy here is astounding. there is clearly an understanding that tenured faculty can speak openly and freely and NTT have to be 'careful'. Also, NTT faculty do not seem to be valued for their research.

- Still feels like a PR thing more than reality. There is an expectation that teaching faculty conduct some research in order to get promoted, but teaching faculty have to buy out part of their contract just to be able to have the time to do true research - why can't the university establish that there is flexibility in teaching expectations and that ALSO applies to teaching faculty? I have a reduced teaching load right now because of my department chair, but under a different chair or in a different department, that would absolutely not be the case, as my counterpart in a different COE department had to buy out part of their contract to do the research they are expected to do if they are to achieve promotion. Meanwhile, many times I have applied for external research awards, I discover I am ineligible because of my non-tenured-track status, even though I would more than meet all other achievements and expectations.
- If WPI can offer tenure for teaching faculty, Northeastern certainly should be able to do so, and it would get rid of this phony One Faculty facade.
- Service expectations are also unbalanced, and that's just another aspect of how this all fits together. During the pandemic, multiple tenured faculty with kids were encouraging the university in open meetings with the provost to hire more teaching faculty so they could have less load to be able to handle their kids, even though teaching faculty have their own children.
- What a disaster. Our department has more than 100 faculty members with 1 chair and no associate chair. No one wants to chair because it's overwhelming. Everyone is always angry.
- TT and NTT have very different priorities. We can get nothing done. NTTs often have little understanding of the university's mission or processes and many are not interested in knowing more because they have been disenfranchised for so long. As a result, their focus is on pay and a belief that tenure will magically improve their lives. There is often little engagement with current work in the field and a lack of support to engage with current work in order to teach new material in the field. On the other hand, we have TTs who will always think of NTTs as lesser
- One Faculty has not penetrated in the way the tenured faculty consider the rest of the faculty, and the salary has NEVER been equivalent. If we were truly one faculty, I would not have been earning \$30,000 less per year compared to my colleagues, particularly when almost all the university's income comes from tuition, not research dollars. If anything, teaching faculty should be getting paid more because we ensure tuition keeps coming in.
- Please stop calling it One Faculty until it's actually equivalent and the tenured faculty actually believe it.
- I feel it's a nice model, but it doesn't help if folks don't listen and take feedback and actually work to improve the lives of its faculty. It feels like a lot of talk and not a lot of do.
- Seems there is a still a separation between teaching faculty and tenured faculty in terms of more opportunities internally for teaching faculty as a way to better compensate and reduce teaching load. But that means tenured faculty are directed to be more outward facing.
- Compensation and teaching load differs between NTT and TT faculty so it's not the case that tenure is the only difference



- Until the expectation and pay grades are equal between the two, one faculty is not true. And to be honest it can't be on less we only have just one type of faculty
- I don't know what the One Faculty model except that I've heard the statement that we are all supposed to be treated the same. I don't know what other benefits there are to this model.
- One faculty should apply to office space too. NonTT faculty should not be de-prioritized to provide offices for TT faculty.
- Hot desking and large shared offices are a disruption to all faculties activities and make jobs harder.
- Failure in terms of compensation
- UC California systems have lecturer's with potential of security of employment. Northeastern could stand out and really recruit and retain the best FTNTT faculty if they implemented such a system (i.e. tenure in all but name). There's a few other schools (University of Delaware) that offer longer contracts (i.e. 7 years) that can enable FTNTT to invest into longer term research, bring in grants, and advise Ph.D. students. Duke has some professor of practice positions also lasting 10 years.
- NTTF are now required to do more service and administration but without having the same conditions in which TF operate. We don't have course releases to perform all these activities and our yearly course load is 6 courses. Often, for program needs, we teach up to 8 classes a year. This makes it very difficult to find the time to conduct service and administrative duties. There is very little time for those of us who are also interested in conducting scholarly research.
- In addition, our annual report evaluation does not reflect the increasing role of service and administration. 80% is based on our teaching performance, while only 10% is service and 10% is professional development (which could include research). This is not a One Faculty model, in my opinion. Certainly granting NTTF access to committees and other governance positions or development funds is a very positive step forward, but it does not change the fact that our contracts are different and the conditions in which we work are different from TF.
- Until actual data for salaries for non-tenure track faculty is provided there is no way to actually implement the one faculty model. Tenure and tenure track faculty are given data and non-tenure track faculty are not.
- differences "minimized" I would answer to the extent they can be; the university might consider something like tenure for teaching faculty, as other institutions have done "security of employment" type arrangements
- I don't think full time faculty should have to share offices
- NTT faculty are required to share offices while TT faculty are not. How does this support the One Faculty model?
- The one faculty model has been very effective at eliminating distinctions among faculty. Unfortunately (but predictably) this did not happen by elevating NTT faculty to equality with T/TT: it has provided the University a convenient cover to reduce all faculty to the lowest common denominator, more similar to part-time contingent faculty. As far as I can tell, it is widely embraced and "effective" because leadership at the unit and college level can now hire at will, institutions

like the senate and faculty committees are now comprised of folks who fear for their jobs, and deans can choose to appoint administrators with contingent contracts, thus centralizing power even further. Rather than a participatory democracy of shared governance and mutual respect, the one faculty model is one of authoritarian power and faculty subservience.

- if my personal office is taken away, or becomes shared, I will leave the university
- NTT research faculty are lumped in with NTT teaching faculty - this is terrible. research faculty and teaching faculty are very different, the policies surrounding research faculty are woefully behind those of teaching faculty, which is terribly shortsighted. Research faculty can bring in grants, teaching faculty cannot; research dollars could expand with clearer expectation about research faculty
- I think the One Faculty is being used as a powerful tool to erode tenure. I want to support non-T/TT colleagues but I would rather see them get on the path to tenure. Too many non TT faculty are now carrying so much more of the workload with little protections and they can't truly speak up against initiatives they disagree with.
- For the last several year the match-mate salary data that has been distributed to COS faculty has been a mess. The numbers have not been apples to apples comparisons, so a lot of angst and stress has been caused when we first think that we are massively underpaid compared to peers at other institutions, only to find out that one value was based on 9 months and the other on 12 months. Please sort all this out before distributing next time.
- Also, within COS there seems to be a large pay gap between TT research faculty and NTT teaching faculty. The main source of my dissatisfaction with the One Faculty model is this pay disparity. If we are paid less, the message is that we are worth less. To the contrary, we do a disproportionate amount of the teaching and therefor generate a disproportionate amount of the COS budget (which is still dominated by undergraduate tuition revenue despite the increase in grant funding). Yet we are paid less. Also, because NTT faculty are more likely women (at least that is the case in Marine and Environmental Sciences) this perpetuates the gender salary gap, which frankly is unacceptable.
- Tremendous achievement!
- I like the spirit of it, but it's hard to make work in practice
- NTT faculty are treated as 2nd class citizens throughout the entire university. We are accidentally left off of important communications. We have to request special permission to do anything. We can't supervise graduate students without going through red tape. We are ignored for research topics even though many of us are 100% research faculty. It is also extremely hard to recruit people to these NTT roles because of all these assumptions.
- I don't know what faculty development funds are, or how they can be used.
- I would love to serve on Senate but am fearful of the cost in speaking my voice and representing others. I have no protections.
- I refuse to hot-desk, I refuse to hotel... I will consider sharing an office with another TT / Tenured professor with complimentary work styles and schedules, but that's as far as I will go.

- It is lunacy to think that Northeastern can recruit 500+ faculty without promising them a regular place to sit and put their books!
- Teaching faculty earns much less pay than tenure track faculty. One faculty is nothing until non tenure track pay is increased. Everything else is hollow showboating.
- Faculty pay equity is a joke. We are TENS of thousands of dollars apart. small pay increases won't cut it.
- I used to be able to attend and present at conferences annually but no longer have funds to do so.
- Other institutions have been more progressive. Tenure Lines for Teaching Faculty.
- Ah finally --
- 1) I fundamentally disagree with this two-track system that erodes the tenure system. I suggest moving nearly all teaching faculty into tenure-line positions.
- 2) collective bargaining should be allowed. see my earlier comments on alternative uses for the large sums spent on union-busting attorneys and consultants.
- It does not seem like it occurs equitably across our college. Some departments embrace it others do not. I also believe that while the COS Dean is vocally supportive of One Faculty, they do not implement policy to show that support.
- I am a FTNTT faculty member, and more than once, I have been ineligible for internal research funding because I am not a tenure track. I am aware that my primary duty is teaching, but I would like to maintain an active research program and receive little to no institutional support for it. I have had to seek out external funding quite often given my short time at Northeastern.
- Faculty funding of \$1,000 is basically guaranteed each year although I request must be completed which includes a number of research related questions even if request is to attend a conference. For requests over \$1,000 more information is requested and it's a more cumbersome process. The likelihood of being able to attend anything for \$1,000 these days is minimal. There's no automatic funding for attendance at things like accreditation body conferences which are basically required attendance, why? Additionally. faculty have been asked by deans why more than one faculty member from the same discipline needs to attend the same conference! Why can't one faculty attend and just tell the other faculty member(s) what happened! How is this faculty development, or one faculty?
- There is not really transparency on faculty pay with regards to tenure track vs. non tenure track faculty. It does seem that the non tenure track faculty tend to do a lot more service yet I am fairly certain we are paid less. Although service is a small part of our responsibilities (10% in our department), many of us are doing much, much more than 10% with a higher teaching load than the tenure track faculty.
- Office space should bear 'one faculty model' in mind. There should be more communication and official writing detailing and defining what the One Faculty model is

- The inequities in office space allocation is a major issue. There is still the sense that T/TT faculty are more deserving of a private office than FTNTT faculty, and this is deeply concerning and could not be farther from the truth. It is a problem, especially at the top where it seems that when the administration thinks about who "faculty" are, the only people they think of are T/TT faculty.
- My workload improved the past year, but it still feels like teaching faculty are a complete afterthought, particularly in the salary department. The "One Faculty model" feels more like a fun slogan designed to plaster over major unsustainable inequities and issues with teaching faculty at the systemic level, including very poor compensation and a lack of any voice at the higher decision-making levels. We often learn about policy changes after our students do, and that's just not acceptable. The equity process was garbage; we were given no time to do it or instruction on how to do it, and the "equity raise" we received was completely in line with the raise we would have received otherwise. It was utterly insulting.
- NTT faculty continue to be under compensated and lack the flexibility that FTNTT faculty have for professional development (e.g., sabbaticals).
- NTT's are asked to do more research while TT faculty are always looking to reduce contact hours in teaching.
- I view the One Faculty model as an excuse for the university to argue that FTNTT faculty should not be allowed to form a union.
- It's largely a separate-but-equal situation: in my unit FTNTTF get paid less, teach more, share offices, and are often shut out of decision making (NB. I'm a TT/T faculty member).
- NTTF faculty in my college are treated quite differently from TTF and from NTTF in other colleges. I don't understand why my college has decided that NTTF should be kept out of department and college leadership roles or why NTTF should have to share offices when they are more likely to be on campus more often (as NTTF in my college teach a 3/3 load but TTF faculty teach only 2/1). The One Faculty model decisions at our college level have opaque.
- I think the large gap in salaries between tenure track and non-tenure track full time faculty is unjustified and that the compensation of part-time faculty is unjust.
- I feel the one faculty model is a joke!
- Need to up the money for faculty development to keep up with BU, Harvard, et al! This isn't 2006 anymore. 2k doesn't even cover one conference.
- It is lip service at best. All the rules in the world can't actually make the Tenure Track folks treat us with respect, value our expertise, and collaborate with us on research. The college would never put a tenure track faculty in a shared office, or in a windowless office in Holmes, or give them lousy furniture, but it happens all the time to NTT folks. A space management person in our College once said, in a meeting, "Oh, it doesn't matter where we put them because they're not tenure track." How does that indicate that we are 'one faculty'? I was pulled off a class that I loved, that I taught for 15 years, that I am on an organizing committee for a national conference about (Capstone design), and that I've written a dozen research papers about because "We want to go in a different direction and we

want some of the new faculty to have some experience, and you're too overloaded." This could have been done without removing me completely from the course, and without my department chair telling me I would never be leading that course again. Then they turned around and asked me to overload a grad course for the Fall! No one would ever do that to tenure track folks. If a tenure track person gets some award from an obscure national society the whole department knows about it. If I get awards from 3 different student groups in one term my accomplishments are ignored. One Faculty is a joke.

- In practice, it is not equitable or inclusive. Northeastern's policies marginalize and disadvantage PT adjunct faculty to a far greater degree than Mills' policies did. Our adjuncts feel they are being pushed out, disrespected, or disadvantaged by higher workloads, less ability to voice scheduling needs, less pedagogical authority, higher barriers to benefits eligibility, exclusion from faculty events and opportunities, and diminished participation in curricular & program design. Faculty tracked into the FTNTT category feel it is an exploitative career dead-end, with low pay for high teaching loads and few opportunities for research/recognition.
- It gave me an impression that the implementation is at the expense of TTT faculty.
- Pay differences between TT and NTT faculty are dramatic -- there can never truly be "one faculty" when TT faculty get paid double what NTT faculty are paid.
- I also feel as if the work associated with research (including increasing demands for fundraising, supervising graduate students, writing books and articles, etc.) is significantly greater than the work associated with teaching one extra class per semester. In other colleges TT faculty have lower teaching loads, but in mine we maintain a 2-2 with significant research expectations on top of that.
- Hiring is focused on TT for research fund generation. NTT seems to be seen as a dime a dozen and easily replaced. NTT time is not protected.
- A challenge with working in two departments on two different campuses is not having a workspace on the main Boston campus. Figuring out hoteling arrangements for that would be useful.
- I have never heard of the One Faculty model. I asked colleagues. They have not heard either. This does not surprise us, as communication is bad at NU.
- As related to my answers about Remote Management software, I'm resentful of the fact that a TT faculty member was able to have her surveillance apparatus removed while mine has not yet been removed, which prevents me from using this new computer.
- Co-op faculty member here - I don't feel part of the One Faculty model at all. Still too disconnected and not sure how to fix that because traditional faculty don't seem to want to be more inclusive.
- Are tenure-track faculty also losing office space? I have worked at Northeastern University ten+ years and obtained the rank of teaching professor. However, this year, my personal office space was reassigned as hoteling space. Not only do my colleagues and I no longer have desks, but there is not even a locker or a shelf that

we can use to store personal belongings. No one uses the hoteling space, I hate carrying all of my belongings from classroom to classroom, and we have lost the sense of community and coziness of assigned office spaces . I know that hoteling is a trend and the office costs are high. However, this is very discouraging. I had better accommodations as a graduate teaching assistant.

- One faculty is a good goal. However, since non-tenured faculty do not have tenure, they depend heavily on the department chair for contract renewal and promotion. Thus, they can be used and abused by administrators. Unless there are changes to assure that all administrators are accountable for their actions, there will never be a One faculty
- The One Faculty model was cynically developed in order to circumvent full time non-tenure track faculty unionization efforts. Unionizing would've allowed FTNTT faculty to have a say in their own treatment, particularly in terms of contracts, pay, and other factors like the sudden implementation of surveillance technology in laptops and iPads. But the university used the One Faculty model, particularly the ability of FTNTT to serve on the faculty senate, and leveraged the sudden increase in extreme right wing judicial appointees courtesy of the Trump administration (which the university claimed to oppose numerous times) to block efforts at unionization. The result is a dispirited faculty that, more than ever, understands the gulf between tenured and non-tenured faculty.
- The idea that all faculty are equal across ranks is laughable. In terms of pay, access to resources, priority in treatment by the university and college, non-tenure track faculty are significantly disadvantaged. Even after pay increases and participation in the equity process, our pay is still not commensurate with other leading universities in the area, nor does it correspond to the drastically increased cost of living in the Boston metro area.
- I have my own office currently because I am an administrator as well as a teaching professor. When the administrative role ends I will be asked to share an office, as do all NTTF in our program (tenured faculty have their own offices) . More importantly, within our program there is a sharp divide between tenured and NTTF faculty, with the NTTF often seen as threats to the security of tenure rather than colleagues. The differences in pay/office space etc. are less difficult to remedy than the large differences - the expertise of teaching faculty is seen as "less than" the expertise of their tenured colleagues. Until that is remedied the One Faculty model will secure certain rights, but will not fundamentally change the way workload, research opportunities etc. are distributed or how our faculty are valued.
- I notice and appreciate the ways that FTNTT faculty are able to apply for more opportunities in recent years (like sabbaticals). There's still a big departmental disconnect, though—re: salary, job roles (teaching vs researching), and attitudes.
- While FTNTT faculty have been included more broadly in decision making and administrative roles, they are still often underpaid and considered later in departmental and college processes compared to their TT/Tenured colleagues. Much of the overall undergraduate teaching responsibility falls to teaching faculty while research and graduate education falls to TT/Tenured faculty. In a true one-

faculty model, these concerns and issues should be addressed as equally and fairly as possible.

- The "One Faculty" ethos is appreciated, but NTT faculty may not feel safe taking on leadership roles.
- As co-op faculty, I feel that we should be treated the same as clinical and teaching faculty in terms of salary and other opportunities. I do not feel that happens. Equity is a prime example, even though my credentials and responsibilities exceed many clinical and teaching faculty loads.
- I do wish I had an office, even if it were just a hot desk that I shared with other faculty members. We literally don't even have a place that I can keep a copy of my textbook on campus (Vancouver) other than a small 2x2 locker that I think I will lose access to.
- The caste system between tenured and non-tenured faculty remains. FTNTT faculty feel very vulnerable and not nurtured.
- Everyone should have tenure as an option. Teaching faculty should get paid more. Administrators should get paid less.
- There seems to be a trend to have non-tenure faculty take on administrative roles, such as department chairs. I think this should be given deep consideration, as it means that someone who has not developed a research program is essentially making career decisions about someone who has.
- It doesn't exist.
- It seems as though at the co-op level, this doesn't really apply? This model doesn't seem to have changed anything at the university from my perspective.
- the demands placed upon NTT faculty to earn promotion, to receive recognition are unattainable in most cases
- in many of my personal experiences, there is not much difference between part-time/adjunct faculty and NTT faculty recognition, sense of job security, adequate pay, or recognition of the time and work needed to produce high quality programs and courses
- NU should hire more tenure line faculty instead of the "one faculty" model.
- Salary for NTT is well below other peer institutions.
- NTT faculty must share offices.
- It does not seem to have been implemented as well (at all?) for co-op faculty or research only faculty as it has for teaching faculty.
- E.G.: Can they serve on the Faculty Senate? If so do any of them? Do they know this? Should an effort be made to specifically get them a senate position? And the same exact questions but substitute in the NTT Faculty Senate Committee for Faculty Senate.
- One Faculty feels like a façade that was created to make NTT faculty feel their voices and needs were being heard. Co-op faculty salaries, especially in colleges with rapidly growing graduate programs, are not high enough to recruit and retain talent. In some of the colleges, the Co-op Faculty workload has significantly increased over the last 5 years with the growth of graduate programs and rapid expansion of the global network. There is no co-op representation on faculty

senate because Co-op Coordinators do not have time to take on this important leadership role, or their Deans treat them like staff and do not invite them to faculty meetings. Co-op Faculty are responsible for advising students both searching for and working on co-op (120-180 simultaneously), teaching co-op courses, job development and maintenance, professional development (for which there is limited funding to present at conferences/travel), and service. When service is only 5% of your job, becoming a faculty senator does not feel feasible. Therefore the voices of co-op are not heard in the One Faculty model.

Additionally, at the higher level of co-op leadership, there is no central leader to hear the Co-op Directors/Assistant Deans and to communicate with and advocate for the co-op division. There used to be, but that person left NU and the position was never reposted.

- Our department has one Chair and one Associate Chair. The Chair runs meetings for tenure-track faculty and the Asso. Chair runs meetings for NonTT faculty. Our merit is assigned by separate committees and our pay is vastly different. I do not have any interaction at all with TT faculty in my department because we do not have any department meetings together.
- There's no rational argument for why some staff have to be on ground and others don't. It makes sense for student facing staff but non-student facing staff are still required to be on ground.
- i wish i knew that the One Faculty model is.

### **Appendix C: Equity Process**

- I think it's more about letting us know what the timeframe will be vs an exact timeline. We received an equity adjustment, but it was not transparent (and there was no place for me to answer that way). It was lumped in with our merit increase, and overall the entire increase was less than 50% of what it would take to offer equity to the match data. It remains a mystery to this day how leadership is responding to or remediating the grossly inequitable pay of NTT FT Faculty.
- Well we received the data after the original deadline so. Literally anything would be better than that.

### **Appendix D: Equity Processes at Other Institutions**

- First, at the other institution, HR had a leadership seat at the table, and nothing was taboo. NU doesn't work this way; it seems like endowments and development and gifts are discussed, but the messiness on the inside is not really talked about. Also at the other institution:
  - Equity reviews occurred every 3 years
  - Equity adjustments and remediations were very transparent: this is what we found, this is how we're fixing it, this is what you can expect.
  - Actual rate adjustments were also very transparent: this is the increase you are receiving now; if we meet our goals, you will receive this (%); if we



do not meet our goals or our revenue lines change, the lowest you'll receive is this (%).

- Service hours were deemed as an additional 4 hours/week or 12 hours/month and were very specific. Service hours and boundaries were also protected. Faculty were not expected to do more and more without pay, and even when stipend, there would be an hour-review to be sure that if more resources were needed, there was a discussion. It didn't mean that more resources were provided, but the discussion would determine whether capacity and workloads could be more fairly distributed, or if it was time to stop doing something completely because the resources weren't there. Here at Northeastern, you're expected to increase your work capacity to upwards of 50-60 hours and not complain about it OR told not to do the work, which then risks being out of compliance re: the quality and type of courses you teach.
- This is why we're considering a union discussion. It will be easier on us and problems will at least have a forum for discussion and prioritization if we are represented all together vs just the tenure tracks.
- They didn't, I was just compared to my departmental colleagues
- They made adjustments without the faculty. The administration initiated it—they looked for the inequities and initiated the process themselves.
- a regular database that could be accessed anytime and was updated with new data when available
- Via the faculty union. Also, I had no idea Northeastern even has an equity process. I've raised concerns about pay equity in my unit, and the process was never mentioned. It would be helpful if the senate communicated the process to faculty.
- In a completely secret and mean-spirited fashion.
- They did not. There was no transparency, and the institution had very well-documented equity issues outside of pay that it was unwilling to address.
- Every three years they provide matched data, then they let us know about the equity program so that we weren't left in the dark in the process (like here), and can remain feeling engaged and supported, and like our employment matters, as they determine how they're going to correct the equity issues.
- Provided all information openly and transparently. Without identities attached to the info
- Public data