

March 11, 2002

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 03/11/2002

John G. Flyn
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Flyn, John G., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 03/11/2002" (2002). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 9. <http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d1000564x>

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: JOHN G. FLYM, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2001-2002 FACULTY SENATE, 11 MARCH 2002

Present: (Professors) Aroian, Baclawski, Barnes, Boisse, Bruns, Flym, Fox, Gilbert, Gilmore, Herman, Hope, Kane, Lowndes, Metghalchi, Naylor, Platt, Rotella, Rupert, Shafai, Vaughn, Wallin, Wertheim, Wray
(Administrators) Hall, Greene, Mantella, Meservey, Onan, Pantalone, Pendergast, Putnam, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bobcean, Giessen, Hall, Kelleher, Levine, Powers-Lee, Sullivan, Willey
(Administrators) Rigg

Convened by Provost Hall at 11:59 a.m.

- I. **Minutes.** The minutes of 28 January were approved.
- II. **SAC Report.** Professor Lowndes gave the following report.

A. **Meetings.**

SAC has met twice in regular session since the last Senate meeting. One of these meetings was devoted in part to a substantive discussion of the semester conversion with Executive Vice Provost Pantalone, who reported that the report would be discussed with the Steering Committee on 8 March and will be e-mailed to faculty this week.

SAC also met with Provost Hall and the Financial Affairs Committee on 7 March for further discussion of the equity distribution. President Freeland has agreed to the recommendation of the Committee on Funding Priorities and the Budget Committee to create an advisory group to handle matchmates and cost of living adjustments.

B. **Excellence in Teaching Awards Judging Committee.**

The Excellence in Teaching Awards Judging Committee has been staffed. The following faculty will serve:

Continuing members:

Professor Mary Florentine (Speech Language Pathology & Audiology)
Professor Thomas R. Gilbert (Chemistry)
Professor Yiannis A. Levendis (MIME)

New members:

Professor Richard Bailey (Geology)
Professor David A. Rochefort (Political Science)
Professor Thomas O. Sherman (Mathematics)
Professor Edward G. Wertheim (CBA)

C. **Administrator Evaluations.**

Dean James R. Stellar. The Agenda Committee has released the report on Dean Stellar, for reading in the Senate Office by the faculty and professional staff of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Peter S. Rosen. The Agenda Committee has released the report on Professor Rosen, for reading in the Senate Office by the faculty of the Department of Geology.

- D. **Next Senate meeting: 8 April in 308 SN. Please note that the 25 March meeting has been cancelled.**

III. **Provost's Report.** Provost Hall reported the following.

A. **Semester Conversion.**

The Semester Conversion Report is nearly ready to be sent to faculty. It likely will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

B. **Administrator Evaluation Process.**

The administrator evaluation process has proved valuable. Provost Hall and President Freeland reviewed the reports on Dean Greene and Dean Soyster, asked for additional information, and have decided to renew their contracts. The performances of both Dean Greene and Dean Soyster have been outstanding.

C. **Klein University Lecture.**

Provost Hall expressed thanks to those who participated in the Lectureship process. Professor Arun Bansil's Lecture was well attended. Henceforth, sponsored by the Senate Agenda Committee and the Provost's Office, Lecturers will receive medallions signifying the academic importance of their contributions to the University. Lecturers from past years were invited to this year's Lecture on 4 March and also received medallions.

IV. **Question and Discussion Time.**

Professor Bruns expressed concern that the accreditation of the College of Business Administration would be adversely affected by that college faculty's teaching in University College. Provost Hall responded that discussions have been under way to separate the day colleges from UC, which will, subsequent to Senate approval, be able to grant its own degrees. The separation makes sense for both economic and marketing reasons and is expected to be completed by the time of accreditation. Vice Provost Meservey added that she is working with UC Interim Dean Stoessel on an array of issues.

Professor Bruns reported a rumor that the Senate was not in favor of the separation. Vice Provost Meservey responded that the matter has not come before the Senate. Professor Lowndes added that Vice Provost Meservey had recently discussed the matter with him for the first time. He characterized the discussion as positive and constructive and this had been reported back to the Agenda Committee. SAC had viewed this as informational and was awaiting a report from Vice Provost Meservey. He viewed the rumour as unfortunate and without foundation.

V. **Equity Distribution.**

Professor Fox moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

WHEREAS, delayed or cancelled merit raises during the early and mid-1990s resulted in Northeastern University faculty salaries that are significantly below those of faculty at comparable institutions, particularly at the full and associate professor ranks; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that an across-the-board adjustment, primarily for the full and associate professor ranks, weighted by merit evaluation performance and years of service since 1990, and adjusted as deemed necessary to reflect any extraordinary circumstances, would be the fairest and most equitable distribution; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is not confident that valid unit matchmates can be reasonably and uniformly determined, or that matchmate data appropriately adjusted for cost of living can be obtained;

BE IT RESOLVED that, should the Provost pursue his matchmate approach for the distribution of equity moneys, the Faculty Senate requests that the Provost circulate to all faculty:

- 1) A thorough explanation of the criteria to be used in selecting unit matchmates;**
- 2) A thorough explanation of the method to be used in determining inequities within units; and**
- 3) Once the process is completed, a detailed summary with:**
 - a) A justification for and the names of the matchmates used for each unit with details of the cost-of-living adjustments employed, and**
 - b) Subject to legal privacy limitations, a unit-by-unit and rank-by-rank summary of the equity allocations made.**

Professor Fox explained that the resolution was not proposed to exclude assistant professors or merit raises for the sake of across-the-board equity adjustments. Because salaries had fallen behind during the 1990s, the Agenda Committee and the Financial Affairs Committee took the position that matchmates have not been accurate. Discussions with the Provost have brought all sides closer to understanding that distribution should be broader and that matchmates will not be a panacea. Ten departments by rank do not allow for adjustment prior to the calculation of the aggregate. You can get average salary and cost of living but not necessarily the size of the adjustment because matchmate schools and departments may be different in size.

Provost Hall reported that the discussions with the SAC and FAC had been productive in clarifying the underlying issues in addressing inequity more broadly. Internal analysis is used to determine inversion and compression in units. The Faculty Handbook requires matchmates on a unit and college basis. However, we need better matchmates for accuracy. Cost of living has become an issue with regard to discrepancies in comparisons. KUPA did not provide enough data. He was trying to be consistent with the spirit of the discussion with the SAC and FAC in sharing information on the way the distribution is conducted. The Handbook restricts information that would reveal individual salaries. He will reserve some funds for possible appeals that need to be addressed. In the spirit of collegiality, he suggested that the focus should not be on passing a resolution but rather on understanding the process and being able to explain it to other faculty members.

Professor Vaughn spoke in favor of the resolution. He pointed out that the first part of the resolution addresses the historical reason for a broad distribution equity adjustment to be made in an open manner. Provost Hall responded that he had promised to provide information so that a resolution would not be necessary. He would not provide matchmates and cost of living for every faculty member, but he will give the information to the deans for them to distribute, as the current Handbook requires.

Professor Gilbert noted that the process and sequence of events is not clear and asked the Provost to relate the sequence of events leading to equity distribution. Provost Hall replied that the reason fifteen schools were requested was that the matchmates would be used for two purposes, equity distribution and market adjustment. For KUPA, ten are needed, but KUPA does not provide information that would be helpful to deans who want information for sizing. If the information does not match, Provost Hall will recommend including other schools in the hope of finding a balance between aspirational and real matchmates. He will ask Mark Putnam to obtain data from KUPA. This data will be shared. At the same time, the internal process will be going on and a scatter block with academic age vs. salary will be prepared for every unit. The Provost and deans would review the KUPA data to see whether some are off the mark and then estimate the amount with which to work. He will review the deans' recommendations at the micro and macro levels to see how they fit with the goals to address compression and inversion and to affirm faculty contributions. Additional discussion may lead to some revising of the distribution, and some appeals may require revising decision-making, but at the end of the process he would announce the distribution for this particular round.

Professor Lowndes acknowledged that although the process described sounded reasonable, the problem was in the premise. He cautioned that the premise that matchmates can be selected that are fair and uniform will be difficult to achieve because professional rankings are not based on a set of uniform professional criteria and, moreover, are not available for all disciplines. Selecting matchmates is an internally competitive and potentially divisive process, and inherently self serving. Without a full accounting to faculty about which matchmates were used for all units, how will the faculty know it was a fair process? Provost Hall responded that if the matchmates are flawed the Senate should change its bylaws because they require matchmates. While he acknowledged that there may be flaws, his goal was to set a standard for selecting matchmates that

will be explicit and not privilege any unit over another. He added that deans are free to share the information. The process this year is better than those of previous years because it goes deeper than just the college levels and thus has a better chance of being accurate. He added that, although the bylaws do not require it, he would bring in a cost-of-living analysis. He read from the Handbook (p. 74): "Equity cases can be made based on comparisons of individual or unit salaries to those in matchmate units or institutions."

Professor Fox explained that the purpose of the resolution was to clear the record about the Senate's position and to indicate faculty concerns about the matchmate data. Fuller information could be shared with the Financial Affairs Committee, if not the entire faculty. The constituents of the Senate are feeling left out of the process. In light of the fact that the study is ongoing, he recommended altering the wording of the resolution. He suggested the following: "BE IT RESOLVED that, because the Provost is pursuing this matchmate approach for the distribution of equity moneys, the Faculty Senate concurs with the plan to report to each unit the explanation of the criteria used, the method used in determining equity in units, and the names of matchmate institutions and their mean salaries by rank and cost-of-living adjustments employed, and, subject to privacy limitations, rank-by-rank salary of equity allocations for those units." In this way, each unit would receive a report. His concern was that many of the constituents of the Senate are not clear about what is happening. They feel left out of the process and want to know the position of the Senate.

Professor Vaughn suggested that the subjunctive was incorrect because the Provost had more or less agreed to items 1, 2, and 3.

Several Senators spoke against the preliminary clauses or the resolution on the floor on grounds that salaries might be deflated or that faculty might be in a stronger position without it.

Provost Hall acknowledged that faculty need to know the rules for selecting matchmates. Faculty are paid by discipline. He had decided to direct the deans to provide a cost-of-living analysis but not on a unit basis.

Professor Fox suggested having a graduated scale based on years of service and matchmate data that can be agreed upon for future analysis.

Professor Aroian reported that a number of faculty in her college are more concerned about the increase in tuition.

Professor Vaughn called the question, and there was no objection.

The Senate turned to a vote on the original motion.

Professor Lowndes asked for a roll call vote. Professors Fox and Vaughn supported the request. The results of the roll call vote are as follows:

Professor Jane Aroian	No
Professor Kenneth P. Baclawski	Yes
Professor Thomas A. Barnes	Abstain
Professor Janet L. Bobcean	Absent
Professor Norman R. Boisse	Abstain
Professor Sharon M. Bruns	No
Professor John G. Flym	No
Professor James A. Fox	Yes
Professor Bill C. Giessen	Absent
Professor Thomas R. Gilbert	No
Professor Maurice E. Gilmore	Yes
Professor Robert L. Hall	Absent
Professor Gerald H. Herman	Yes
Professor Doret M. Hope	No
Professor Stephen M. Kane	Yes
Professor Maureen E. Kelleher	Absent
Professor Marc N. Levine	Absent
Professor Robert P. Lowndes	Yes

Professor Mohamad Metghalchi	No
Professor Richard S. Naylor	Absent
Professor Marjorie Platt	No
Professor Susan G. Powers-Lee	Absent
Professor Guy L. Rotella	No
Professor Timothy J. Rupert	No
Professor Bahram Shafai	No
Professor Denis J. Sullivan	Absent
Professor Michael T. Vaughn	Yes
Professor Bruce A. Wallin	Yes
Professor Edward G. Wertheim	No
Professor Ronald J. Willey	Absent
Professor William E. Wray	Abstain
Provost David Hall	Did not vote
Dean Jack R. Greene	No
Vice President Philomena V. Mantella	No
Vice Provost Patricia M. Meservey	No
Professor Kay Onan	No
Executive Vice Provost Coleen Pantalone	No
Vice President Katherine N. Pendergast	No
Director Mark L. Putnam	No
Vice President Karen T. Rigg	Absent
Dean Stephen R. Zoloth	No

Vote: FAILED, 8-19-3.

Motion. Professor Herman moved to adjourn. There was no objection.

Adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Flym, Secretary
Faculty Senate