

April 08, 2002

## Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/08/2002

John G. Flyn  
*Northeastern University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Flyn, John G., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/08/2002" (2002). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 10.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005651>

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, 8 APRIL 2002

---

Present: (Professors) Aroian, Baclawski, Barnes, Bobcean, Bruns, Flym, Fox, Giessen, Gilmore, Hall, Herman, Hope, Kane, Kelleher, Levine, Lowndes, Naylor, Platt, Powers-Lee, Rotella, Rupert, Shafai, Sullivan, Vaughn, Wallin, Wertheim, Wray  
(Administrators) Hall, Mantella, Meservey, Onan, Pantalone, Pendergast,

Absent: (Professors) Boisse, Gilbert, Metghalchi, Willey  
(Administrators) Greene, Putnam, Rigg, Zoloth

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

I. **Minutes.** The minutes of 11 February were approved as amended by changing “KUPA” to “CUPA”.

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 Registrar Allen, who reported that new classrooms in Behrakis and a half dozen others will become available when people move into Behrakis. Discussion is under way on the number of sequences to be included in the semester system. The current scheme has eleven sequences, but another may be added.
- B. **Resolution.** The 25 February Senate resolution on the restructuring of the Provost’s Office was acknowledged by President Freeland on 18 March as informational.
- C. **Next Senate Meeting: 15 April 2002 in 308 SN.** Please note that the Senate will be meeting weekly due to the quantity of work expected, i.e., reports from standing and ad hoc committees and discussions on the semester conversion and the Faculty Handbook.

III. **Provost’s Report.**

Provost Hall reported that equity matchmates are being developed, with input from departments and colleges. Vice Provost Meservey has been working with units. Letters will be sent within the next week or two.

IV. **Question and Discussion Time.**

- A. Professor Wallin, referring to matchmate analysis, asked if there were slippage in the CUPA data. Provost Hall responded that he had had a tight time frame for gathering information from CUPA by the HRM deadline. The deadline has been shifted and the process is moving well now. Vice Provost Meservey added that the CAS chairs wanted their lists separate rather than grouped. Our information is being sent to CUPA and will be back in about a week.
- B. Professor Bruns asked whether this is a proposal-based equity process, and whether faculty would have to make their own cases. Provost Hall responded that he expected the deans to make recommendations based on information given to them. He would then make decisions based on the colleges’ recommendations.

Professor Bruns noted that it would be impossible to make a case for equity without information on comparisons. Provost Hall replied that the deans are free to share that information with departments. Vice Provost Meservey pointed out that part of the reason for doing scatter plots and matchmate analysis was to bring some objectivity into the analysis.

- C. Professor Fox asked whether information could be shared on the averages by rank in a unit and by matchmates, and if faculty might speak to the deans after seeing it. Provost Hall responded that the

information would be sent to colleges on 29 April and recommendations would be due by 10 May, which permits a small window of time.

- D. Professor Vaughn asked what information Mark Putnam would get on the cost-of-living analysis to be done. Provost Hall replied that the information would come from CUPA and the cost-of-living analysis would be attached. Vice Provost Meservey added that the data on 2000-2001 salaries would be looked at to include such factors as an across-the-board merit pool, the appropriate way to format cost-of-living adjustments, and years since terminal degree.

V. **Vice President Sandra King, University Relations: Strategic Positioning of Northeastern University.**

Vice President King, a graduate of Northeastern's MBA program, reported that she and her staff are engaged in increasing the visibility of NU in the marketplace. We need to increase our recognition, and we have the right kind of attributes—faculty, programs, students, and facilities—to be able to package in a way that tells our story effectively to the marketplace.

Prior to Vice President King's arrival nearly two years ago, President Freeland had hired some firms to assess our communications systems and make recommendations on coordination, web management, publications, and public relations. Thus her position was created, and since then she has conducted primary and secondary research by asking faculty, students, and parents what they want to hear about the University to be able to make favorable decisions on our behalf. She has also spent time developing creative messages. She noted that the \$18.5M to be spent to enhance NU's image that was mentioned in *The Boston Globe* actually did not refer to her office but rather to hiring colleagues for faculty. Her job is to manage the image and the reputation at the macro level, that is, in support of enrollment management, development, alumni relations, and HRM's efforts to attract highly qualified faculty and staff. She has also been working with the colleges to get more positive stories to the media and to implement an internal communications plan to increase the visibility of the President and engage the participation of the university community in smaller settings where there is opportunity for interaction.

The term "branding initiative" refers to the positioning of the University in the mind of the marketplace, locally, regionally, and nationally. The goal is to increase our recognition, our pride factor. Northeastern has 146,000 alumni, and we need to have more of their energy behind who we are and what we do. We need to know what to do to overcome perceptions of NU that are less than positive. What has not been clear in the market, based on the data obtained, is an understanding of our academic excellence and how it is integrated with the Coop experience to produce a strong product that is differentiated from other academic products. The target audience is the prospective student, and our goal is to get on the short list of very strong students who understand the integration of academic excellence and Coop. That audience is supported by concentric circles of influences, as represented by the faculty, parents, neighbors, or alumni to whom prospective students look for information. Finally, our relationship with our Coop employers is critical in taking our message to the right place and to the right market.

Vice President King explained that the target geography is driven primarily by the patterns of enrollment management. Most of our applications come from New England, but more are coming from the Mid-Atlantic region. We have tiered our message so that the first tier is the greater Boston area, New England, and the Mid-Atlantic region as far south as Virginia and Pennsylvania. The second tier audience is selected by demographics and by the concentration of our alumni in California, Florida, and Texas. A tertiary tier will eventually take that message to additional areas.

An outdated vision and information about the University is troublesome. While we are proud of our past, the University has changed significantly over time, and we need to correct the old image of the campus and the quality of its residential life, among other things. University College is the largest advertiser in the University and, because of its mission, has had to emphasize in many ways its convenience over academic quality. Vice President King has been working to help realign some of the positioning of key messages.

Vice President King also reported that our competitive setting is changing. We are seeing more cross-applications with NYU, BU, and George Washington University, whereas, five years ago, the competitors were URI and Endicott. We need to demonstrate that we fit into that competitive setting. One way is to market practice-oriented education as the academic approach to research, establishing a center around POE and

research but without sacrificing the mindshare that we have around Coop. We have a number of faculty with strong national reputations, and we need to continue to enhance and spotlight these individuals in the public media as well as in academic journals. Employers are impressed with the maturity of our students in the workplace, and this is another asset we can showcase. Other institutions are introducing experiential programs to simulate what NU has used for a long time as a core differentiator.

Vice President King referred to the material she had distributed and explained that it demonstrated a grand building cycle that is intended to take the prospective student from awareness to loyalty. The basic rules of positioning call for a message that is simple, differentiated, and positive. We have a quality product and will be running an aggressive print campaign in May, with full-page color ads in the *New York Times*, *Boston Globe*, and *Boston Herald*. Billboards in the areas around the Mass. Pike are planned. We will sponsor the Northeastern University Brainteaser at Red Sox games this season. The Red Sox is a Northeastern Coop employer, and we are working on a way to correlate that with students, particularly students in our honors program. Decisions on future initiatives will depend on feedback from these endeavors.

Vice President King then showed some samples of the popup microsite for prospective students, which will permit easier access to our website. Advertisements incorporate photographic combinations of, for example, the Zakim Bridge and a student sitting at a piano, suggesting an interaction between Engineering and the Arts.

The floor was then opened to questions.

Professor Vaughn suggested that the Office of University Relations provide a fact sheet and help with websites. Vice President King replied that Ken Gornstein, Director of Editorial Services, has been working with some of the colleges to establish websites.

Professor Aroian reported the plight of a prospective student with a 3.5 g.p.a. who cannot attend the University because of the high tuition and denial of financial aid. She recommended that more be done to manage this problem because it is everybody's problem. Vice President King agreed that it is everybody's problem and pointed out that increasing the recognition of our institution in terms of the quality we offer must justify the tuition.

#### VI. Faculty Development Committee Report.

Professor Wertheim moved the following resolutions, and the motion was seconded.

Resolution #1:

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends the adoption of the University of Washington's Instructional Assessment System (IAS) for a period of five years, from the summer term of 2002 until the spring term of 2007.**

Resolution #2:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all *Faculty Handbook* provisions and regulations currently applicable to the use of TCEP in matters of tenure, promotion, and merit review be made applicable to IAS when that system comes on line.**

Resolution #3:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the use of IAS be assessed by the Director of CEUT and the Director of Assessment or their designees during the summer term of 2004 to determine the overall accuracy, fairness, usefulness, and the general acceptability of the system. The results of this assessment shall be communicated to the Senate Agenda Committee by the end of the summer term of 2004. The purpose of the assessment shall be to determine whether to continue using IAS beyond the spring term of 2007, or whether Northeastern should begin developing its own teacher-course evaluation system, to be tested and in place by the summer term of 2007.**

The floor was yielded to Professor Peterfreund, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee, who, with the CEUT, investigated the merits of various programs and decided that the University of Washington was the one most appropriate to select on a trial basis. This decision would not prevent the eventual creation of our own program.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out that the resolutions protect the guidelines of the TCEP and the confidentiality of faculty in terms of the amount of information shared and in what form. This is a local option for units as long as it does not violate the Faculty Handbook. The turn-around time for data is about fifteen days.

Motion. Professor Herman moved to amend by adding “**in consultation with**” before “**the Senate Agenda Committee**” and “**and the Student Government Association**” after “**Senate Agenda Committee**”. These changes were accepted as friendly amendments.

Motion. Professor Vaughn moved to amend by substitution of “**through**” for “**during**”, and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Motion. Professor Lowndes moved to amend by substituting “**fall term of 2004**” for “**summer term of 2004**”, and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The floor was yielded to Vice Provost Barabino, who explained that outsourcing the evaluation process at this time, after a year of studying systems nationally, was determined to be the best course of action for now. The person who had been doing it at Kansas State had left, and since that time the in-house system has been patched without success. It kept breaking down because we did not have a staffing programmer and statistician to run it, which would represent a major investment of resources. Provost Hall added that the consensus was to have it in-house, but the system we have is too problematic. What is being proposed is a temporary measure until we can develop a long-term plan.

Resolutions #1 and #2, and #3 as amended, read as follows:

Resolution #1:

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends the adoption of the University of Washington's Instructional Assessment System (IAS) for a period of five years, from the summer term of 2002 until the spring term of 2007.**

Resolution #2:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all *Faculty Handbook* provisions and regulations currently applicable to the use of TCEP in matters of tenure, promotion, and merit review be made applicable to IAS when that system comes on line.**

Resolution #3:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the use of IAS be assessed by the Director of CEUT and the Director of Assessment or their designees in consultation with the Senate Agenda Committee and the Student Government Association through the spring term of 2004 to determine the overall accuracy, fairness, usefulness, and the general acceptability of the system. The results of this assessment shall be communicated to the Senate Agenda Committee and the Student Government Association by the end of the fall term of 2004. The purpose of the assessment shall be to determine whether to continue using IAS beyond the spring term of 2007, or whether Northeastern should begin developing its own teacher-course evaluation system, to be tested and in place by the summer term of 2007.**

Vote on all three Resolutions: PASSED, 29-0.

## VII. New Process for Reviewing and Approving Graduate Certificate Programs

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

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approve the new process for reviewing and approving non-degree and graduate certificate programs as approved unanimously by the Graduate Council on 18 January 2002.**

The floor was yielded to Dean Croatti, Chair of the University Graduate Council Executive Committee, who explained that the Graduate Council wanted to streamline the certificate approval process for University College. The change would not apply to Certificates of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS), but only to non-degree and graduate certificate programs for graduate schools and University College.

Professor Herman noted that UC was in flux. Programs are subject to the colleges, and it would not be a good idea to approve programs without input from graduate directors.

Motion. Professor Herman moved to add the following to the bulleted items on page 1: “**Executive Committee will notify all Graduate School Directors and related parties of hearings on Graduate Certificates**” and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

There being no further discussion, the Senate moved to a vote.

Vote: PASSED, 27-0.

Adjourned at 1:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Flym, Secretary  
Faculty Senate