

Northeastern University

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

October 27, 2004

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 10/27/2004

Charles H. Ellis Jr.
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Ellis Jr., Charles H., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 10/27/2004" (2004). Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. Paper 56. http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d1000466x

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE

FROM: CHARLES H. ELLIS, Jr., SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2004-05 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 27 OCTOBER 2004

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bansil, Blank, De Ritis, Ellis, Glod, Hansberry, Heiman, Herman, Krishnamoorthy,

Kruger, Lowndes, Margotta, Marshall, McKnight, Melachrinoudis, Morrison, Peterfreund, Powers-Lee,

Reynolds, Robinson, Schaffer, Shafai, Sherman, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wiseman, Wray

(Administrators) Abdelal, Finkelstein, Onan, Spieler, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bannister, Bobcean, Futrelle

(Administrators) Falcon, Hill, Moore, Soyster

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:54 a.m.

I. **Minutes**. The minutes of September 22 and 29 were approved as amended.

- II. **SAC Report**. Professor Lowndes reported the following.
 - A. **Meetings**. The Agenda Committee met twice in regular session, and once with Provost Abdelal. In the meeting with the Provost, SAC raised a number of issues:

Faculty Development Funds

SAC was concerned with the ongoing low level of support for faculty development both for the centralized funds managed out of the Office of the Provost and the decentralized moneys in the colleges. This despite a strong recommendation for significant increases by the 2001-02 Senate. It was pointed out that in CAS, for example, the faculty development support level had not been increased since 1996, and that faculty in at least some areas were being asked to use these moneys even for supplies such as printer cartridges. The Provost indicated that he had begun to channel some non-salary moneys from the Academic Investment Plan to the colleges. SAC urged him to target some fraction of these towards faculty development.

SAC also raised the issue of the new policy not to provide release time through the RSDF, IDF and Faculty Development Funds in the Provost Office, and were especially concerned that such a policy would undermine the IDF. The Provost indicated he would review this.

Sabbatical Leaves

SAC indicated to the Provost that they had begun to receive a number of expressions of concern about the sabbatical leave program, most notably that some applicants had not been notified of their eligibility and that some sabbatical leaves for this year had not been approved until the summer, contrary to the *Faculty Handbook* policy that decisions must be communicated by the Provost to the faculty member by January 15. SAC also queried some changes made this fall to the sabbatical application process for applicants this year.

Promotions.

SAC indicated that they had received some expressions of concern about last year's lateness in approving some promotions - in some cases decisions were not transmitted until well into the summer. The Provost indicated that the new semester calendar had contributed to this and that the calendar schedule for promotions might need revision in order to accomplish these decisions in a more timely fashion.

B. Committees of the Senate

The Senate Agenda Committee is continuing this year its initiative begun last year to establish "Special Committees". The Special Committees consist of a regular Standing Committee of the Senate plus additional members, mainly drawn from the academic deans. The effort is intended to draw a broader expertise and viewpoint into the consideration of certain academic initiatives. The members of the following Special Committees who are not members of the associated standing committee are indicated by an asterisk. Issues that may arise during the course of the year beyond the charge to a Special Committee will be addressed as usual by just the Standing Committee.

1. Special Committee on Academic Policy

Membership

Professor Gerald H. Herman, Chair (History)

Professor Robert P. Futrelle* (CIS)

Professor Nancy Kindelan (Theatre)

Professor Thomas O. Sherman (Mathematics)

Professor Edward G. Wertheim (Human Resources Management)

Professor William E. Wray (Cooperative Education)

Dean Jack R. Greene* (CJ)

Vice Provost Malcolm D. Hill*, ex officio

Associate Dean Richard J. Scranton* (COE)

Dean Stephen R. Zoloth* (Bouvé)

Background

The 2003-04 Special Committee on Academic Policy was asked to recommend an innovative template for a general education program for Northeastern students that would satisfy the students' needs for a general, interdisciplinary and contextual education in preparation for life and work in the twenty-first century, which would provide competitive advantage to recruit and retain still higher caliber students to the University, and which would provide enhancement for the University's academic reputation. The Committee was asked to generate such a program for all students or, recognizing that the constraints facing some units might preclude all students from participating, for the vast majority of students.

Charge

Given these defining elements for a general education program, and based on the principles contained in the report and recommendations of the 2003-04 Special Committee on Academic Policy, the 2004-05 Special Committee has been asked to:

- 1. Construct the curricular parameters from which individual Colleges and Units can build major-specific requirements for a University-wide general education template, and to test these parameters on a range of specific programs.
- 2. Develop a full-cost budget for the proposed general education program.

In developing these, the Committee was asked to exercise due diligence concerning the accreditation standards of all academic units where these exist, and to insure that students throughout the University retain a reasonable level of flexibility to explore within and beyond their disciplines. The Committee was asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 15 March 2005.

2. Special Committee on Enrollment and Admissions Policy

Membership

Professor Richard Rasala, Chair (CIS)

Professor Neil O. Alper (Economics)
Professor Brendan Bannister (Human Resources Management)
Professor Dennis R. Cokely (Modern Languages and ASL)
Professor Bahram Shafai (ECE)
Senior Vice President Philomena Mantella
Dean Allen L. Soyster* (COE)
Dean Thomas E. Moore* (CBA)

Background

In its report to the Senate in the last academic year, the 2003-04 Special Committee on Enrollment and Admissions Policy proposed the following resolution concerning transfer students to the Senate:

"WHEREAS, the academic quality of incoming freshmen classes has, during recent years, been on an upward trajectory as measured by SAT scores and high school GPA, and

WHEREAS, during the same period of time the profile of external transfer students has remained relatively static, and

WHEREAS, external transfer students comprise a portion of the annual enrollment cohort for academic units, and

WHEREAS, a number of leaders of academic units have expressed the view that transfer students, as a group, are not as academically prepared as the higher caliber of freshmen that we now attract, and

WHEREAS, these unit leaders report the presence of a potential bimodal distribution of academic performance in some classes; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate commission, under the auspices of this Standing Committee, a study undertaken by Institutional Research that examines a range of data points concerning the academic preparedness of transfer students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That, after receiving the aforementioned study, this Standing Committee, recognizing the impact of increased selectivity on transfer enrollments and in consultation with the Provost's Office and Enrollment Management, be charged with making specific recommendations regarding enrollment, admission and academic performance of transfer students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Provost's Office work with the Office of Admissions to increase recruitment of competitive transfer students, particularly, in underenrolled majors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That such recommendations, if any, be submitted to the Faculty Senate no later than March 15, 2005."

This was adopted by a unanimous vote of the Senate (25-0-0), and therefore provided the foundation for the charge to the 2004-05 Special Committee.

Charge

The Senate Agenda Committee has asked the 2004-05 Special Committee to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following charge:

"Consistent with the 2003-04 Senate resolution on this matter, the Special Committee is asked to work with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to commission and then examine a range of data points concerning the academic preparedness of transfer students and the patterns in which they utilize University teaching resources. Based on these and any other data that the Committee may wish to include, the Committee is asked to make specific

recommendations regarding the enrollment, admission and academic performance of transfer students."

The Committee was asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 15 March 2005.

3. Standing Committee on Financial Affairs

<u>Membership</u>

Professor Louis J. Kruger, Chair (Counseling and Applied Psychology)
Professor Yiannis A. Levendis (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering)
Professor Joseph W. Meador (Finance and Insurance)
Professor Michael T. Vaughn (Physics)
Professor Bruce A. Wallin (Political Science)

Two key areas for improvement that will support our top-100 goal continue to be faculty salaries and investment in the colleges.

Over the last four years, the Faculty Senate has used diverse data to establish that Northeastern's competitive edge of the early nineties for faculty salaries had been seriously eroded. The Administration has responded with successive equity pools to address this issue. Nevertheless, as the recent 2005 *US News* rankings demonstrate, Northeastern still is not where it needs to be in terms of faculty salaries. Faculty salaries comprise 35% of the Faculty Resources category of the *US News* rankings. According to the *US News*, Northeastern's ranking for Faculty Resources has declined steadily over the years. In 1996, for example, Northeastern's overall national ranking was 138th but its ranking for Faculty Resources was 96th, this latter then being Northeastern's best ranking of any of the factors used (i.e. academic reputation, retention, faculty resources, selectivity, financial resources, alumni giving, and graduation rate). Since 1996, Northeastern's ranking for Faculty Resources has deteriorated markedly from being its best component to its worst component. In 2003 it was 195th; in 2004, it was 147th; and in 2005 it is 159th. And the data reveal that faculty salaries are clearly the major component leading to this poor result for Faculty Resources.

A second key area for change continues to be investments in the Colleges. Over the past several years, the total budgets of the basic colleges grew at a dramatically smaller rate than the other sectors of the University as we committed extraordinary levels of funding to important investments in the University's infrastructure. Last year, the Senate was successful in working with others to help secure the new Academic Investment Plan (note that this will increase the University's budget after 5 years by about \$22 million – the \$75 million touted for public relations efforts is arrived at by summing the cumulative costs over five years). Unfortunately, the ultimate size of the original request for this initiative was significantly reduced in the Committee on Funding Priorities and then in the Budget Committee, and then was further constrained by the imposition of benchmarks. Even if everything goes according to plan, the NU student/faculty ratio at the end of five years will still be worse than the ratio that our competitors currently have.

SAC therefore believes that investment in the Colleges must continue to be a special priority this year. A particular component of this need, though not the only one, concerns the declining size of the professoriate. During the last three years, reports to the Senate have described a significant decline in the size of the professoriate since 1990-91, despite a sharp increase in recent years in the full-time student headcount to above the headcount levels in 1990-91. A similar report (*Life at the Top*) to the Senate this year has shown these trends unchanged. In the fall of 2003, the basic colleges had a total of 588 tenured and tenure-track faculty compared to 594 (2002), 590 (2000), 635 (1996), and 775 (1990). The full-time student headcount (i.e. the total of full-time undergraduates and graduates including those from the School of Law) in the fall of 2003 was 17,317, compared to 16,941 (2002), 16,456 (2000), 14,135 (1996), and 16,239 (1990). What continues to be troubling is that this decline in the professoriate appears to have been compensated for via a sharp increase in full-time lecturers and the like.

A third key area for possible change continues to be the University budget process. The President accepted recommendations from the 2003-04 Senate Agenda Committee for improvement in the budget process effective this year, especially certain aspects of the operations of the Budget Committee and the Committee on Funding Priorities. This is good progress, but still more changes may be needed.

Charge

The Senate Agenda Committee has asked the Financial Affairs Committee to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following three-part charge:

- 1. Based on current information and any other analyses that it may wish to undertake, the Committee is asked to make recommendations on appropriate merit raises and equity adjustments for 2005-06, with a particular emphasis on restoring Northeastern's earlier competitive advantage. The recommendation for equity/market adjustment raises should include consideration of matchmate data collected by the Office of University Planning and Research, appropriately adjusted for cost of living factors if possible. The Committee should present its recommendations on these matters to the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee by 20 October 2004, and to the Senate on 27 October.
- 2. In close collaboration with the Provost and the academic deans, the Committee should continue to assess carefully the needs for new investment in the colleges with a special focus on increasing the size of the professoriate in the basic colleges, and in faculty development moneys. The Committee should work constructively to achieve these goals within the Committee on Funding Priorities and in due course, at an appropriate time to be set later, provide a report back to the Senate on the outcome of these efforts.
- 3. This year, all members of the Financial Affairs Committee will serve on the Committee on Funding Priorities. The Committee members should consider all appropriate issues as they relate to the well-being and success of the University. The Committee members should report back on the progress of the Committee on Funding Priorities in a timely and appropriate manner. Along with the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee, the Financial Affairs Committee should carefully consider and report back to the Senate by no later than 1 March 2005 any suggestions for further improving the annual budget process.

In due course, SAC may add a fourth charge for the Committee relating to involvement by the academic sector in the planning and decision-making concerning investments in new buildings and facilities.

4. Ad Hoc Committee on Library Policies and Operations

Membership

Professor John Casey, Chair (CIS)

Professor Mansoor M. Amiji (Pharmaceutical Sciences)

Professor Arun Bansil (Physics)

Professor Emanuel S. Melachrinoudis (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering)

Professor Harlow L. Robinson (Modern Languages)

Professor David E. Schmitt (Political Science)

Professor Wallace W. Sherwood (Criminal Justice)

Dean Edward Warro, ex officio

Background

In recent years, investments in our academic operations have been limited. This has been especially true for the Library which saw its budget increase by just 9% during 1998-2003. In contrast the college budgets rose by 27.5%, and all other budgets rose by 45.3%. Last year, the Senate worked

closely with the Provost and the Deans to rectify this and the outcome was the creation of the Academic Investment Plan, which has already provided new resources for the Library.

This year, SAC is again focusing on academic policy, research, and educational issues that can assist the University towards its quest for top-100 status, and clearly the further enhancement of the Library is vital to this effort.

Charge

The Senate Agenda Committee has asked the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Library Policies and Operations to address the following three-part charge and prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on at least the second and third parts:

- The Committee will advise the Dean of Libraries on policies, strategic plans and operations
 of the Libraries.
- 2. The Committee will evaluate the funding needs of the libraries and prepare a five-year plan consonant with the goals of the Academic Investment Plan. The five-year plan should account for the toll of inflation on the libraries' materials budget and for the growth of the print and electronic collections necessary to meet the instructional and research needs of Northeastern University. This plan should be prepared if possible in advance of the University's deliberations for the 2005-06 budgets.
- 3. Many universities and research institutes in the United States and abroad have issued statements and taken actions to support open access to periodical information as a means of combating periodical inflation and ensuring equitable distribution of scholarly information, particularly the results of research paid for by government grants. The Committee is asked to explore the issues involved in the movement to provide free online access to scholarship (Open Access Movement) and recommend actions that it deems appropriate to support the movement.

The Committee was asked to provide its report on charge #2 before the University's deliberations on the 2005-06 budget, if possible, and its report on #3 by no later than 15 March 2005.

5. Ad Hoc Committee on Information Systems Policy

<u>Membership</u>

Professor Arun Bansil, Chair (Physics)

Professor Joseph Ayers (Biology)

Professor David E. Budil (Chemistry)

Professor John Casey (CIS)

Professor Helen Connolly (Economics)

Professor Anthony P. De Ritis (Music)

Professor Eric L. Miller (ECE)

Professor Carey M. Rappaport (ECE)

Professor Mustafa R. Yilmaz (Management Science)

Linda D. Allen, University Registrar

Leslie Hitch, Director, Academic Technology Services

Srinivas Sridhar, Vice Provost, Research

Robert Weir, Vice President, Information Services, ex officio

John Guilfoil, SGA

Ipek Ozer Stillman, Graduate and Professional Student Association

Charge

There are a number of significant issues that are important for the Committee and the University to address in the general area of information technology. Some of these might demand more than one academic year to address. Accordingly, the Senate Agenda Committee has asked the *Ad Hoc*

Committee to first develop a list of information technology issues prioritized in terms of their criticality for research and teaching in a top-100 university, and to report back on these to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 15 November 2004. From that list, the Agenda Committee will then select issues for the Ad Hoc Committee to address this year and to report back to the Senate by 15 March 2005.

Ad Hoc Committee on the Graduate Council

Membership

Professor and Associate Dean Agnes H. Chan¹, Chair (CIS)

Professor and Associate Dean Edward L. Jarroll¹ (CAS)

Professor Ralph H. Loring¹ (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
Professor Ronald F. Perry¹ (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering)

Professor Stuart S. Peterfreund¹ (English)

Professor Christopher Robertson¹ (General Management)

Professor Simon I. Singer¹ (Criminal Justice)

Professor John W. Cipolla² (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering)

Professor Daryl A. Hellman² (Economics)

Dean Larry A. Finkelstein³ (CIS)

Dean James R. Stellar³ (CAS)

Vice Provost Luis M. Falcon³

Vice President Christopher E. Hopey³

¹ Elected by and from the Graduate Council

² Appointed by SAC

³ Appointed by the Provost

Background

Graduate programs play a definitive role in shaping the academic reputation of any institution. Since the Graduate Council was created by the Faculty Senate in 1966, the number and size of the graduate programs have grown significantly, and the external markets for graduate programs are dramatically different.

Given all these changes, and given the vital importance of the graduate programs to our quest for top-100 status, SAC and the Provost are agreed that this is an appropriate time to assess possible ways in which the structure and operations of the Graduate Council might be enhanced to support our goal.

Charge

Consistent with our drive for top-100 status, and consistent with the challenging and competitive demands of the external marketplace, the Ad Hoc Committee was asked to develop specific recommendations on the structure and operating procedures of the Graduate Council that will enable:

- The timely and appropriate consideration of new graduate programs
- The timely and appropriate evaluation of existing programs
- An appropriate and effective advocacy for the recruitment and retention of graduate students.

The Committee was asked to present its report, in both hard copy and electronic form, to the Agenda Committee by no later than 15 March 2005.

C. President's Response to Senate Resolutions. President Freeland and the Academic affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees have approved the Senate resolutions on the following School of Professional and Continuing Studies (SPCS) programs recommended earlier this fall by the Senate:

B.S. in Environmental Studies
Associate of Science in Paralegal Studies
B.S. in Leadership
M.S. in Leadership
Master of Professional Studies in Informatics
Master of Liberal Arts Degree

- D. **Next Meeting: November 17 in McLeod**. President Freeland will attend.
- III. **Provost's Report**. Provost Abdelal reported the following.
 - A. Faculty Development Funds. The assumption under which the Provost operated for the last two budget cycles has been to distribute to the colleges (rather than increase the centralized funds in the Provost's Office) whatever funds could be secured for the academic budget, other than full-time faculty and professional staff positions, in support of faculty development. In his first year here, Provost Abdelal tried to regularize commitments of "floating funds" that did not appear anywhere in the budget, focusing on getting them incorporated into the recurring budget. In his second year, which was the most recent completed cycle, he was able to bring sufficient funds into the academic budget that approximately \$2M in non-staff-related funds could be distributed to the colleges. However, the degrees of freedom at the college level were constrained by the fact that two of our largest colleges, Arts and Sciences and Business Administration, have significant deficits. He emphasized that, while all the colleges have inadequate operational budgets, his guiding philosophy has been that the best way to manage the non-personnel money is at the college and department levels while the Provost's Office looks at higher levels of requests. The underfunding of program operation whether supplies, copying, telephone, professional travel, or student activities in departments should be corrected in local operational budgets.
 - B. **Sabbaticals**. This year, the Provost's Office will work to respond in a more timely way to sabbatical proposals.
 - C. **Promotions**. Provost Abdelal reported that he is working on a proposal to bring to the Agenda Committee a new timeline for the promotion process because with the academic year ending on May 1 there is not enough time to deal with the items that traditionally were handled in June.

IV. Question and Discussion Time

- A. Professor Herman reported that the *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Committee, which is completing its deliberations, has created for the new Handbook semester-based language that will address deadlines for promotions and other critical decisions. He urged that proposals be submitted as early as possible to avoid the problems of last year. He also expressed concern that faculty development funds, whether centralized or decentralized, should have a minimum amount per faculty member in the formula, with the final decision at the local level, to ensure that every faculty member does have access to faculty development money. Provost Abdelal concurred.
- B. Professor Peterfreund expressed concern about the obnoxious level of smoking at entrances of campus buildings and asked that the Provost confer with the vice presidents to extend the embargo that exists around the library portico to all major buildings on campus. He suggested building kiosks away from building entrances. Provost Abdelal agreed to take the suggestion under advisement.
- V. **Financial Affairs Committee Report**. Professor Kruger reported that strides were made to restore the University's earlier competitive merit and equity position with last year's 3% merit increase and the \$800,000 equity pool. Nevertheless, there is more to be done with regard to faculty salaries, and faculty resources in particular. *U.S. News and World Report* ranked NU at 159th in faculty resources, within the 120th overall ranking. Clearly the Faculty Resources category, which contributes 20% to the overall rankings of the University, is very important as we strive to be in the top 100. He moved Resolution #1, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

Whereas Northeastern University aspires to be a top-100 university, the University also must aspire to be a top-100 university in regard to faculty resources, generally, and in particular with respect to faculty salaries,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee that Northeastern University invest sufficient funds to attain top-100 status with respect to overall faculty resources as well as to faculty salaries.

Professor Kruger noted that the faculty salary subfactor is the single biggest drag on faculty resources and one of the main stumbling blocks to our attaining top-100 status. Even when using a conservative regional cost-of-living adjustment of about 20%, our average faculty compensation is more than \$5,000 behind other colleges that are ranked near the 100 level in faculty resources.

Professor Margotta asked whether the discrepancies were at the individual faculty level, or did they reflect a difference in distribution of full vs. associate professor or other levels, or were they department-by-department discrepancies? Professor Kruger replied that some departments were behind but he did not know which ones. Professor Vaughn added that on a rank-by-rank basis, depending on how you do the cost-of-living adjustments (COLA), the average for the University is close to that of its peers. *U.S. News* uses a COLA by Runzheimer, which refuses to release its data. We do not have the data by department, but some departments are above and others below. At the moment, the salaries of assistant professors are competitive because they are hired at market rates, but associate and full professor salaries are behind.

Provost Abdelal pointed out that, according to the data from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), some departments stand out as needing more correction than others because of their matchmate averages. When equity is distributed, that data becomes available to the deans and the equity money is allocated to the colleges in a targeted way.

In response to a question as to whether the Financial Affairs Committee could estimate where NU would fall in the faculty compensation category, Professor Kruger explained that this subfactor was not reported by U.S. News. Dean Zoloth pointed out that the issue is complicated further because the metrics used in comparisons are different.

Professor McKnight suggested that this issue was related to the problem of large numbers of sections being taught by part-time faculty. Professor Kruger replied that the figures in the report were for full-time faculty.

Professor Lowndes cautioned that while faculty compensation as reported in *U.S. News* refers only to the professoriate, other *U.S. News* categories, such as the percentage of total faculty with top terminal degrees, included other ranks such as lecturers, etc.

Professor Krishnamoorthy asked how NU compares with other Boston area institutions. Professor Kruger noted that Boston has a high cost of living, and its schools therefore struggle with the faculty resources ranking.

Provost Abdelal identified two separate issues: 1) where we rank in terms of faculty resources; and 2) how to rank better. How we calculate whether we are compensating our faculty at market-competitive levels is determined by departments as compared with the specific matchmate list of ten departments that have the same mix of programs and the same level of research productivity.

Professor Marshall expressed concern about faculty coming here with enthusiasm and then leaving in a few years. He suggested being more creative about how we designate faculty resources perhaps offering to new faculty rental subsidies, interest-free loans, or other non-salary possibilities that would make NU more attractive.

Provost Abdelal noted that the data from the OIR has a COLA of about 20-25% built into it, which would take into consideration the Boston area vs. other locations. Boston institutions have taken steps other than salaries to attract young faculty. Tufts has a residential support program, for example.

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

Vote on Resolution #1: PASSED, 30-0-1.

Professor Kruger moved Resolution #2, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for a merit raise pool of 4.9% for continuing faculty in the 2005-06 academic year.

Professor Vaughn pointed out that the Boston cost-of-living increase is 2.9% from July to July and that is the benchmark we use every year. In addition, we need about 2% in order to provide a genuine merit raise.

Professor McKnight asked whether the 2% were essentially a no-cost, steady state increase over time, which would mean taking people off the top and redistributing the money at the lower levels. Professor Vaughn replied that it is not quite steady state, but to some degree the moneys are recouped by replacing the more expensive faculty who retire with less costly junior faculty.

There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote on Resolution #2: PASSED, 29-0-1.

Professor Kruger moved Resolution #3, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for an \$800,000 equity pool in fiscal year 2005-06 to close the market/equity gap between the salaries of Northeastern University faculty and those of faculty at peer institutions.

Professor Alper doubted that \$800,000 would close the market/equity gap and suggested changing the wording of the resolution.

Professor Vaughn suggested substituting "reduce" for "close" and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Robinson asked if information were available on the nature of the gap in terms of the number of faculty and in which departments. Provost Abdelal responded that he could share general features of the information gathered from Institutional Research rather than providing details department by department and rank by rank, in order to protect the privacy of individuals.

Professor Robinson asked whether it would be helpful to have the data to which Provost Abdelal referred in order to ascertain whether the \$800K would adequately address the issue. Professor Vaughn replied that the FAC and each department should get the broad characteristics relevant to it as long as it does not compromise the privacy of individual faculty members.

Provost Abdelal suggested changing "reduce" to "address". He pointed out that simply providing the data does not really address all the questions because different people can interpret it differently. The change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Kruger suggested that, based on the Provost's data, the FAC could reassess what the gap is and report that to the Senate to see whether we are on track.

Professor Vaughn noted that, although more is needed, some progress has been made in the last three years and the FAC and the Senate should acknowledge President Freeland for that.

Provost Abdelal explained that the analysis is complicated because, while a department may not have a gap, some of the ranks within that department may be above or below the matchmate. Simply adding up the deficits does not take into account the departments that have more than their matchmates. There are

legitimate reasons why department averages can vary, and deans of colleges should make equity judgments looking at specific cases. Closing the gap cannot be done by a simple formula. The process is dynamic, comparing salaries every year to what is happening nationally, and making corrections where possible. Sometimes correction is not possible due to lack of money. On the basis of that reasoning, the \$800K figure is reasonable.

In response to a question on the routing of the resolutions, Provost Abdelal explained that they would go to the Committee on Funding Priorities (CFP), which would prioritize the list of all the requests it has received, and then to the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee discusses with the CFP the recommendations it plans to make to the President, and on the basis of that discussion, may make further adjustments. The President takes the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees, and that recommendation almost always stands.

Professor Krishnamoorthy asked whether the resolutions were supported by credible evidence. Professor Morrison explained that the CFP meets at least once a week through Thanksgiving. It gets background information on presentations from University Planning Director Putnam on *U.S. News*, from Vice President Mantella on our market position, from Provost Abdelal on the Academic Investment Plan, and other vice presidents on their requests. The Financial Affairs Committee's report and resolutions came to the Senate at this time because next week they will go to the CFP. The total amount requested will far exceed the money available. The CFP will then, as charged by the President, outline broad budget priorities rather than line items and, using a system whereby each of the twenty-six members allocates some hypothetical amount, the CFP will present to the Budget Committee a range that has not yet been determined. Provost Abdelal added that the deliberations of the CFP are comprehensive. They encompass all the academic and non-academic areas of the University, including health insurance for graduate students.

Professor Lowndes pointed out that, despite the presence of faculty on the CFP, it was remarkable how other needs regularly supersede faculty and staff salaries. He did not want the body to think faculty needs were in safe hands or that the 4.9% was a certainly. He urged those present, including the senior administrators and deans, to argue more strongly for appropriate merit and equity increases for faculty and staff, despite their own issues.

The floor was yielded to Professor Wallin who spoke in support of Professor Lowndes' statement. He added that people could write letters to their deans and talk to their students to make a case behind the scenes on behalf of faculty and staff.

Professor Sherwood expressed concern that faculty representatives on committees may be too reasonable in their approach, overlooking the fact that reasonable arguments can be made for both sides. When the administration counters a reasonable argument, faculty should not be overly hasty in embracing it.

Provost Abdelal added that, although this is a difficult process, it is one in which a significant number of faculty participate effectively. He maintained that he does not subscribe to an adversarial model and noted that collegiality has improved over the past two years. The CFP engages in vigorous debate, and views are presented strongly. When organizations become radicalized, it acts against collegiality and the effective operation or the organization.

Professor Lowndes countered that the problem is not due to a lack in the FAC's advocacy. Even when a case seems compelling for some level of merit and/or equity, it rarely prevails. It is usually undercut. Last year's recommended 5% increase was quickly watered down to 3%, even though everyone agreed that the case was sound and compelling. But, other multimillion dollar issues suddenly appeared that were deemed urgent, and were funded as usual. The discussion was collegial until the Budget Committee reported back to the CFP. All of the FAC and the Chair of the SAC expressed considerable disappointment, which was a shock to some. The FAC had put in a great deal of effort to arrive at a reasonable estimate for the faculty/staff increase only to see it, once again, reduced. Budget managers always seem to find something that is more important. In fact, that was what led to the disastrous decline of salaries in the 1990s. There was a disposition not to pay the faculty sufficiently, and its consequence has been the decline in the faculty resources ranking from 96th in 1996 to 159th this year. It has taken four years to address a fairly modest equity claim. Assuming we get the

\$800K for equity this year, the total amount over four years is but a small percentage of the total operating budget; similar requests for other initiatives are funded in one year. He urged all Senators to support the case outside the Senate.

On the positive side, Provost Abdelal pointed out that, after the unhappiness evoked by the last budget cycle, a discussion with the President and SAC had resulted in agreement that this year, after the Budget Committee comes up with its own analysis, there will be an opportunity for further discussion and reconciliation with the CFP.

Professor Peterfreund spoke of the need to change the culture and recalled that, when he was Chair of the Agenda Committee in 1992-93, he had been asked how we know a matchmate is really a matchmate, and the \$1.5M package requested was reduced to \$750K. What is on the table for this year is the 2.9% July-July figure and the 2% steady state COLA. If less than the 4.9% is allocated, one may infer that money is being subtracted from the overall salary moneys on hand. In the spirit of Red Sox mania, he suggested that this is the time to reverse the purse curse.

Professor Vaughn noted that the *U.S. News* also ranks educational expenditures—a category not included in the FAC report, in which NU ranks 133rd. This category incorporates faculty salaries, new positions, faculty development funds, and a range of initiatives that the deans support.

Professor Blank suggested adding "the urgent problem of" after "address" and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Motion. Professor Ellis called the question.

Vote on cloture: PASSED, 32-0-0.

Resolution #3, as amended, read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for an \$800,000 equity pool in fiscal year 2005-06 to address the urgent problem of the market/equity gap between the salaries of Northeastern University faculty and those of faculty at peer institutions.

Vote on Resolution #3 as amended: PASSED, 29-1-2.

Adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Ellis, Jr. Secretary