IRis

Northeastern University

Faculty Senate Meeting Agendas

Faculty Senate

February 27, 2008

Faculty Senate meeting agenda: 02/27/2008

Faculty Senate, Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, Northeastern University, "Faculty Senate meeting agenda: 02/27/2008" (2008). *Faculty Senate Meeting Agendas.* Paper 117. http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10014305

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

TO: All Faculty
FROM: Faculty Senate Agenda Committee
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting

I. The next meeting of the 2007-08 Faculty Senate will be:

Date**: Wednesday, 27 February**
Time**: 11:45 AM to 1:25 PM**
Place**: Raytheon, 240 EC**

II. Agenda

A. Approval of minutes

B. SAC Report (Professor Glod)

C. Provost's Report (Provost Abdelal)

D. Questions & discussion

III. Graduate Programs update (Vice Provost Luis Falcon) (12:00-12:30 PM)

IV. Final report and resolution from the Senate *ad hoc* Committee for TRACE Implementation (Professor Fox)

WHEREAS the Senate previously voted to switch from the TCE Program to TRACE to be administered on-line,

BE IT RESOLVED That the University move immediately to implement TRACE on-line using the *CoursEval*^{3} interface for all undergraduate and graduate classes (except directed studies and similar special offerings), effective for the spring 2008 semester (with the exception of the School of Law and the School of Continuing and Professional Studies, both of which have a different academic calendar).

IV. Special Senate Faculty Development Committee on Merit report and resolutions (Professor Sherman)

WHEREAS the Faculty Development Committee has been charged with examining merit procedures across the University and to consider the extent to which unit-based practices should be standardized; AND

WHEREAS, while there are arguments for local control, certain principles and practices should be common to all units;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the following be implemented by academic units in time for the spring 2009 raise pool and be adopted for addition to the Faculty Handbook:

FDC resolution #2

Performance evaluations of all faculty members in a unit shall be performed by tenured faculty in that unit, selected by a process determined by the tenured faculty.

(a) There may be exceptions (e.g., to avoid nepotism because of personal relationships) that shall be approved and overseen by the Dean and the Provost.
(b) A unit may utilize a different composition of the evaluation committee (e.g., administrators or both tenured and tenure-track faculty), but such changes require a majority vote of all voting faculty and approval by the unit head and Dean and must be re-approved by the unit every five (5) years or the process reverts to evaluation by tenured faculty.
(c) All evaluations must reflect the assessment by at least two individuals.
(d) The unit shall decide the extent to which the unit head has discretion to adjust performance evaluations and merit scores determined by the evaluation committee. This must be revisited by the unit every five years.
(e) Because market inequities are normally handled through a separate process and pool of funds, neither unit heads nor deans shall have set-aside funds drawn from the merit pool.

FDC resolution #3

Units must have a clearly defined and timely appeals process in place. Faculty shall be informed of the outcome of their assessment and related merit score (though not the merit raise itself) at least one month prior to the point when recommendations to the Provost's Office for merit adjustments are submitted and finalized.

FDC resolution #4

Faculty raises shall be distributed based on percentages, rather than dollars.

FDC resolution #5

All faculty in a unit shall be advised of the average and range of merit scores in teaching, research/scholarship, and service as well as the weighted combination of the three performance areas.

FDC resolution #6

All faculty shall be given specific and timely written feedback in regard to the outcomes of their merit review that goes beyond merely providing a score. Feedback shall be consistent with an individual's workload priorities. At minimum, the feedback shall provide the basis for the merit scores in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, any area(s) of relative weakness shall be coupled with recommendations for improving performance in that area. Units are also encouraged to consider the implementation of

feedback meetings with individual faculty for the purpose of clarifying the basis of the merit scores and the recommendations.

FDC resolution #7

Evaluations for merit shall be performed early in the spring semester, with the assessment covering the previous calendar year. A general timetable for the merit process is as follows:

- **Faculty submit annual dossier for merit review—end of January**
- **Faculty receive merit reviews (score and commentary)—end of February**
- **Submission of faculty appeals—mid-March**
- **Faculty receive outcome of appeal—end of March**
- **Unit head receives merit reviews and scores—beginning of April**
- **Faculty notified of raise and report of unit results after the Provost releases this information.**