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Executive Summary

The Senate Agenda Committee met periodically during the summer of 2007 and weekly during the academic year. We reviewed the work of the previous year’s Senate committees and Senate, and developed the priorities and charges for 2007-08. In response to faculty concerns an Executive Session of the Faculty Senate was held on 9/19/07 (see http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/about_faculty/documents/documents/GlodSlides.pdf), and was followed by specific resolutions which addressed issues of faculty governance, input into major university policies (such as tenure/promotion, budgeting), and the need for action on outstanding revisions to the Faculty Handbook (previously passed by the Faculty Senate during 2002-2005) which impact faculty roles and responsibilities. The Senate Agenda Committee emphasized the need for increased full-time tenure-line faculty based on analysis of faculty composition and trends over time.

Priorities

Over the course of the 2007-2008 academic year, several important key issues and priorities were addressed, including Faculty Handbook revisions; role of faculty/Faculty Senate in determining university budget priorities and establishing processes; an implementation plan for the undergraduate core curriculum (General Education); revision/online implementation of the current Teacher-Course Evaluation Program (TCEP) to TRACE; review of the current composition of the faculty; review of the system of merit review of faculty; academic honesty and student handbooks; review of degree and program proposals from across the University.

Revision of the Faculty Handbook

Twenty-two Faculty Handbook resolutions, passed by the Faculty Senate between 2002 and 2005, remained outstanding at the beginning of the academic year. On September 18, 2007, three resolutions (appendix A) were approved. The remaining resolutions and other faculty concerns were discussed in the Faculty Senate Executive Session on September 19, 2007, and resulted in the following resolutions.

On October 3, 2007 the following resolution was passed unanimously by a vote of 33-0-0, and was signed by the President:

BE IT RESOLVED That each unsigned resolution pertaining to the Faculty Handbook receive a response from Northeastern University administration by noting approval or listing specific issues in dispute, with the expectation that a Faculty Handbook be in place by the end of spring 2008 semester.
Subsequently, The Senate Agenda Committee and Office of the Provost agreed that Vice Provost Falcon and Professor Malcolm Hill (representing SAC) would review the remaining Handbook resolutions. Following a complete analysis by the SAC entailing some editorial changes and updates, four of these resolutions were revised, presented to the full Senate for review, and passed (p.112). As of this writing, 19 Faculty Handbook resolutions remain under review by the Office of the President. There remains a need for a current up-to-date Faculty Handbook prior to NEASC and for effective shared governance.

**Reaffirmation of Shared Governance**

Also on October 3, 2007, the Senate affirmed the following resolution on shared governance by a vote of 33-0-1. This was subsequently signed by the President.

> BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That, in the spirit of shared governance outlined in the current Handbook, we respectfully request that the President, Provost and senior administration, including Deans, work with the Faculty Senate to ensure meaningful input and participation as well as transparency in the Northeastern University decision-making process to improve the functioning of the University.

**Faculty Composition**

Although the 2008 faculty data were not available at the time of this writing, an analysis of faculty trends by rank and tenure status was presented to the Senate (at the first and final meetings), and reviewed periodically by the SAC over the past year. The data indicate that the composition of the faculty has changed substantially over the years, using comparisons of the 2007 data on the full-time Northeastern day faculty. Contained in the table (appendix B), the data indicate an overall increase in the number of faculty, reflected by an increase of about 54 tenure-line faculty over the past five years, and an increased percentage of non-tenure track faculty over the past 10-15 years. The changing composition of the faculty through these data provided the rationale for the establishing priorities in the 2008-09 budget and future projections about the need for hiring additional full-time tenure-line faculty (specifically, a minimum of 30 additional full-time tenure-line faculty each year).

**University Budget and Budgeting Processes**

After review of the University budgeting process by the Senate Financial Affairs Committee (FAC), SAC, and following discussion of these issues during the Executive Session, the SAC and FAC met with the senior administration to discuss potential options and develop priorities and processes (see 2007-08 FAC report). The FAC evaluated the fiscal 2009 budget in regard to both the process and extent that the budget reflected faculty concerns and priorities; they concluded that both the budget priorities and the process were much improved from last year as reflected in their final report & recommendations. These include active involvement by the FAC and SAC Chair in setting priorities and in the overall budget process annually. Their resolutions were approved by Senate and subsequently by the President on June 7, 2008.

**General Education/Core Curriculum**

The 2005-2006 Special Senate Committee on Academic Policy (APC) finalized a General Education template for departmental review/comment prior to review and acceptance by the Faculty Senate. The comprehensive plan/core curriculum was implemented in fall 2007 for undergraduate students embodied eight dimensions to prepare students for a general, contextual education. These included:
SAC appointed an ad hoc Core Implementation Committee to develop an implementation plan for each department’s writing-intensive courses along with the necessary resources; to determine how new courses and requirements will be reviewed and approved, along with the ongoing supervision of the NU Core; and to coordinate important aspects of the core curriculum with the sections on General Education in Standard 4 (The Academic Program) of the NEASC Accreditation Guidelines. The Committee made specific recommendations for resources for writing courses in the core and for oversight and assessment which are reflected in their final report (p.65). These resolutions were passed by the Senate and subsequently by the President.

**Teacher Course Evaluations Review, Revision, and Implementation**

In response to student requests about teacher/course evaluations, previous Faculty Development Committees reviewed/made recommendations to the process. On February 28, 2007, the Faculty Senate passed a series of resolutions that set the stage for replacing the current Teacher-Course Evaluation Program (TCEP) with an electronically administered Teacher Rating Course Evaluation (TRACE) instrument. The advantages of the TRACE included updated closed questions that more appropriately reflect pedagogy, open-ended responses to provide more qualitative evaluation, and promote a more formative evaluation of the course, instructor, and course materials (p.44). Based on this previous work, the Senate Agenda Committee established a Special Ad Hoc Committee on TRACE Implementation that conducted pilot studies during the fall 2007 semester and presented their results and resolutions. The Faculty Senate passed the resolution in February 2008 to administer the TRACE online using the CoursEval interface for all undergraduate and graduate classes (except directed studies and similar special offerings), effective for the spring 2008 semester.

**Research Grant Processing and Research Infrastructure**

The faculty and department chairs have continued to raise recurring major issues related to the timely processing of contracts, including clinical agency contracts, research contracts, and software licensing agreements which encompass multi-year agreements requiring review and approval by the Board of Trustees. The Senate Agenda Committee continued to discuss these issues with the Provost, the President, University Counsel, and during its yearly meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, and referred the issue to the Senate Committee for Research Policy Oversight (RPOC). Specifically, we charged the RPOC with examining these ongoing issues and making recommendations related to improvement of the research infrastructure at this University. The RPOC proposed, and the Senate then passed, three resolutions intended to improve the processing of grants/contracts and the overall infrastructure. These include restructuring and reorganization of research activities into the proposed new “Office of Grant and Contract Administration”; permitting the Technology Transfer Office signatory authority; and establishing an Electronic Research Administration System. The
resolution regarding signatory authority remains under review in the President’s Office at the
time of this writing.

**Merit Procedures**
The Senate Agenda Committee, in consultation with the Provost, charged the 2007
Faculty Development Committee to review and revise the current process for merit
distribution, outlined in their report. The Senate passed five resolutions which were
subsequently approved by the President. These focus on faculty merit assessment
reflecting agreed upon workload; unit-based appeals processes; greater transparency
about the average and range of merit scores; timely and specific written feedback about
performance.

**Academic Honesty/Grade Distribution**
The report/resolutions from the 2006-07 Committee for Academic Policy (APC) focusing
on issues concerning academic honesty were discussed and passed by the Senate in fall
2007. These addressed the need for consistent University-wide reporting mechanisms
for all academic integrity violations; a review of the restorative justice concept; and
expansion of the Student Government Association’s Academic Integrity Policy.

The 2007-08 Committee for Academic Policy was charged to review the distribution of
undergraduate grades across the University and by department and honors status. Their
report and analysis
(http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees/20072008/200708_special/documents/APC0708_FnlRptUG_grade_Distr06.pdf)
indicated an acknowledgement of the existence of grade inflation/compression and a call to further investigate and address these issues.

**Administrator Evaluations/Search Committees**
This year the Senate Committee for Administrator Evaluation Oversight completed a
high volume of administrator reviews (page # in the annual report). Search committees
that were formed throughout the academic year are also detailed in the report (page #),
including the Provost Search Committee.

Proposed new programs and revisions to existing programs were developed by various
departments throughout the day Colleges and in the School for Professional and
Continuing Studies, and are listed among Resolutions (p.103). A proposal to change the
name of the School of Professional and Continuing Studies to the College of Professional
Studies passed the Senate on April 23, 2008, and was subsequently approved by both the
President and the Board of Trustees.

**Other**
The Information Technology Policy Committee carried out its several charges related to
updates on course photo rosters, digital signatures, needs regarding student/faculty
portals, transition to Vista operating system, and the status of computers in classrooms.
These are detailed in their extensive report (page #). They proposed establishing a
Standing Committee for Academic Software Application and Technology Assessment
and Adoption, which was passed by the Senate and remains under review by the President.

The final reports of the Library Policy and Operations Committee and the Ad hoc Committee for the Quality of Campus Life were received and are under review.

And finally, at the time of this writing the final report from the Athletics Committee remains outstanding.

_A word of thanks_
I would like to extend a special word of thanks to the members of the Senate Agenda Committee and Faculty Senate Office staff, as well as to the approximately 200 faculty who agreed to participate in the work of the Senate over the past year. It has been an honor and privilege to serve as Chair of the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee during each of my three terms, to contribute to university governance and to represent the faculty. I am indebted to my faculty colleagues, staff, students, and the University administration. It is these synergistic efforts that have and can continue to lead to successful University change and transformation.

_Respectfully submitted,_
_Carol Glod, Ph.D._

July 15, 2008
Executive Summary Appendix A

1/14/04 0304-17. Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Committee Resolution #2 – V.G (Examination Policies):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section V.G (Examination Policies) presented in the Revised Draft (4/16/03) from the ad hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the Faculty Handbook. (32-1-0)

Action by President: Approved by Provost/President 9/14/07; BoT approval not required.

0304-18. Reconsidered Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Committee Resolution #1 – V.B.7 (Conference Hours):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section V.B.7 (Conference Hours) presented in the Revised Draft (4/16/03) from the ad hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the Faculty Handbook. (30-1-2)

Action by President: Approved by Provost/President 9/14/07; BoT approval not required.

1/28/04 0304-19. Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Review Committee Resolution #3 – V.H (Grading):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section V.H (Grading) presented in the Revised Draft (4/16/03) from the ad hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the Faculty Handbook. (33-0-1)

Action by President: Approved by Provost/President 9/14/07; BoT approval not required.
**Executive Summary Appendix B**

Northeastern University  
Faculty Headcount Comparison Fall 1990-2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Non-TT *</th>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>Total FT Day Faculty</th>
<th>Headcount of T &amp; TT</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Non-TT *</th>
<th>SPCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Basic College lecturers, academic/clinical specialists, cooperative education coordinators, and other full-time faculty without specification
FACULTY SENATE 2007-08

Faculty

Christopher J. Bosso (CAS-PoliSci)* 303 ME 4398
Sharon M. Bruns (CBA-Acct)** 404 HA 4648
Elizabeth A. Chilvers (CBA)** 304 HA 3418
Dennis R. Cokely (ASL)* 405 ME 3064
Richard A. Daynard (Law)** 117 CU 2026
James A. Fox (CCJ)* 204 CH 3296
Ann M. Galligan (CAS)** 239 RY 3439
Carol A. Glod (BCHS-Nursing)* 211 RB 3105
Carole D. Hafner (CCIS)** 202 WVL 5116
Robert L. Hall (CAS-AAS & History)** 132 NI 2621
Gerald Herman (CAS-History)* 249 ME 4441
Malcolm D. Hill (Earth&EnvironSci)* 14 HO 4377
Cynthia M. Jackson (CBA-Acctg)* 404 HA 4643
Stephen M. Kane (COE)** 442 DA 3452
Laura H. Lewis (COE-ChemE)** 342 SN 3419
Marc N. Levine (CAS-Math)* 357 LA 3899
Stephen McKnight (COE-Elec&Compt)* 409 DA 2060
Steven A. Morrison (CAS-Econ)** 301 LA 2873
John H. Portz (CAS-PoliSci)* 303 ME 3391
Tracy L. Robinson-Wood (BCHS)** 203 LA 5936
William Sanchez (BCHS-Couns&AppPsych)** 203 LA 2404
Thomas O. Sherman (CAS-Math)* 567 LA 2785
Thomas Starr (CAS-VisualArts)* 239 RY 5286
Alexandru I. Suciu (CAS-Math)* 357 LA 4456
Michael C. Tolley (CAS-PoliSci)** 303 ME 2780
Ali Touran (COE-Civil&Environm)* 400 SN 5508
Michael T. Vaughn (CAS-Physics)* 111 DA 2954
Barbara L. Waszczak (BCHS-PharmSci)* 312 MU 3312
Jonathan B. Welch (Fin&Ins-CBA)* 413 HA 4572
Alan J. Zaremba (CAS-Communick Studies)*101 LA 4073

Administrators

Luis M. Falcon (Vice Provost, Grad Ed) 112 HA 7464
Jack R. Greene (Vice Provost, ExperEd)
Christopher Hopey (VP&Dean,SPCS) 295 RY 2414
Mary Loeffelholz (Pres Office)
David Luzzi (COE-Dean) 230 SN 2152
Thomas Moore (CBA-Dean)
Susan Powers-Lee (ExecVPov) 112 HA 2842
James R. Stellar (CAS-Dean) 100 ME 5173
Stephen R. Zoloth (Interim Provost) 215 BK 3323

* Term expires June 30, 2008
** Term expires June 30, 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Criminal Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher J. Bosso (PoliSci)*</td>
<td>James A. Fox *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis R. Cokely (ASL)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann M. Galligan** (Co-op)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Hall (AAS, History)**</td>
<td>Stephen M. Kane (Co-op)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Herman (CAS-History)**</td>
<td>Stephen McKnight (Electrical &amp; Computing)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm D. Hill (Earth&amp;EnvironSci)*</td>
<td>Laura H. Lewis (ChemE)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc N. Levine (Mathematics)**</td>
<td>Ali Touran (Civil &amp; Environm)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven A. Morrison (Economics)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Portz (Political Science)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas O. Sherman (Mathematics)**</td>
<td>Richard A. Daynard**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Starr (Art &amp; Design)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandru I. Suciu (Mathematics)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael C. Tolley (Political Science)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael T. Vaughn (Physics)*</td>
<td>Luis Falcon, Vice Provost, Grad Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan J. Zaremba (Communication Studies)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol A. Glod (Nursing)**</td>
<td>Thomas Moore, Dean, CBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Robinson-Wood *</td>
<td>Susan Powers-Lee, ExecVice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sanchez (Couns&amp;ApplPsych)**</td>
<td>James R. Stellar, Dean, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara L. Waszczak (PharmSci)*</td>
<td>Stephen R. Zoloth, Interim Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Term expires June 30, 2008</td>
<td>**Term expires June 30, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°Not eligible for re-election</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Committee on Academic Policy (APC)
Professor Rhonda Board, Chair (BCHS-Nursing)
Director Linda Allen, Registrar
Professor Dennis Cokely (CAS-ASL)
Professor William J. DeAngelis (CAS-Philosophy & Religion)
Professor David Massey (CAS-Mathematics)
Executive Vice Provost Susan Powers-Lee
Professor Tracy Robinson-Wood, SAC Liaison (BCHS)

Committee on Athletics
Professor Frederick Wiseman, Chair & NCAA Rep (CBA)
Professor Sharon M. Bruns (CBA)
Professor James A. Fox (CCJ)
Professor Meredith H Harris (BCHS)
Professor Bruce A. Wallin (CAS)
Executive Vice Provost Susan Powers-Lee
Director David B. Thornton (Registrar’s office)

Committee on Enrollment and Admissions Policy (EAPC)
Not charged in 2007-08

2007 Special Senate Committee for Faculty Development (FDC)
Professor Thomas Sherman, Chair (Mathematics)
Professor Thomas R. Gilbert (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
Professor James Fox (Criminal Justice)
Professor Steven A. Morrison (Economics)
Professor Louis Kruger (Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Shiawee Yang (CBA)
Dean Thomas Moore (CBA)
Professor Sharon M. Bruns, SAC Liaison (CBA)

Committee on Financial Affairs (FAC)
Professor Louis J. Kruger, Chair (BCHS-Counseling and Applied Psychology)
Professor Neil O. Alper (CAS-Economics)
Professor Carole D. Hafner (CCIS)
Professor John H. Portz (CAS-Political Science)
Professor Edward Wertheim (CBA-HRM)
Professor Carol A. Glod, SAC Liaison (BCHS)

Committee on Information Technology Policy (ITPC)
Professor James Dana Jr (CAS-Econ)
Professor Robert Futrelle (CCIS, Provost’s representative)
Professor Leon Janikian (CAS-Music)
Professor Yang W. Lee (CBA)
Professor Ronald Mourant (COE-MIE)
Committee on Library Policies and Operations (LPOC)
Professor Anthony De Ritis, Chair (CAS-Music)
Professor John Casey (CCIS)
Professor William M. Fowler, Jr (CAS-History)
Professor Richard Katula (CAS-Communication Studies)
Professor David Massey (CAS-Mathematics)
Professor David E. Schmitt (CAS-Political Science)
Professor Ali Touran (COE-CEE)
Professor Steven Morrison, SAC Liaison (CAS)

Committee on Research Policy Oversight (RPOC)
Professor Carey Rappaport, Chair (COE-ECE; CenSSIS)
Professor Hortensia D. Amaro (BCHS; Institute On Urban Health)
Dean Barry Bluestone (CAS; School of Social Science, Urban Affairs & Public Policy)
Professor Craig F. Ferris (CAS-Psychology)
Professor Kim Lewis (CAS-Biology)
Professor Alexandro Makriyannis (BCHS-Pharmacy Science; Center for Drug Discovery)
Professor Joanne Miller (CAS-Psychology)
Professor Nikos Passas (CCJ)
Professor Michael B. Silevitch (COE-ECE)
Vice Provost Srinivas Sridhar, ex officio (CAS-Physics)
Professor Carol A. Glod, SAC Liaison (BCHS)

Ad Hoc Senate Committees

Ad Hoc TRACE Implementation Committee
Professor James A. Fox, Chair & SAC Liaison (CCJ)
Professor Kostia Bergman (CAS-Biology)
Professor Raymond M. Kinnunen (CBA-General Mgmt)
Professor Gregory J. Kowalski (COE-MIE)
Executive Director Richard Mickool (IS Business Operations)
Executive Vice Provost Susan G. Powers-Lee
Professor Malcolm D. Hill, SAC Liaison (CAS-EES)

Ad Hoc Committee on the Quality of Campus Life
Professor William Sanchez, Chair (BCHS-Counseling & Applied Educational Psychology)
Professor Daniel D. Burkey (COE-ChemE)
Professor Stephen M. Kane (Coop-Engineering)
Professor Susan J. Roberts (BCHS-Nursing)
Professor Phyllis R. Strauss (CAS-Biology)
SGA Rep (TBA)
GPSA Rep (TBA)
Professor James A. Fox, SAC Liaison (CCJ)

Ad hoc Committee on NU Core Implementation
Professor Thomas C. Sheahan, Chair (COE-Civil & Environmental)
Associate Dean Peggy L. Fletcher (CBA)
Associate Dean William (Jay) Gillespie (BCHS)
Professor Stephen M. Kane (COE-Coop)
Professor Kathleen Kelly (CAS-English)
Associate Dean Richard Rasala (CCIS)
Professor Simon I. Singer (CCJ)
Sr. Associate Registrar Nina L. LeDoyt
Executive Vice Provost Susan G. Powers-Lee
TBA-SGA Representative
Professor Malcolm Hill, SAC Liaison (CAS)

Ad hoc Committee to review Faculty Suspension Policies
Professor John W. Cipolla, Jr., (Chair) (COE)
Professor Martha F. Davis (Law)
Professor Coleen C. Pantalone (CBA)
Professor Wallace W. Sherwood (CCJ)
Professor Robert F. Young (CBA)
Professor Sharon M. Bruns, SAC Liaison (CBA)

COMMITTEE FOR ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION AND OVERSIGHT (AEOC)
Professor Stephen McKnight, Chair (COE-ECE)
Professor Peter D. Enrich (School of Law)
Professor Elizabeth P. Howard (BCHS-Nursing)
Professor John R. Reynolds (BCHS-Pharmacy Practice)
Associate Dean Bruce Ronkin (CAS-UG Affairs)
Professor Carol A. Glod, SAC Liaison (BCHS-Nursing)

Committee to Evaluate James Stellar, Dean, CAS
Professor Richard Deth Chair (BCHS-Pharmacy Science)
Professor Daniel Givelber (School of Law)
Professor Alain Karma (CAS-Physics)
Professor Hameed Metghalchi (COE-MIE)
Professor Sheila Puffer (CBA)

Outcome: Report released to CAS 7/10/08

Committee to Evaluate Emily Spieler, Dean, School of Law
Professor Meredith Harris (BCHS)
Professor Karl Lieberherr (CCIS)
Associate Dean John McDevitt, (CCJ)
Professor Michael Tolley, Chair (CAS)
Professor Edward Wertheim (CBA)

Outcome: Report released to LAW 6/30/08
Committee to Evaluate George Thrush, Chair, School of Architecture postponed
Professor Susan Asai (CAS-Music)
Professor Judith Barr (BCHS-Pharmacy Practice)
Professor Lee Breckenridge (School of Law) Report released to dept 5/27/08
Professor Vladimir Novotny (COE-CEE)
Professor Harlow Robinson (CAS-Modern Languages)

Committee to Evaluate Graham Jones, Chair, Chemistry
Professor Anthony De Ritis, Chair (CAS-Music)
Dean Christopher Hopey (SPCS)
Professor Ban-An Khaw (BCHS-Pharmacy Science)
Professor Phyllis Strauss (CAS-Biology)
Professor Ronald Willey (COE-ChemE)

Outcome: in process

Committee to Evaluate Steven Morrison, Chair, Economics
Professor Leon C. Janikian, CAS-Music
Professor Marjorie Platt, CBA-Accounting
Professor Alan J. Zaremba, CAS-Communications Studies
Professor Paul Bolster, Chair CBA-Finance
Professor Margaret Burnham, LAW

Outcome: Report released to dept 5/27/08

Committee to Evaluate Larry Finkelstein, Dean, CCIS
Professor Christopher King, CAS-Math
Professor Robert Cersosimo, BCHS-Pharmpractice
Professor David Kaeli, Chair, COE
Professor Nikos Passas, CCJ
Professor Fred C. Davis, CAS-Biology

Outcome: in process

Committee to Evaluate Dennis Cokely, ASL/Modern Language
Professor Andrew M. Sum, CAS-Economics
Professor Adam Reeve, CAS-Psychology
Professor Ibrahim Zeid, Chair COE-Mechanical & Industrial Engg
Professor Tim Rupert, CBA-Accounting
Professor Alan Zaremba, CAS-Communications Studies

Outcome: Report released to dept 5/27/08

Committee to Evaluate Jack Greene, Dean, CCJ (On Hold)
Professor John H. Portz, CAS-Political Science
Professor John W. Cipolla, COE-MIE
Professor Chieh Li, BCHS-CAP
Committee to Evaluate Mustafa Yilmaz, Coordinator, CBA-Info/Ops&Analysis
Professor Geoffrey Davies, CAS-Chemistry & Chemical Biology
Professor Ravi Sarathy, Chair, CBA-Int.Business
Professor Ronald Mourant, MIE
Professor David Massey, CAS-Mathematics
Professor Viera Proulx, CCIS

Outcome: Report released to dept 5/27/08

Committee to Evaluate Laura Frader, Chair, CAS-History
Professor Walter Gershuny, CAS-Modern Language
Professor Laura Green, CAS-English
Professor Kenneth Baclawski, Chair, CCIS
Professor Peter Manning, CCJ
Professor Marcus Breen, CAS-Communication Studies

Outcome: Report released to dept 4/28/08

Committee to Evaluate Ali Abur, Chair, COE-ECE
Professor Ali Touran, COE-CEE
Professor George Alverson, CAS-Physics
Professor Terence Gaffney Chair, CAS-Math
Professor Joseph Ayers, CAS-Biology
Professor Philip Warner, CAS-Chemistry

Outcome: in process

Committee to Evaluate John Portz, Chair, CAS-PolSci
Professor Gregory Wassall, CAS-Economics
Professor Wendy Parmet, LAW
Professor Nancy Kindelan, CAS
Professor Simon Singer, CCJ
Professor Neal Pearlmutter, Chair, CAS-Psychology

Outcome: Report released to dept 5/27/08

Committee to Evaluate Marjorie Platt, Coordinator, CBA-Accounting
Professor Jane Aroian, BCHS-Nursing
Professor Wendy Smith, CAS-Biology
Professor Robert Millen, Chair CBA-Info/Ops & Analysis
Professor Laura Lewis, COE-ChemEngg
Professor Arun Bansil, CAS-Physics

Outcome: Report released to dept 5/27/08

Committee to Evaluate Brendan Bannister, Coordinator, CBA-HRM
Professor John Kwoka, CAS-Economics
Professor Richard Katula, CAS
Professor Emery A. Trahan, CBA-Finance&Insurance
Professor John Portz, Chair, CAS-Political Science
Associate Dean James Sarazen, CAS-Admin&Finance

Outcome: Report released to dept 5/27/08

Committee to Evaluate Paul Zavracky, Dean, Technological Entrepreneurship

Committee to Evaluate Nancy Hoffart, Dean, School of Nursing
Cancelled: Dean Hoffart is stepping down.

Committee to Evaluate William Sanchez, Chair, Counseling & Applied Psychology
Cancelled: Professor Sanchez is stepping down.

AD HOC SEARCH COMMITTEES

Communication Studies Chair Search Committee (External)
Professor Anthony P. De Ritis (CAS-Music)
Professor Murray W. Forman, Chair (CAS-Communication Studies)
Professor Daniel J. Givelber (School of Law)
Professor Joanne Morreale (CAS-Communication Studies)
Professor Alan J. Zaremba (CAS-Communication Studies)

Outcome: Thomas Nakayama

English Chair Search Committee (External)
Professor Elizabeth C. Britt (CAS-English)
Professor Laura Green, Chair (CAS-English)
Professor Harlow L. Robinson (CAS-Modern Languages)
Professor Guy L. Rotella (CAS-English)
Professor Robert F. Young (CBA-Marketing)

Outcome: In process

Sociology & Anthropology Chair Search Committee (External)
Professor Daniel R. Faber, Chair (CAS-Sociology & Anthropology)
Professor Michael J. Handel (CAS-Sociology & Anthropology)
Professor Ineke Haen Marshall (CAS-Sociology & Anthropology)
Professor Susan Setta (CAS-Philosophy & Religion)
Professor Simon I. Singer (CCJ)

Outcome: Steven Vallas

African American Studies Chair Search Committee (Internal)
Professor Leonard L. Brown (CAS-AAS)
Professor TBA
Professor TBA
Professor Oscar Brookins, Chair (CAS-Economics)
Professor Hope Lewis (School of Law)
Outcome: in process

Counseling and Applied Psychology Chair Search
Professor Louis J. Kruger, Chair (BCHS-Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Emanuel J. Mason (BCHS-Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Barbara F. Okun (BCHS-Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Ralf W. Schlosser (BCHS-Speech Language Pathology & Audiology)
Professor Judith A. Hall (CAS-Psychology)

Outcome: Dr. Y. Barry Chung

School of Nursing Dean Search Committee (External)
Associate Clinical Professor Steve L. Alves (BCHS-Nursing)
Professor Margaret H. Emerson, Chair (BCHS-Nursing)
Clinical Instructor Ann G. Hill (BCHS-Nursing)
Professor Barbara R. Kelley (BCHS-Nursing)
Professor Hortensia de los Angeles Amaro (BCHS)
Professor Mary B. Ballou (BCHS-Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Carl W. Nelson (CBA)
Rob Stenson, Graduate Student Representative

Outcome: In process

Pharmacy Practice Chair Search Committee (External)
Professor Robert J. Cersosimo (BCHS-Pharmacy Practice)
Professor Adam J. Reeves (CAS-Psychology)
Associate Clinical Professor J. Andres Skirvin (BCHS-Pharmacy Practice)
Associate Clinical Professor Jenny A. Van Amburgh (BCHS-Pharmacy Practice)
Professor Mary E. Watson (BCHS)

Outcome: in process

Earth & Environmental Sciences Chair Search Committee (Internal)
Professor Richard Bailey (CAS-EES)
Professor Peter S. Rosen (CAS-EES)
Professor Martin E. Ross, Chair(CAS-EES)
Professor Donald P. Cheney (CAS-Biology)
Professor Thomas C. Sheahan (COE)

Outcome: Malcolm Hill

Civil & Environmental Engineering Chair Search Committee (External)
Professor Ali Touran (COE-CEE)
Professor Sara J. Wadia-Fascetti, Chair (COE-CEE)
Professor Irvine W. Wei (COE-CEE)
Professor Malcolm Hill (CAS-Earth & Environmental Sciences)
Professor Michael B. Silevitch (COE-Electrical & Computer)

Outcome: in process
**Provost Search Committee**
Professor Donna M. Bishop, Chair (CCJ)
Associate Justice Margot Gardener Botsford, (Mass Supreme Judicial Court, NU Board of Trustees)
Professor Agnes H. Chan, (CCIS)
Professor James R. Hackney, (Law)
Stephen Lavenberg, (SGA)
Professor Karin N. Lifter, (BCHS-Couns& ApplPsych)
Dean David E. Luzzi, (COE)
Professor Joanne L. Miller, (CAS-Psychology)
Tina Penman, Graduate Student Representative
Professor Carey M. Rappaport, (ECE)
Professor David Sherman, (CBA-Accounting)

**Outcome:** Stephen W. Director

**AD HOC MEDIATION COMMITTEES**

**Grievance Committee #0708-1**
Professor Mary B. Ballou (BCHS-Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Daniel J. Givelber (Law)
Professor Ibrahim Zeid (COE-MIE)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES**

**Graduate Council** *(staffed by the Senate Agenda Committee)*
Vice Provost Luis Falcon, Chair
Professor George Adams (COE-MIE)
Professor Akram Alshawabkeh (COE-CEE)
Professor Kamran M. Dadkhah (CAS-Economics)
Professor Joan Fitzgerald (CAS-LPS)
Professor David Forsyth (CAS-Chemistry)
Professor Phil He (CCJ)
Professor Ralph Loring (BCHS-Pharmacy)
Todd Leach (SPCS)
Professor Mitch Wand (CCIS)
Professor Yaman Yener (COE-Graduate Programs)
Associate Dean Lesley Milner (Library Services)

**University Standing Appeals Committee on Tenure** *(staffed by the Senate Agenda Committee)*
Professor Sagar Kamarthi (COE)
Professor Carl Nelson (CBA)
Professor David Phillips (Law)
Professor Rajamohan Rajaraman (CIS)
Professor Robert Schatz (BCHS)
Professor Alan Zaremba (CAS)
Professor Dana Brooks (COE)
Professor Sangit Chatterjee (CBA)
Professor Deborah Greenwald (BCHS)
Professor Edward Jarroll (CAS)
Professor Mohammad Taslim (COE)
Professor Alexandru Suciu (CAS)
Professor Nikos Passas (CCJ)

**Excellence in Teaching Awards Selection Committee (staffed by the Senate Agenda Committee)**
Professor Elizabeth Britt (CAS-English)
Professor Daniel J. Givelber (School of Law)
Professor Meredith H. Harris (BCHS-Physical Therapy)
Professor Jack Levin (CAS-Sociology & Anthropology)
Professor Magdalena A. Mateo (BCHS-Nursing)
Associate Professor Wallace Sherwood (CCJ)
Professor Tomacz R. Taylor (CAS-Physics)
Professor Abe Zeid, Chair (COE)

**Klein Lecturer Selection Committee**
Professor Carol Glod, Chair, SAC (BCHS-Nursing)
Professor Sanjeev Mukerjee (CAS-Chemistry and Chemical Biology)
Vice Provost Luis Falcon
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Introduction

Our major annual charges are to (a) recommend merit and equity raise pools for the next fiscal year, (b) participate in the university-wide budget process, and (c) evaluate the budget in regard to process and outcomes. Additional responsibilities are to monitor and have input into any of the university’s financial policies that affect the well-being of the faculty, the academic mission of the university, and the university as a whole. This year, we had the additional charge of reviewing and updating the 2002 cost of living adjustment (COLA) study that was conducted in 2002. Furthermore, we also took the initiative to review faculty benefits.

Merit and Equity Raise Pools

We made the following recommendations pertaining to the 2008-2009 merit and equity increases: (a) a merit raise pool of at least 5% for continuing faculty; (b) a market/equity raise pool that equals the total amount of the market/equity gap between the salaries of Northeastern University faculty and those of faculty at peer institutions, as determined by the study conducted by the Provost’s Office; and (c) that the administration consult with the FAC with respect to process and priorities used to distribute the market/equity pool. The Faculty Senate voted overwhelmingly in favor of these recommendations.

The 2008-2009 Budget

We evaluated the 2008-2009 budget in regard to both the process and to what extent the budget reflected faculty concerns and priorities. Overall, our conclusion is that both the budget priorities and the process were much improved from last year. The reasons for this conclusion are discussed below.

Budget Process

The current Senior Vice-President for Administration and Finance (SVPAF) added considerable clarity to the role of the SVPAF in the budget process by repeatedly stating the SVPAF’s role is to serve the academic mission of the university. SVPAF, together with the Provost, formed a two-person team in leading this year’s budget process. They met with different constituent groups throughout the fall to solicit the groups’ priorities for the budget and keep them abreast of budget developments. These groups included (a) the Senate’s Financial Affairs Committee (FAC), (b) senior university administrators, (c) the Dean’s Council, (d) representatives from the Student Government Association, and (e) the Board of Trustees’ Financial Affairs Committee.

This year’s process was notable for considerable collegiality, as well as more complete and transparent reports about the university’s finances than were provided in previous years. Furthermore, with the exception of the Interdisciplinary Faculty Initiative (IFI) discussed below, FAC was engaged in a more proactive manner than last year, which facilitated substantive discussions and input in regard to major budget allocation decisions. The Provost and SVPAF worked collaboratively with each other and the different constituent groups in an attempt to reach consensus regarding the major priorities of the university, and these efforts were largely
successful. In addition, there was some sharing of priorities across groups. For example, our written priorities were given to the Dean’s Council, and a representative from FAC discussed priorities with representatives of the student group. Furthermore, a draft budget was shared with FAC for the purpose of obtaining our feedback. After providing our feedback, we received a timely response from the Provost and Chief Financial Officer in regard to our comments and suggestions about the draft budget. Finally, the President, Provost and the SVPAF met with the FAC to review the budget prior to publicly sharing it with the Senate. In addition to setting a collaborative tone, the multiple opportunities to have both a written and oral dialogue about the budget facilitated mutual understanding about the important priorities and helped align the priorities among the different constituent groups. The end result was a budget that reflected considerable consensus among faculty and administration.

Another positive development was the Provost’s Office’s consultations with the FAC and the Chair of the Senate Agenda with respect to the market / equity guidelines and criteria. We believe these discussions will lead to an improved process and a clearer delineation of the guidelines.

Despite these positive developments in the budget process, we also have concerns and suggestions for improving the process. Chief among our concerns is our exclusion from the decision to provide substantially more funds to the IFI. Although we advocated for more funds for hiring new faculty, we were not consulted about the IFI that will occur during the next three years. Given that the recruitment of 50 senior faculty members has major academic and budgetary implications, it seems reasonable that FAC should have been consulted about this major strategic plan. The e-mail announcing the expansion of the IFI asserted that the decision was made “after consultation with the academic leadership.” However, FAC was not consulted.

Another concern pertains to the timing of the budget process. Almost all of the budget consultations are compressed into the fall and early winter. The Board typically approves the budget in March. However, departments must make major decisions about teaching assignments, course offerings, faculty hiring priorities and other issues with budgetary implications before the university budget is finalized. The need to make major decisions without accurate information about the upcoming budget year handicaps the departments’ ability to make sound resource allocation decisions.

The FAC was unable to take into consideration this year’s matchmate study prior to making recommendations to the Senate regarding the equity raise pool because the results were not available until late in the budget process. We were orally presented with an estimate of the overall gap between Northeastern University’s academic units and the units at matchmate institutions. However, it would have been helpful to review a written report earlier in the budget cycle.

Reactions to the 2008-2009 Budget Allocations

First and foremost, we enthusiastically support that 73% of the new operating expenses is being devoted to academic areas. This budgetary emphasis represents an important commitment to furthering the academic quality of the university. Specifically, the budget reflected three of our priorities: (a) hiring new faculty, (b) providing support for graduate students, and (c) enhancing the college’s and department’s operating budgets. In recent years, the net increase in tenure-track lines has slowed to fewer than 10 per year. This rate is far below the goals of our recent hiring
initiatives. Therefore, we recommended sufficient funds to result in a net increase of 30 tenure-track / tenured faculty from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009. Northeastern University’s support for graduate students has lagged behind its support for undergraduate students. In addition, we award far fewer PhDs than most of our principal competitors. The increased support for graduate students in the 2008-2009 budget will help us recruit and retain top-notch students, who will advance our research aims. Many units still have razor-thin operating budgets, and these meager budgets impede the productivity of faculty. Therefore, we were pleased with the increase in operational funds for the colleges. Furthermore, we were encouraged by the Provost’s and SVPAF’s receptivity to expanding classroom space on our main campus. The strain on classroom space is now widely acknowledged. It was gratifying to learn that the Provost and SVPAF share our goal of increasing the number of classrooms.

The 2008-2009 budget provides for a 3.5% merit and a 1.5% equity increase. Although the 3.5% merit increase is an improvement over last year’s 3% increase, it falls substantially short of the 5% merit recommended by the Senate. This increase seems insufficient given current inflationary pressures, the high cost of living in the Boston area, and the fact that our raises during the last decade (when adjusted for inflation) were below the national average. Also, we objected to the fact that equity comprised 30% of the total increase in the salary pool. Equity has typically comprised a smaller proportion of the total salary increase than is the case for the upcoming fiscal year. The net effect is to give faculty less input into the distribution of the overall salary pool increases and to give more control over the salary increases to the deans and Provost, who oversee market/equity adjustments.

**Updating of 2002 Cost of living Adjustment (COLA) Study**

Although we reviewed the 2002 COLA study and discussed the potential advantages of updating the study, we did not initiate and complete such a study. The time consuming nature of this year’s transition to a new budget process precluded our ability to oversee a revision of the COLA study.
Report on Benefits

The following information is based on a meeting with Vice President of Human Resources Management (HRM), Katherine Pendergast. One overarching theme of the discussion was the lack of knowledge on the part of many faculty and staff of the university’s benefits.

- **Medical Benefits:** The major concern is the inexorable rise in medical premiums. While rising in double digits in most organizations, the rise has been moderated somewhat here by our moving to one carrier, Blue Cross / Blue Shield (BCBS).
- **Fitness Benefit:** The added fitness benefit as part of the BCBS plan has had the positive effect of increasing membership in the Recreation Center by over 200 faculty and staff.
- **Medical Care Reimbursement Account:** The most visible recent change in this benefit was the addition of the debit card option to make it easier to pay for covered medical expenses (including some over the counter products), and (it is expected) to reduce the paperwork involved in dealing with the medical care reimbursement program.
- **Early Retirement Plans:** It doesn’t appear that the university is considering any expansion of its very limited existing program for early retirement (i.e., 2/3 teaching load over two “final” years). While no formal expansion is planned, the Provost Office’s works with deans on an ad hoc basis to develop individual solutions to particular faculty’s needs with regard to retirement.
- **Retirement Plans:** The recent past has seen the number of options available in TIAA/CREF and Fidelity expanded to virtually the whole family of investment options under each plan. When asked how our plan (i.e., 5% individual contribution, 10% university contribution) compares to other sister institutions, VP Pendergast stated that we are “middle of the road.”
- **Four-Day Summer Work Week:** VP Pendergast indicated that the longstanding policy of a four-day work week during the summer will be modified. The new policy states that for the eight weeks of the “summer” staff can choose four of the eight to move to a four-day schedule. She cited the need to have fuller coverage over the summer as the reason.
Recommendations

Budget Process

In regard to the budget process, we recommend that:

- the following practices be continued: (a) multiple budget discussions between the FAC and the budget team (i.e., Provost and the SVPAF) prior to the development of the draft budget; (b) the scheduling of sufficient time for the FAC to provide feedback on the draft budget and obtain responses on this feedback from the budget team prior to the presentation of the draft budget to the Board of Trustees; and (c) presentation and discussion of the approved budget with the FAC prior to its public announcement.
- the sharing of priorities among the constituent groups be expanded and made an integral part of the process. In this regard, it would be helpful for each constituent group to prepare a written statement of its priorities and disseminate it to the other groups. Such sharing of priorities would facilitate communication and increase the likelihood that consensus would be attained among the groups.
- the budget process end earlier in the fiscal year (e.g., February 1st). Departments and colleges need to know their budgets prior to the scheduling of fall courses so that they can make good resource allocation decisions regarding teaching assignments.
- FAC be consulted prior to any administrative decisions (e.g., faculty hiring initiatives, a new master building plan, responsibility-centered management), which have significant university-wide budgetary implications.
- the written report of the matchmate study be provided to the FAC in a timely manner early in the fall so that FAC can review the report prior to making market / equity recommendations.

COLA Study

- It is recommended that the COLA study be updated next year.

Benefits

In regard to benefits, we recommend that HRM should:

- Provide an annual “state of the university” report to the FAC about faculty and staff benefits.

- Consult with the FAC, on a timely basis, about significant changes in benefits that are being considered.
Resolutions

**Resolution #1:** Be it resolved that the annual budget process including approval by the Board Of Trustees conclude in advance of the date when colleges and departments need to develop the fall semester’s schedule of courses.

**Resolution #2:** Be it resolved that the following practices become part of the annual budget process: (a) multiple budget discussions between the FAC and the budget team (i.e., the Provost and the Senior Vice-President for Administration and Finance) prior to the development of the draft budget; (b) the scheduling of sufficient time for the FAC to provide feedback on the draft budget and obtain responses on this feedback from the budget team prior to the presentation of the draft budget to the Board of Trustees; and (c) presentation and discussion of the approved budget with the FAC prior to its public announcement.

**Resolution #3:** Be it resolved that the FAC be consulted prior to any administrative decisions (e.g., faculty hiring initiatives, a new master building plan, responsibility-centered management), which have significant university-wide budgetary implications.

**Resolution #4:** Be it resolved that the Division of Human Resources Management provide the FAC an annual “state of the university” about faculty and staff benefits.

**Resolution #5:** Be it resolved that the Division of Human Resources Management Consult with the FAC, on a timely basis, about significant changes in benefits that are being considered.

Respectfully submitted:

The 2007-2008 Financial Affairs Committee
Professor Neil Alper
Professor Carole Hafner
Professor Louis Kruger, Chair
Professor John Portz
Professor Edward Wertheim
The Research Policy Oversight Committee was very active during the past academic year. We held meetings every two weeks, and although the extensive travel and work schedules of its members always prevented full attendance, many issues were considered and a wide variety of opinions were put forward. Since research policy encompasses many aspects of Northeastern University, the issues discussed ranged far beyond the initial charge to the RPOC. We assembled a Concerns List of areas of university research infrastructure that require attention:

1. Proposal Processing
2. Legal Processing
3. Human Resources/Personnel
4. Accounting
5. Equipment Infrastructure
6. Space Management/Facilities
7. Development/Fundraising
8. Institutional Review Board
9. Information Technology for Research Administration Support
10. Environmental Health and Safety

We came to consensus on ways of addressing a few of these issues, pushed others to lower priority, and left several issues open, without resolution.

Following are two versions of recommendations on reorganizing the university research infrastructure that encompass the general sentiment of the RPOC. The two versions are very similar, but vary in emphasis. The first has been extensively discussed and developed over the course of several meetings; the second was a suggested alternative presented after our last meeting, and while it has the support of a several members of the RPOC, it has not been discussed in any meeting. We submit both at the suggestion of the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee.
The RPOC was brought together and charged with identifying issues/problems that prevent researchers at Northeastern University from efficiently conducting research. We found considerable shortcomings with the current system. While there are many areas of research infrastructure that must be improved for Northeastern to advance into the upper ranks of research universities, we have concentrated on five particular issues: administrative infrastructure organization, Technology Transfer Office authority, automatic tracking of grant/contract documents, research equipment needs, and the length of the workweek. The bulk of this report concentrates on the first issue, administrative infrastructure, which was discussed most extensively by the RPOC. The RPOC has discussed, but has not decided on other research infrastructure issues. These will be taken up again in the next session.

The RPOC has solicited input from faculty of various Northeastern University units. We were struck by the extent of dissatisfaction with research administrative infrastructure, which we summarize below. We concluded that these shortcomings stem from a combination of inadequate leadership and systemic problems generated by Northeastern University’s striking and rapid rise in research profile.

The RPOC believes that reorganization and new leadership of the entire Research Administration Infrastructure is necessary. Below we propose approaches to address the observed concerns. It will be necessary to create a new “Office of Grant and Contract Administration” to act as a facilitator and advocate for researchers. We stress that this new office would replace the Division of Sponsored Project Administration to act as the administrative counterpart – complementing the faculty researchers – in creating a seamless and efficient mechanism for bringing funding to the University. This new office would be given sufficient budget and authority to encourage other offices in the broad research administration infrastructure to expedite service, but it would not have the power to rule in place of these offices. Along with these enhanced powers it would also bear the full responsibility of managing all internal administrative aspects of research grants and contracts.

Overall Observations of the Current Research Administration Infrastructure

1) The Division of Sponsored Project Administration (DSPA) is perceived by the research faculty as the primary face of the administrative side of the research infrastructure.
   A) PIs rely on DSPA by default to shepherd proposals, grants, and contracts through the various administrative Northeastern offices.
   B) DSPA cannot control document progress through other administrative offices.
   C) DSPA is often not knowledgeable about procedures outside its own domain, and therefore cannot offer adequate assistance in resolving research administration issues that arise.
2) The broad Research Administration Infrastructure (RAI) across the university could improve its customer service approach.
   A) There is not a sense of “ownership” of proposals by the RAI, and as such the RAI does not champion, lobby for, or encourage their submission.
   B) The RAI does not keep adequate track of proposal/grant status, and is not able to adequately follow-up on proposals once they have been submitted.
   C) The flow of information from the RAI to PIs is insufficient.

3) There is a perceived lack of transparency concerning procedures and processes within the RAI and throughout the proposal/grant approval process in general.

4) The organization of DSPA and various financial offices is inefficient.
   A) Having different pre- and post-award officers seems to lead to a lack of continuity.
   B) There is insufficient communication between DSPA and the Accounting/Billing Office.
   C) There is no access to the Accounts Receivable side of the FRS system, making it difficult to note when payment on a grant project has been received and credited to specific projects.
   D) The role of the Research and Property Accounting Office is unclear.

5) There is insufficient training for new faculty and recent grant awardees in grant/contract and proposal procedures and requirements.

6) The RAI leadership does not spend sufficient time on RAI general organization and functioning. For example, if the DSPA Director is unavailable, it is very difficult to obtain an official signature or advice on problems.

7) There is no PI access to the PeopleSoft ERP system, so PIs cannot assess the funding sources connected to their staff.

8) It can take excessive time to begin working on grants after they have been awarded.
   A) It can take too long (months) to set up account numbers to begin charging on grants.
   B) Legal approval of contracts can take a large proportion of the time required to perform the research task, and occasionally takes longer than the entire performance period.

9) RAI has difficulty with non-standard grant opportunities, such as proposals without competitive bidding or open requests.

10) Several specific procedures are unnecessarily inefficient and frustrating to PIs.
    A) New hiring forms have to be submitted each time to pay existing part-time researchers on a new grant.
    B) Paying consultants using Invoice Approval Forms requires three forms.
Proposed New “Office of Grant and Contract Administration”

The responsibilities of the newly created Office of Grant and Contract Administration will include:

- To advocate, facilitate, and foster the administration of university research in centers and institutes, and for individual PIs.
- To submit grant and contract proposals to funding agencies.
- To ensure compliance with agreed rules, policies, and rates.
- To present a professional and competent face to outside funding agencies and organizations.
- To expedite the procedures that are necessary to set up newly funded projects.
- To carefully monitor the flow of funds into grants and contracts as well as monitor the flow of payments from grants and contracts, and inform PIs of irregularities and potential problems.
- To interact with the Technology Transfer Office on industrial contract issues to ensure uniform compliance and follow-up.
- To coordinate staff hiring and compensation for grant and contract staff with Human Resource Management and Payroll Offices.
- To work with the Accounting Office to assure that all consultant invoices and other bills are paid in a prompt and timely manner using a simple format.
- To deal with the Legal Counsel’s Office to assure prompt, timely, and proportionate review of grants and contracts as needed.
- To coordinate research space requests with the appropriate office or unit so that grant and contract research is not handicapped by insufficient space.
- To provide triage on simple proposal issues, such as ensuring a fast response for incorrect rates or supplying missing University information.
- To establish schedules with PIs to most efficiently: respond to short proposal deadlines, determine reasonable grant and contract starting and ending dates, and establish spending plans to satisfy sponsors.
- To train staff with an attitude of getting to “Yes” instead of “No.”
The RPOC also proposes four specific recommendations related to fostering increased research productivity at Northeastern:

1) Recommend that the Technology Transfer Office be given signatory authority and that it handle most of its own legal issues without necessarily requiring approval from the University Legal Counsel Office. The Technology Transfer Office should be given the power to determine if further legal assistance from the University Legal Counsel Office is necessary.

2) Recommend that the University establish an Electronic Research Administration System, which can be used by researchers to monitor proposals for grants and contracts in real time as they proceed through the approval process, and facilitate management of awards after they are received.

3) Recommend: A) That the Faculty Senate appeal to University Leadership to provide funding needed to address specific deficiencies in scientific research equipment and infrastructure. We envision that this will have a synergistic effect with significant previous investments in existing research equipment. B) That the Faculty Senate charges the department chairs to provide thoughtful and realistic requests to the University Leadership for critical pieces of equipment.

4) Recommend that the University seriously consider implementing a consistent, year-long, five-day workweek.

Final Comments

Our suggestions for the new “Office of Grant and Contract Administration” are in the form of general guidelines, rather than specific steps for implementation. As faculty, we believe that we should leave the implementation details to those administrators with the appropriate expertise.

If the Senate agrees with the RPOC recommendations, we suggest that they be sent to the President for consideration of implementation. We would request that the President report back to the RPOC and the Faculty Senate within 60 days, and that an action plan be developed by the Administration within 3-6 months.
Restructuring the Research Infrastructure at Northeastern University — VERSION B

Research Policy Oversight Committee
April, 2008

The RPOC was brought together and charged with identifying issues/problems that prevent researchers at Northeastern University from efficiently conducting research. We found considerable shortcomings with the current system, which we enumerate below. We concluded that these shortcomings stem from systemic problems generated by Northeastern University’s striking and rapid rise in research profile and inadequate investment and attention to the infrastructure (including administration, equipment, information technology and computation, and facilities and space) necessary to the conduct of research;

Be it resolved that:

Resolution 1: The President charge the Senior Vice Presidents to present a plan to the Faculty Senate to eliminate roadblocks in the administration of research at the University, by investing adequate resources in personnel and technology, reducing delays in legal review of grants and contracts, streamlining appointment of research personnel, improving the administration of research budgets, and improving the maintenance of research laboratories.

Resolution 2: A) the University Leadership should provide funding needed to address specific deficiencies in scientific research equipment and information technology. B) That the Faculty Senate charges the department chairs to provide thoughtful and realistic requests to the University Leadership for critical pieces of equipment and information technology.

Resolution 3: The Technology Transfer Office be given signatory authority and that it handle most of its own legal issues without necessarily requiring approval from the University Legal Counsel Office. The Technology Transfer Office should be given the power to determine if further legal assistance from the University Legal Counsel Office is necessary.

Resolution 4: The University establishes an Electronic Research Administration System, which can be used by researchers to monitor proposals for grants and contracts in real time as they proceed through the approval process, and facilitate management of awards after they are received.

Resolution 5: The University seriously considers implementing a consistent, year-long, five-day workweek.
Appendix: Shortcomings of the Current Research Infrastructure

1) The Division of Sponsored Project Administration (DSPA) is perceived by the research faculty as the primary face of the administrative side of the research infrastructure.
   D) PIs rely on DSPA by default to shepherd proposals, grants, and contracts through the various administrative Northeastern offices.
   E) DSPA cannot control document progress through other administrative offices.
   F) DSPA is often not knowledgeable about procedures outside its own domain, and therefore cannot offer adequate assistance in resolving research administration issues that arise.

2) The broad Research Infrastructure (RI) across the university could improve its customer service approach.
   A) There is not a sense of “ownership” of proposals by the RI, and as such the RI does not champion, lobby for, or encourage their submission.
   B) The RI does not keep adequate track of proposal/grant status, and is not able to adequately follow-up on proposals once they have been submitted.
   C) The flow of information from the RAI to PIs is insufficient.

3) There is a perceived lack of transparency concerning procedures and processes within the RI and throughout the proposal/grant approval process in general.

4) The organization of DSPA and various financial offices is inefficient.
   A) Having different pre- and post-award officers seems to lead to a lack of continuity.
   B) There is insufficient communication between DSPA and the Accounting/Billing Office.
   C) There is no access to the Accounts Receivable side of the FRS system, making it difficult to note when payment on a grant project has been received and credited to specific projects.
   D) The role of the Research and Property Accounting Office is unclear.

5) There is insufficient training for new faculty and recent grant awardees in grant/contract and proposal procedures and requirements.

6) The RI leadership does not spend sufficient time on RI general organization and functioning. For example, if the DSPA Director is unavailable, it is very difficult to obtain an official signature or advice on problems.

7) There is no PI access to the PeopleSoft ERP system, so PIs cannot assess the funding sources connected to their staff.

8) It can take excessive time to begin working on grants after they have been awarded.
   A) It can take too long (months) to set up account numbers to begin charging on grants.
   B) Legal approval of contracts can take a large proportion of the time required to perform the research task, and occasionally takes longer than the entire performance period.
9) RI has difficulty with non-standard grant opportunities, such as proposals without competitive bidding or open requests.

10) Several specific procedures are unnecessarily inefficient and frustrating to PIs.
    A) New hiring forms have to be submitted each time to pay existing part-time researchers on a new grant.
    B) Paying consultants using Invoice Approval Forms requires three forms.
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The Senate Academic Policy Committee (APC) was asked to address and report on the following charges:

1) To review grade distribution at Northeastern and collect data regarding trends across units, adjunct, non-tenured, and tenured faculty, undergraduates, graduates, and semester/summer courses.

2) To review distribution of students graduating with honors and note trends over time. A question to consider is, "As the University recruits and admits stronger students, does this translate into more students graduating with honors"?

The following methods were used to complete the above charges:

1. Review of literature on grade inflation.
2. Analysis of grades from undergraduate and graduate students for all colleges/departments for five incremental time points over last 20 years [Data provided by David Thornton, Associate Registrar].
3. Analysis of undergraduate students graduating with honors during same time periods [Data also provided by Associate Registrar].
4. Discussion with Joey Fiore, NU Student Government President.
5. Meeting with Associate Deans of Northeastern University.
6. Review of various NU department policies.
7. Discussion among committee members who are all from different departments and colleges.

It became clear through our analyses, reviews, and discussions that there are varied and diverse opinions, policies, and practices surrounding grading, at both the undergraduate and graduate level. While the registrar data showed the number of A’s (A & A-) given to students in the past 20 years has not changed dramatically, it was generally recognized by the committee and those the committee interfaced with that students have become progressively better during that time period. In addition, the number of undergraduate students graduating with honors did increase over the past 10 years (from 34% to 54%) and the overall QPA of students has increased in many departments. Analysis of a group of courses taught in summer & fall terms by the same instructors revealed no significant change in grade distribution during the summer minimester.

This generated further discussion on how students should be taught, meaning should program standards be raised if the current students in reality are better than past students, i.e., enter with
better preparation, higher ability, higher motivation and/or are devoting more time to courses? Or should teaching standards remain the same and faculty simply accept that increasingly more students will achieve the higher echelon in their programs?

Before these questions can be answered, we make the following recommendations and resolution.

**Recommendations**

1. All units on campus actively and regularly (e.g., every fall at a departmental faculty meeting) discuss the department specific requirements and recommendations for grading of undergraduate and graduate courses.

2. Distribute to all faculty a description of what an A student is, a B student is, etc. These guidelines clearly elucidate the expectations at each level, including the + and – criteria.

3. Establish clear course objectives and outcomes upon which to build a clear grading structure.

4. Adhere to the policies on use of S/U/I/W grades and establish a policy that requires department approval of all I (Incomplete) and W (Withdrawal) grades, with the goal of consistency and equity. Each department can determine which individual or committee gives that approval (e.g., Chair of department, Academic Standing committee, Faculty advisor, etc.).

5. Institute university-wide grading policies for all NU core courses in the undergraduate curriculum.

- The College of Business Administration has grading criteria and descriptions clearly stated in their MBA Student Handbook ([http://www.cba.neu.edu/grad/portal.cfm?nav=48](http://www.cba.neu.edu/grad/portal.cfm?nav=48); p. 31). It is recommended these be used as a guideline for drafting policies in other departments and programs.

**Resolution**

Prior to implementation of any recommendations and in order to have a better understanding of what policies are in existence,

- The Senate Agenda Committee appoint an ad hoc or standing committee to (1) review all NU campus grading policies, including all departments/schools/colleges and the Provost’s office, and (2) review past Senate resolutions related to student grading.

Policies, in particular, that need to be examined includes:

- The use of S, U, I, and W grading. Analysis of some departments revealed high percentages of both these types of grades.
• Timing of individual student’s decision to change their grading to S/U in lieu of a letter grade. There appears to be little consistency among departments as to when this should be done.

• Examination of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory policies, with consideration of changing the Unsatisfactory to Failure. This grade would then impact a student’s overall QPA.

NOTE: The APC chart for Undergrad Grade Distributions for 2006 may be found on the Faculty Senate website at http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees/20072008/200708_special/documents/APC0708_FnlRptUG_grade_Distr06.pdf
2007-2008
Senate Standing Committee on Information Technology Policy

The Standing Committee on Information Technology Policy is charged by the Faculty Senate as follows:

The Committee shall be concerned with all questions relating to the development, maintenance, security, and availability of information systems and infrastructures; The Committee will periodically review information systems priorities, policies, resources, and operations and, based on these reviews, make recommendations concerning activities that may improve operations or enhance the seamless flow of data and information to the communities that depend on it; The Committee will also make recommendations to the Senate Agenda Committee, the administrative head of Information Systems, or to others in the administration (as appropriate) on matters concerning operations, resources, or policies.

The 2007-2008 Committee was convened in December and presented with five specific areas on which its work should focus. A sixth charge was later added by the Senate and two were added by the committee. Following an executive summary are the reports on each of these charges.

1. Establish a process for software acquisition based on faculty needs and requests
2. Provide an update on availability of photo rosters for all classes
3. Based on the recommendation from last year’s committee, finalize a recommendation for a policy on digital signatures
4. Provide an update on changes/needs regarding student/faculty portals
5. Assess advisability and timetable for transition to Vista operating system
6. Assess the status of computers in classrooms and the feasibility of installing computers in all classrooms
7. Provide an update on developments to establish a Coop Experience Reporting System
8. Accessibility statement

Executive Summary

The IT Policy Committee (ITPC) found that the charges under review originated from situations requiring widely varying degrees of action. Many issues are currently being adequately addressed or are in the final stages of an implemented solution, suggesting further assessment upon completion. Overall, the committee welcomed the positive nature of these findings. Hence the ITPC found that proposing resolutions was warranted only for some charges.

Establishing a process for software acquisition was perhaps the most serious and complex of the charges, one that has been before the ITPC in the past. Building from past and present charges, the committee addressed instructional and research computer and communications technologies from the interrelated perspectives of software and hardware. The ongoing and rapidly developing use of technology in higher education is critical to the educational process and to the ability of Northeastern to compete with peer institutions. The establishment of a Faculty Senate-based committee would provide a central venue through which the academic community could apply for new software and related technology. Critical to this strategy will be the dedication of ongoing funding to support proposals approved by this committee.
The ability to generate photo rosters for classes has long been sought after and remains unavailable with the present administrative systems technology. The Unified Digital Campus project and its transition to Banner software, already in process, is solving this issue.

Digital signatures, largely an administrative issue with legal concerns, is an emerging technology for which adequate evaluation is premature. We recommend, however, that any future committee making policy recommendations on a system be certain to retain vendor choice, conform to Federal standards, and maintain compatibility with all operating systems.

Student/faculty portals have been upgraded to virtually eliminate congestion. However, the portal needs to be able to support the increasing use of technology in the classroom. The committee recommends that the ITPC work with IS to review changes to portal technology.

The Vista operating system was introduced with many problems that have since been resolved. Yet some software incompatibility and security constrains remain. Since Vista was first introduced IS has provided a Vista image for those who request it. However no decision has yet been made to replace XP with Vista. Vista is currently being supported so that arriving students and faculty with new Vista-loaded machines will be accommodated. The merging of previously separate functions into the new IS Service Desk further facilitates support. Similarly, a web-enabled Knowledge Base that is currently in development will be implemented next year.

The status of computers in classrooms has changed rapidly as laptop ownership has become ubiquitous. Going forward, the need for installed computers in the classrooms will be even more reduced while the need for connectivity replaces it. The wireless campus is a great convenience but its bandwidth is limited compared to the five-times-faster high speed wired network. The other hardware component which classrooms rely upon is digital projection. A new generation of projectors with superior resolution and brightness and of lower cost is now available. A timetable for upgrading projectors is recommended.

A reporting system that serves the Co-op experience is included in the development of an electronic portfolio system which is currently underway. The E-portfolio Working Group is about to launch a demonstration, followed by a pilot.

Universal accessibility to existing and emerging technologies needs to be assured through the adoption of university-wide standards and policies.
Establish a process for software acquisition based on faculty needs and requests

This issue was addressed in the report of the 2006-2007 Standing Committee on Information Technology Policy. The present committee has revised and expanded the prior Charge #2 and corresponding report:

**Charge 2: Are there additional instructional and research technology (hardware or software) that the University should consider?** The Committee is encouraged to survey contemporary instructional and research technology in order to investigate promising emerging technologies and establish a process to regularly compare Northeastern’s resources against this benchmark and provide recommendations on the adoption and implementation of appropriate instructional and research technology.

Instructional and research computer and communications technologies in higher education are rapidly evolving and affect the ability of universities worldwide to deliver educational products and to compete with peer institutions. For example, the acquisition and availability of software applications is becoming more important for both instruction and research. This reliance spans most disciplines including those which in the past have not usually relied on technology for pedagogy or research. Further, there is a cost to software acquisition. Software licensing has become more complex, and the opportunity to save funds with economies of scale regarding the acquisition of instructional and research related software can easily be missed by educational institutions. Other examples of evolving technologies that impact research and/or educational missions of universities include teleconferencing, student information systems, high performance computing, etc.

Because it is neither pedagogically/research viable nor financially plausible to purchase or install all current or emerging technology and software (as it is neither viable nor plausible to purchase all books or e-journals in all disciplines), the Faculty Senate Information Technology Policy Committee suggests establishing a Faculty Senate-based process to review and provide feedback on introduction and implementation of instructional and research related technologies.

Below we provide a framework for review of the acquisition and delivery of software applications and related technology services to faculty and students at Northeastern. [Note: this section concentrates on software specifically with the expectation that, as other relevant technologies are identified as important to the education or research mission of the university, they would be added to the agenda of the proposed committee.]

In the area of software distribution Northeastern University must examine three sets of policies and procedures: academic software asset management and academic software assessment and adoption and remote delivery of software. In the area of academic software asset management, the university must remain compliant with varied software distribution and use terms and conditions even as it breaks new ground with this mode of distribution. This is an increasingly complex task given changing software delivery methods and a diverse and changing software licensing environment. Licensing arrangements range from single user licenses to enterprise, site, server and/or client based licenses. Negotiating licenses on university-wide basis could provide economies of scale in purchasing software and would help insure we are in compliance with licensing requirements. Information Services continues to improve the
University’s capacity in this area, and the introduction of On Demand\(^1\) services will improve Northeastern’s ability to monitor and manage software licensing and usage.

In support of this new initiative this committee recommends that the University should consider revising its current approach to software assessment, adoption and retirement. In an On Demand environment, faculty can be expected to integrate many more software supported analytic methods and techniques into courses, and students and employers can be expected to demand this type of pedagogical integration. What is needed is a policy that responds with much greater flexibility to increasing demands for deploying new software applications and/or more licenses (for existing applications) that is sure to arise in an active On Demand environment.

Currently, the University has a relatively fixed level of funding for academic software applications managed by Information Services. Requests for additional applications go either to Information Services (which has an essentially fixed budget for software) or to unit administrators (i.e., a chair or dean). A third method of acquiring such software applications is through funded research. Critically, none of these approaches can meet the expected increase in demand for these software applications when they are optimally integrated into our courses.

To facilitate the acquisition and delivery of academic software applications (above and beyond the licenses already deployed) a new faculty-based assessment and funding approach needs to be considered. Specifically, we propose establishing an Academic Software and Technology Assessment and Adoption Committee, chosen by the Provost and Deans Council in agreement with the SAC, for staggered terms of three years, with faculty comprising the majority of positions on the committee and at least one voting member from IS. All members of the committee are expected to have considerable knowledge of computers and software. The committee’s decisions would be vetted through the Provost’s Office and Information Services for integration with existing systems.

In addition, individual academic units and/or faculty frequently need to install local copies of software acquired through departmental or research budgets to meet specific and not widely shared needs without a large bureaucratic overhead. In order to facilitate the distribution of limited use licenses (e.g., for particular individuals or departments) for which there is no large demand we need a flexible software acquisition policy which makes it possible for the individual scholar or research group to get what it needs in a timely fashion. Importantly, current software budgets for academic units should not be taken to increase the central software repository.

Finally, the committee as part of its charge will also investigate alternative models of licensing and purchasing of software as faculty or students software needs evolve. Thus, increasingly “courseware” is being published for use in conjunction with books. Also, e-books

---

\(^1\) Information Services’ objective in the first iteration of the On Demand strategy (http://educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eqm0638.pdf) is designed to deliver to faculty, staff and students, the same on-campus tools or applications authorized and necessary to do their work. Importantly, this is coupled with the capacity to store, retrieve, and share that work wherever they are and on whatever workstation is available. From a pedagogical perspective, the paradigm shift in the delivery of information technology services to students and faculty is more than a matter of access and convenience or, in the longer run, a potential cost saver (e.g., over the longer time the advent of On Demand services should reduce the need for computer labs). For example, the On Demand availability of computing, software, and storage resources means that many more classes can introduce students to the most current analytic methods and techniques in their subject areas. Equally important, since students will have access to the applications and data on an anytime/anywhere basis, they may spend more time on the applications than they would in a computer lab.
have increasingly complex licenses. As e-books come in broader use there is need for an ongoing review of licensing options in order to provide maximum flexibility to faculty in adopting e-books or other electronic content for instructional purposes. We also need to help insure we optimize faculty options and flexibility in the purchase of special use technology for which there is limited university wide demand. In summary, given the growing relevance of software, electronic content and information technology more generally to both the educational and research missions of the university the proposed committee must be able to review both centralized and distributed methods of acquiring and delivering these resources to faculty and students.

The key is to set up a process that 1) consolidates licenses for economies of scale and sets up a process to purchase software used by multiple departments; and 2) also enables individual faculty to acquire and test out new tools to meet their potentially unique needs. In the latter circumstance a review by a central software licensing specialist may sometimes be able to provide licensing negotiation support and also help identify if there are common interests/needs in other areas in the university.

Faculty need to be prominently involved in this process because they are the members of the university community closest to the pedagogical needs of the students. The goal of the Academic Software and Technology Assessment and Adoption Committee would be to create a venue by which the academic community can propose/request new applications for academic and/or research activities. This committee would review and approve proposals for new academic software applications or the expansion of additional licenses from the faculty. The committee would also regularly consult with the appropriate technical personnel from IS and the colleges to determine whether proposed software applications could be properly deployed and/or managed with the On Demand service. In addition, especially given Northeastern’s commitment to experiential learning, the committee should also regularly solicit information from students and industry/business partners on software applications in particular industry or research sectors.

On an annual basis, applications funded through this committee would be reviewed in terms of university demand/usage which would be based on monitoring audits provided by Information Services. Based on usage statistics, the Committee would recommend reducing or dropping applications that showed decreased or no demand. This process would prevent a stagnant application environment and release funding for new applications. The ITPC suggests that a budget for software be allocated for this purpose from existing academic software budgets and/or other sources if necessary.

Software asset management of the applications approved by the proposed Committee should remain with Information Services. This organization has the management tools and experience to monitor compliance and optimize the ability to negotiate favorable licensing arrangements with software vendors.

A critical success factor in implementing the proposed strategy will be the allocation of dedicated one-time and ongoing funds to support proposals approved by the Academic Software Application Assessment and Adoption Committee. At the moment there are no significant additional software funds available for this program. As noted, Information Services will continue to administer software licensing and manage the distribution and delivery of the software applications. However, Information Services does not have additional funding necessary to meet the expected increases in demand for software licenses associated with the
delivery of On Demand services. Likewise College Deans and Departmental Chairs also are not likely to have the necessary funds. We propose that working with the Office of the Provost and Information Services, the Committee should develop budget recommendations for the funding necessary to support the adoption of new academic software applications and also investigate potential revenues streams to support ongoing software applications and technology. This process should proceed on an annual basis. With the approval of the Senate, budget recommendations should be presented to the Provost and relevant university budget committee. The presentation of budget recommendations to the upper levels of the university budget process is important because academic and research technologies can be best thought of as an institution-wide resource much like library resources. Acting now will provide Northeastern with a several year lead over most other universities.

Northeastern University is in an excellent position to meet the technological expectations and needs of students in the 21st Century. If we move expeditiously in the arena we can provide our institution with important competitive advantages over the next few years and more importantly, provide our students with enhanced educational experiences and career opportunities.

Based on the above report, the ITPC proposes that the following resolution be considered by the Faculty Senate:

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate establish the Academic Software Application and Technology Assessment and Adoption Committee, as described in the 2007-2008 report of the ITPC, to review proposed academic software acquisitions for distribution through the Northeastern On Demand service or standard software distribution services. A budget for new software needs should be allocated for this purpose. Current software budgets for academic units should not be taken to increase the central software repository. Finally, in the future the need for additional software allocations should be reviewed and recommended on regular basis.**

2

Provide an update on availability of photo rosters for all classes

Northeastern is presently in the process of revamping its entire administrative systems technology environment, of which the generation of photo rosters is a part. The Unified Digital Campus (UD) project will be a major improvement over the present system in the management of university data. The foundation of UDC is Banner software which is provided by SunGard Higher Education, and deployed at many leading institutions. It provides access to consistent and accurate data through an intuitive Web-based interface.

Linda Allen met with the committee on March 13 to discuss the features of Banner and the schedule to phase-in implementation. Banner consists of three components: Advancement, Finance and Student. The launch of Banner Student is scheduled to start in 2009.

Banner has the capability to generate photo rosters from registrar data and images gathered during the process of issuing student photo ID cards. Linda pointed out that even now there is some capacity to provide faculty with student photos through FACT. The drawback is that only individual photos are available, not thumbnail images of an entire roster. Linda offered to
investigate the possibility of configuring FACT to provide photo rosters before Banner is implemented.

As a FERPA issue, student photos fall outside of what Northeastern has determined constitutes ‘directory information,’ the information that can be publicly disclosed without consent. Student consent is therefore required and will be obtained as part of the admissions process. Only a small percentage of students is expected to deny permission as is the case now but accommodations should be put in place to support the individual student’s preference.

Banner will be up and running when registration opens for Fall 2009 in Spring 2009--one year from now. The committee therefore recommends no action before the new student information system is in place.

Further information about the Unified Digital Campus is available at http://www.northeastern.edu/emsa/udc/index.html

3
Based on the recommendation from last year’s committee, finalize a recommendation for a policy on digital signatures

The use of digital signatures is a relatively mature technology, although software and security considerations are still in a state of flux. Digital signatures are more of an administration than faculty issue. Moreover, the legal issues involved are beyond the scope of this committee. A future committee should be convened to assess the maturity of the industry and make policy recommendations at that time. However, there are three considerations that we find essential to any policy adopted by Northeastern:

1. There should be no system that locks the University into a single vendor
2. Any system adopted must be compatible with standards established by the Federal government, and
3. Any system adopted must be compatible with a variety of operating systems – Windows, Mac OS, Unix, Linux.

4
Provide an update on changes/needs regarding student/faculty portals

As Northeastern encourages faculty to make more use of technology in the classroom, the present design of Northeastern’s portal needs to be able to support this growth. During peak times, such as the end of the semester, we should assume that a large majority of users will be trying to access the portal at the same time.

While congestion in the current portal has been virtually eliminated and IS continues to support direct connections to student email and to Blackboard that do not go through the portal we suggest that IS explore alternative vendors so that the system can continue to expand to meet the increasing demand.
Based on the above report, the ITPC proposes that the following resolution be considered by the Faculty Senate:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate charge the ITPC to work with IS to review changes made to the portal technology to ensure that the connection to student email and to Blackboard through the portal continue to meet the increasing demand on these services. This review may include surveying alternative portal vendors, analyzing technology platforms, and/or complementary ways of accessing online services which may require incremental investments.

5
Assess advisability and timetable for transition to Vista operating system

When Vista first was released by Microsoft, there were numerous problems with this new operating system. Additionally, software applications from other vendors had not yet caught up to be compatible with the system. Most of these issues have now been resolved. However, because of continued inconvenience for the end user around some software incompatibility and security constraints, Information Services is addressing Vista adoption by gradually bringing in Vista-ready computers. (This process is also in place for Apple’s new system, Leopard). IS has:

- Prepared a Vista image for those who request it. This Information Services image has been available since Vista was introduced by Microsoft in January 2007.

- Replaced many faculty and academic staff and student computing lab computers with Vista-capable machines.

A decision to convert the Vista-ready machines to use the system (to replace XP) has not been made as of the date of this report.

1. Vista is being supported so arriving students, faculty and new machines will be helped and not have problems connecting.

2. Early in 2008, the Information Services InfoCommons, Help Desk, Call Center, Audio Visual, and Desktop Support teams merged to create the IS Service Desk team to improve customer service. The new approach is designed to further improve technology assistance services to the Northeastern Community by cross-training service personnel to broaden their individual technical knowledge in order to increase the team’s flexibility when responding to customer issues across the technologies supported. The Service Desk will be the face of IS by:

- Keeping the community informed of progress, advising on technology issues, and improving monitoring of progress of resolution to outstanding issues;

- Developing a knowledge base that will offer immediate information toward resolution and reduce call-in waiting times;

- Increasing training offerings on software and applications needed to better utilize current technology and to introduce new offerings;
• Enhancing Macintosh assistance; and

• Improving classroom A-V response time.

Information Services has been developing a web-enabled Knowledge Base to offer the Northeastern Community easy to use access to both frequently asked and/or technically specific questions regarding hardware, software, and other technology-related questions. As of the date of this report, NU has access to over 90,000 entries. There are over 1000 entries which are NU-specific. The system is currently being used (and updated) by IS staff. Within the next academic year, IS will make the system available to the community.

6
Assess the status of computers in classrooms and the feasibility of installing computers in all classrooms.

At present there are approximately 100 classrooms that are wired but without an installed computer. Yet, since the advent of the practice of installing computers in classrooms, the landscape of need has dramatically changed. With the widespread increase in laptop ownership among students and faculty, it is no longer necessary or desirable to maintain desktop computers in every classroom, with a few exceptions such as teaching labs.

Even though wireless access is already universally available at NU, there are some courses where it is necessary to have classrooms in which an instructor can have students’ access information from a remote site via their own laptops with a faster connection than wireless currently provides. Wireless is too slow (five times slower than wired) for some purposes such as CAD (Computer Aided Design) or GISS (Geographic Information Systems).

Because the cost to install high speed interfaces and electrical outlets in all NU classrooms would be prohibitive (both the one-time cost of installation and ongoing maintenance costs), and because, while becoming faster, wireless technology is still not as fast, we suggest that there be a review of computing labs where, as noted above, high density programs are taught. This review would ascertain how many high-speed facilities would be needed, and how they should be distributed.

[Note: In the summer of 2007, IS installed over 650 new computers in student labs across the campus and disciplines with the funding for these computers from the Provost’s Office. A three-year student lab computing replacement program is now in place.]

Additionally, there should be a plan to upgrade classroom digital projectors to new, advanced high resolution machines with brighter displays.

Based on the above report, the ITPC proposes that the following resolution be considered by the Faculty Senate:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate charge the ITPC with review of classroom computing requirements and to establish a timetable to upgrade projectors with equipment of superior resolution.
Additional Issues:
In addition to the specific charges provided by the Faculty Senate, the committee also considered two additional issues that are outside of the original charge to this committee:

7
Update on developments to establish a Coop Experience Reporting System

Alicia Russell and Kostia Bergman lead the E-portfolio Working Group which has been studying requirements for an electronic portfolio system that would function across the university. When implemented it would in part address Coop issues.

The portfolio can be used to collect bodies of work--both coursework and Coop--as evidence of development over a student’s academic career and to provide reflection points to help students integrate academic and experiential learning. Briefly, the group surveyed faculty and developed eight ‘use scenarios’ for e-portfolios at Northeastern and the software requirements needed to fulfill them. The complete explanation of use scenarios is included in Appendix A. The preliminary report of August 20, 2007 is attached in PDF form.

After reviewing and testing potential products, the group has selected one for public vendor demonstration which is scheduled for April. A pilot is expected to run this summer and fall from which a broader implementation strategy will be determined.

8
Accessibility statement

Web accessibility is denied to the visually impaired and increasingly the audio impaired. Blind and deaf students are not accommodated by most NU web interfaces. This is a University-wide problem. Furthermore, the technology of inclusion exists and is installed that enables accessibility but by default is not put into practice.

The committee recommends that the Disability Resource Center, which is knowledgeable in what students need, review what accessibility technology is currently available at Northeastern and develop requirements, and funding sources, for additional needs. Additionally, the ITPC recommends that, as there are continuously emerging technologies that may not be universally accessible, there be university-wide standards and policies that assure accessibility.

Respectfully submitted,

2007-2008 Senate Standing Committee on Information Technology Policy:

Professor Thomas Starr, Chair (CAS-Art + Design)
Professor James Dana (CAS-Economics & CBA)
Professor Robert Furelle (CCIS)
Professor Leon Janikian (Music)
Professor Yang Lee (CBA)
Professor Ronald Mourant (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
Professor Neal Pearlmutter (Psychology)
Professor Judith Perrolle (CAS-Sociology & Anthropology)
Professor Michael Vaughn (CAS-Physics)
Mr. Christopher Bourne (SGA Representative)
Dean Seamus Harreys (Student Financial Services)
Principal Research Scientist Glenn Pierce (Criminal Justice)
Director Leslie Hitch (Academic Technology Services)
Appendix A

Potential Use Scenarios (types of portfolio)

Electronic portfolio systems enable a common set of activities that include collecting work samples or artifacts, reflecting on the meaning of the work in some broader context, presenting subsets of work in different formats to different audiences, and assessing individual artifacts or complete portfolios at an individual, programmatic, or curricular level. Portfolios may be developmental, showing a progression of work over time, or representational, providing a demonstration of ultimate achievement.

The goals and priorities of a particular program along these dimensions will influence the structure of a given portfolio and the capabilities of the system required. The following seven descriptions represent potential scenarios for portfolio uses that reflect the requirements of current and previous Northeastern portfolio projects, either in pilot or in planning.

Enhanced Resumes
An enhanced resume is an electronic resume, similar in format to a traditional resume, but enhanced by links to work samples in various media saved in a student's repository. This enables the student to provide evidence of skills gained from academic and experiential education. In the best cases this will include an opportunity to demonstrate "soft skills" such as critical thinking and problem solving. An ePortfolio system should allow a student to easily customize resumes and share them with specific employers.

Open Structure Portfolio
An open structure portfolio allows the student control over the structure of a personal website, which can be shared publicly or through restricted access to display results of research, class projects, or bodies of work. This format may be useful to graduate students involved in research as well as students in creative fields who desire extensive control over the structure and visual presentation of their work.

Developmental Completion of Program Requirements
Some programs will want students to collect evidence of their development over their academic careers, providing a view of growth over time and the opportunity to review and reflect on the meaning of work at different points. This type of portfolio typically focuses on student reflection and enables faculty to assess effectively the progression of a curriculum. It can facilitate advice from faculty mentors on important areas of improvement. The portfolio could be used, in part, to provide reflection points to help students integrate academic and experiential learning. The current Department of Physical Therapy portfolios are an example of a developmental portfolio. Other programs have expressed interest in using a portfolio approach to tracking the progress of students in Ph.D. programs.

Representational Portfolio
In a representational portfolio (sometimes called a showcase portfolio), a student presents a final picture of his/her achievement through academic and experiential education. A representational portfolio can be used for reflection on integrating educational experiences, to present authentic evidence of achievement to employers, and for curriculum assessment that measures how well students are meeting ultimate curricular goals.
Visual Showcase
Disciplines that produce primarily visual and/or media-based artifacts (i.e., art, design, photography, architecture, communication) have specific needs for the display of work, whether the portfolio is organized developmentally or representationally. A visual showcase portfolio should include some form of “gallery” of thumbnail images that can be used to scan the work in the portfolio. Thumbnails should be clickable to launch a larger view of the image/media that could include caption and description information. Students using this type of portfolio are also more likely to desire the ability to customize the overall portfolio design.

Curriculum assessment
Curriculum assessment can be achieved through a portfolio system that allows the association of student work (artifacts) with assessment rubrics and the aggregation of work by multiple students for assessment using the rubrics. The Northeastern Department of Biology has achieved this using the Open Source Portfolio (OSP) system for representational portfolios created by students in the capstone course. The system allows faculty to compare artifacts submitted as evidence of achievement of defined criteria and to distribute the artifacts for anonymous review by expert reviewers.

Assessment of NU Core
Similar in many ways to curricular assessment, assessment of the NU core could be a university-wide portion of a portfolio system that collects writing samples and makes them available for anonymous expert review.

Demonstration of Professional Criteria
Some professional programs are required to demonstrate achievement of specific standards set by outside bodies, both for accreditation and certification of individual students. As an example, the EdTech Center has developed a database for the Physical Therapy department that maps accreditation criteria to specific courses, methods of assessment, and sample evidence of achievement (student work). Ideally, a system like this would be connected to student portfolios. Such a system would be ideal for the School of Education.
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On February 28, 2007, the Faculty Senate passed a series of resolutions that set the stage for replacing the current Teacher-Course Evaluation (TCE) program with a redesigned and electronically administered Teacher Rating Course Evaluation (TRACE) instrument. The last of the three resolutions directed the Senate Agenda Committee to establish a Special Ad Hoc Committee on TRACE Implementation. The overall task of this Committee was to design, oversee and evaluate all steps needed to effect the transition from the existing pencil-and-paper TCE tool to an electronic TRACE instrument.

The TRACE Implementation Committee, comprised of members of the faculty, the Provost's Office and Information Technology, met several times during Summer and Fall 2007 to examine the online instruments used at other institutions, to select a possible third-party vendor for online evaluation software, and to plan a pilot test of the new evaluation strategy.

The Committee invited a demonstration of a tool called "CoursEva\textsuperscript{R}," an Internet-based product from Academic Management Systems (AMS) of Amherst, NY. Academic Management Systems provides management software for colleges and universities, including admissions management, curriculum analysis, and course assessment. While the Committee harbored some concern that the client list of AMS primarily included smaller institutions and several health professional schools, the members were sufficiently impressed with the company's responsiveness as well with the capabilities of CoursEva\textsuperscript{R} to move ahead with a pilot test of the online course evaluation system without any obligation to enter into a contract with AMS.

For this purpose of pilot testing, two experimental approaches were implemented in the Fall 2007 semester. One involved a true randomized experiment applied to large classes with students randomly assigned to two conditions; the second was a quasi-experiment matching multiple sections of the same courses taught by the same instructors.

For certain large classes, in particular, half the enrolled students, chosen randomly, were asked to evaluate the class using TRACE online while the other half were given an online version of the TCE form. This experiment would allow us to determine the impact of changes in question wording and context between the old TCE form and the new TRACE instrument.

Next, for pairs of class sections of the same courses taught by the same instructors, one section was to use the usual pencil-and-paper TCE questionnaire distributed in class while the other was to have the online version of TRACE. This quasi-experiment (no random assignment of students to conditions) would test the impact of shifting to online administration on the quality and content of results.

Early in the Fall Semester, department chairs and college deans were asked to nominate instructors and classes for the pilot test/experiment. Because course evaluation results are typically used in tenure decisions, we asked the chairs and deans
to avoid classes taught by probationary faculty, but instead to focus on tenured faculty and non-tenure-track faculty. Ultimately, the instructors for all nominated classes were asked for their consent and cooperation; only a couple of them declined to participate. The experimental layouts are shown in Table 1. As shown, as there were two instructors who taught three sections of the same class, an additional quasi-experimental design was possible, comparing TRACE online, TCE online and TCE in-class. Finally, one honors section was used for a small comparison of having the same students complete both the in-class TCE form and the online TRACE survey.

As end of the Fall Semester approached, students in the classes designated for online course evaluations (using either TRACE or TCE) were informed about the pilot test both in writing form the Committee and orally in-class by their instructors. The window for online evaluation would commence at the end of classes and continue throughout the final examination period. Those classes designated for the usual pencil-and-paper TCE forms were not specifically informed about the pilot.

Because of the pilot nature of Fall Semester experiments, several features that would be in place if and when online TRACE were adopted campus-wide could not be incorporated into the process. Most notably, the sanction approved by the Student Government Association that students who do not complete the evaluations would be denied access to their course grades for a period of up to two weeks could not be implemented because of the limited coverage of the pilot test. Second, under the terms of the pilot testing process, the instrument, software and data bases would necessarily be hosted at AMS rather than at Northeastern, thereby impacting the means by which students could access the survey questionnaire. Specifically, they would need to follow an e-mailed link to AMS, rather than have it as a prominent feature in the myneu portal.

As it happened, this temporary limitation caused many students difficulties in logging on to the system, particularly when attempting access from public machines whose browsers were not configured to accept cookies. As soon as the online window opened, dozens of students sent e-mails to the Committee Chair reporting that they were not able to access the system. These issues were relayed to the IT department for assistance. There is no telling, of course, how many students tried unsuccessfully to complete the survey and gave up trying.

It is our understanding that the access problems will be eliminated once the online system is hosted on-campus so that students can respond to the course evaluation questionnaire through their usual myneu login and “self-services” page. Specifically, the NU servers would have already been established as a trusted source for students, avoiding the security problems encountered when they were directed to the AMS server. One additional glitch occurred because of a communications lapse between the Committee and the IT department that impacted on response rates. Specifically, the window for the online TCEs for classes in Experiment A was delayed by four days, which appears to have impacted on responsiveness of students.
The response rates for the three instruments—TRACE online (TRACE), TCE online (TCE), and pencil-and-paper TCE (TCEpp)—are shown in Tables 2 and 3. Clearly, the online response rates were not nearly as high as those for the in-class instrument. Of greatest interest, the TRACE response rates varied from a low of 21% to a high of 76%. Although somewhat disappointing, it is not possible to determine how much of this shortfall is a result of login problems versus the fact that online course assessment is not a process that students would have come to expect. Once the technical difficulties are resolved, once students are well-aware of a new campus-wide approach to course evaluation (and don’t still participate in the in-class TCE process for all but their one class that is part of a pilot test), and once the SGA-prescribed sanction for non-compliance is in place, we fully expect that response rates will rise substantially. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the highest response rate (76%) came in the course taught by the Committee Chair who had reminded his students on several occasions of the importance of their participation. It would seem, therefore, that launching a strong campus campaign informing students of the new evaluation system and encouraging them to participate will be important.

The primary interest for this pilot test surround results for the overall instructor question, common to TRACE and TCE, that often is used for merit reviews as well as tenure consideration. Results for the instructor assessment item are shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Scanning these results, a shift from pencil and paper to online administration tends to boost instructor rating scores, although not all that substantially. Generally, instructor effectiveness scores tended to be between one- and two-tenths of a point higher (on a five point scale for the online TRACE instrument (see Appendix A for a more detailed analysis). Of course, it is not possible to rule out the possibility that higher scores on the online instruments were to some extend related to response rates. On the other hand, across all classes using TRACE, the response rates were not correlated with mean instructor ratings (r = -.08). Perhaps the TRACE context, with its greater emphasis on formative assessment, may actually have contributed to higher scores. Overall, there appears to be little reason for concern that a shift over to a new instrument (TRACE) and a new mode of delivery (online administration) will impact negatively on faculty.

The TRACE instrument offers more than just a new set of closed-ended questions. TRACE presents students with a wide array of open-ended queries about the strengths and weaknesses of the course, course material and instructor. In addition, unlike the limited number of cryptic responses that faculty typically receive from students answering the in-class TCE before getting up to leave the classroom, it was hoped that TRACE would tap into students’ tendency to be more verbose with online vehicles (like ratemyprofessor.com).

The results of the online TRACE responses tend to support this expectation. Although not quantified in any way, it does appear that students were far more apt to comment thoughtfully with the online approach. For purposes of illustration of the type and extent of student feedback, the Committee Chair agreed to have his TRACE report form appended to this assessment.
In conclusion, the Committee is quite pleased with the results of the pilot test. Although somewhat disappointed with the relatively lower response rates, we expect that they will be much higher once technical issues of off-site hosting are eliminated, once students become fully aware of and accustomed to online administration of course evaluations, and once the SGA-prescribed sanction for non-compliance is in force. Notwithstanding the response rate concern, we are encouraged by the quality of results and the fact that faculty should not be negatively impacted by shifting over to online TRACE campus-wide. In addition to these issues, faculty can expect immediate feedback with the ability to access their results online as soon as the evaluation period ends, departments can incorporate a customized set of questions, and the University can be advantaged by the reduced labor and cost of online administration.

As a result of the pilot test and discussions about the prospects of utilizing CoursEval software for TRACE administration and reporting, the Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate support a move to implement the previously-approved online course evaluation process across the campus 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 calendars) The Committee also recommends that this first campus-wide effort use the basic TRACE form, holding off with local customization of question content. In addition, out of concern for both fairness and feasibility, we recommend that implementation of the sanction for student non-compliance be delayed until at least Fall 2009. This will give the campus community some experience with the new approach before enforcing any penalties that could produce resistance to this new and far improved approach to assessing the quality of instruction at Northeastern University.
### Table 1: Fall 2007 Pilot Design

**A. Large Class (split in two) Randomized Experiment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHM U151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM U151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM U151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM U151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM U151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR U300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMU311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVU260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJS U370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC U241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Random split online TRACE/TCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Paired Class Quasi-Experiment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTH U180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH U180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH U241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH U241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH U115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH U115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Triple Class Quasi Experiment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC U403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TCE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TCE paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>TRACE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC U201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>TCE online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Both TRACE online and TCE paper for all**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HNR U341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>TCE paper and TRACE online for all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Response Rates by Experiment and Evaluation Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>TRACE</th>
<th>TCE</th>
<th>TCEpp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCEpp</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Response Rates by Experiment, Course/Instructor, and Evaluation Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>TRACE</th>
<th>TCE</th>
<th>TCEpp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Course</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Course</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Course</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Instructor Rating by Experiment, Course/Instructor, and Evaluation Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>TRACE Unweighted</th>
<th>4.59</th>
<th>4.71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCEpp</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCEpp</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCEpp</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCEpp</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCEpp</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Instructor Rating by Experiment, Course/Instructor, and Evaluation Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>TRACE</th>
<th>TCE</th>
<th>TCEpp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment A Course</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Course</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Course</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Course</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Technical Results
Besides the means and standard errors presented in tables of the report, for each of the experimental designs, the instructor effectiveness scores ($Y_{ik}$) for the $i^{th}$ respondent in the $k^{th}$ experimental condition with the $k^{th}$ instructor were analyzed using a linear model containing an intercept ($\mu$), instrument effects ($\alpha_i$), instructor effects ($\beta_k$) and their interactions ($\alpha_k\beta_k$), constrained so that all main and interactions parameters sum to zero, plus a random disturbance term ($e_{ik}$). That is,

$$Y_{ik} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_k + (\alpha\beta)_i + e_{ik} \quad i = 1,2,...,N_{ik}; j = 1,2,...,a; k = 1,2,...,b$$

where $\sum \alpha_i = 0, \sum \beta_k = 0, \sum (\alpha\beta)_i = 0, \sum (\alpha\beta)_k = 0$.

The estimation and testing process assumed a mixed effects model wherein the instrument factor is fixed (all conditions represented) and the instructor factor is random (a selection of possible instructors). The null hypotheses, parameter estimates, sums of squares (SS), mean squares (MS) and expected mean squares are given by:

Hypotheses: $\alpha_i = 0, \beta_k = 0, (\alpha\beta)_k = 0$

Estimates:

$$\hat{\alpha}_i = \bar{Y}_{..i} - \bar{Y}...$$
$$\hat{\beta}_k = \bar{Y}_{..k} - \bar{Y}...$$
$$(\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta})_k = \bar{Y}_{..k} - \bar{Y}_{..i} - \bar{Y}_{..k} + \bar{Y}...$$

Sums of Squares:

$$SS_A = \sum_i N_i (\bar{Y}_{..i} - \bar{Y}...)^2$$
$$SS_B = \sum_k N_k (\bar{Y}_{..k} - \bar{Y}...)^2$$
$$SS_{AB} = \sum_i \sum_k N_{ik} (\bar{Y}_{ik} - \bar{Y}_{..i} - \bar{Y}_{..k} + \bar{Y}...)^2$$
$$SS_{Within} = \sum_i \sum_j \sum_k (Y_{ik} - \bar{Y}_{ij})^2$$
$$SS_{Total} = \sum_j \sum_k \sum_i (Y_{ik} - \bar{Y}...)^2$$

Mean Squares:

$$MS_A = SS_A / a - 1$$
$$MS_B = SS_B / b - 1$$
$$MS_{AB} = SS_{AB} / (a - 1)(b - 1)$$
$$MS_{Within} = SS_{Within} / (N - ab)$$

Expected MS:

$$E(MS_A) = \sigma_r^2 + b\sigma_{\alpha}^2$$
$$E(MS_B) = (b - 1)(\sigma_r^2 + a\sigma_{\beta}^2)$$
$$E(MS_{AB}) = \sigma_r^2 + n\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^2$$
$$E(MS_{Error}) = ab(n - 1)\sigma_r^2$$
For all four experimental designs, the interaction effects were non-significant (nor even close), allowing a revised additive model that pools the interaction and error sums of squares.

$$Y_{ik} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_k + \epsilon_{ik} \quad i = 1,2,...,N_i \quad j = 1,2,...,a \quad k = 1,2,...,b$$

where $\sum \alpha_i = 0$, $\sum \beta_k = 0$

with

Expected MS:

$$E(MS_{\alpha}) = \sigma^2_{\alpha} + bna\sigma^2_{\epsilon}$$
$$E(MS_{\beta}) = (b-1)(\sigma^2_{\epsilon} + ana\sigma^2_{\epsilon})$$
$$E(MS_{\epsilon}) = ab(n-1)\sigma^2_{\epsilon}$$

Test statistic:

$$F = MS_{\alpha} / MS_{error} \sim F_{a-1,N-ab}$$
$$F = MS_{\beta} / MS_{error} \sim F_{b-1,N-ab}$$

The parameter estimates and analysis of variance tables are shown below for each of the four experimental designs. In the three primary experiments, the TRACe condition produces a small but (in light of the large number of respondents) significant boost in instructor rating scores. When compared with TCE online (experiment A), TRACe increases the scores by 0.20 (on a five-point scale). Comparing TRACe with TCE in-class (Experiment B), the increase is a somewhat smaller 0.13. In Experiment C, both online instruments result in higher levels of instructor effectiveness, though this analysis is based on far fewer respondents. Finally, the difference between the TRACe scores and the in-class TCE scores for the small case of Experiment D is neither statistically significant no noteworthy.
Analysis of Experiment A Data

Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.670</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>40.802</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.445 - 4.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=1.00]</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.194 - .223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=2.00]</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>-4.86 - .132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-.640</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-3.731</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.978 - -.303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>-3.143</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.650 - -.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-2.852</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.574 - -.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-.954</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>-.425 - .148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>-.317 - .180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>-.551</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-2.851</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.930 - -.171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty=REDACTED</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5631.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5631.022</td>
<td>3276.781</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Error</td>
<td>14.766</td>
<td>8.290</td>
<td>1.780*</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument Hypothesis</td>
<td>4.056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.056</td>
<td>8.043</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>208.805</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>.504*</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty Hypothesis</td>
<td>10.044</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>4.544</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>208.805</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>.604*</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. .714 MS(faculty) + .286 MS(Effect)  
b. MS(Effect)
Analysis of Experiment B Data

Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.505</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>41.495</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.291 - 4.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=1.00]</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.330 - .295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=0.00]</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=1]</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>-.300 - .255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=2]</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.393 - -.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=3]</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>-.332 - .320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=4]</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>-.394 - .236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=5]</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>-.388 - .345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=6]</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5267.871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5267.871</td>
<td>116.640</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24.235</td>
<td>5.376</td>
<td>4.508*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>223.832</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>0.587*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>223.832</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>.587*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>29.013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.804</td>
<td>10.165</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>223.832</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>.587*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>223.832</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>.587*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. .726 MS(faculty) + .274 MS(Error)
b. MS/Error
Analysis of Experiment C Data

Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.856</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>26.458</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=1.00]</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=2.00]</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>2.432</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=3.00]</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=MINORITY]</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-3.448</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-802</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faculty=WHITE]</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.*

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1355.441</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1355.441</td>
<td>158.733</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8.863</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>8.539a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>6.919</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.459</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94.260</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.865b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>10.282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10282</td>
<td>11.890</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94.260</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.865b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. .815 MS(faculty) + .185 MS(Error)

*b. MS(Error)
Analysis of Experiment D Data

Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.444</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>25.100</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.097 - 4.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=1.00]</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>-0.613 - 0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[instrument=3.00]</td>
<td>0$^a$</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$: This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>.009$^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>610.060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>610.060</td>
<td>116.792</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15.659</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>637.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>15.719</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$: R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = -.029)
Appendix B

Sample Evaluation Report
## TRACE - Teacher Rating and Course Evaluation

Northeastern University

**Course:** CJU570 - CRIM VIOL

**Instructor:** JAMES FOX

**Department:** CJ

**Resp. Revd / Expected:** 31 / 41

### Course Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[SA] [A] [U] [D] [BD] Med. Mode S.D. N Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 The syllabus helped me to learn.</td>
<td>2 20 6 2 1 4 4 .82 31 3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 The textbook(s) helped me to learn.</td>
<td>15 16 0 0 0 4 4 .50 31 4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 The materials posted online, including Blackboard, helped me to learn.</td>
<td>6 21 3 1 0 4 4 .65 31 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 The out-of-class assignments and fieldwork helped me to learn.</td>
<td>11 18 1 1 0 4 4 .67 31 4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 The lectures helped me to learn.</td>
<td>24 5 1 1 0 5 5 .69 31 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 The in-class discussions and activities helped me to learn.</td>
<td>19 9 3 0 0 5 5 .67 31 4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 The classroom technology helped me to learn.</td>
<td>7 16 0 0 0 4 4 .69 31 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 I found this course intellectually challenging.</td>
<td>9 18 2 2 0 4 4 .76 31 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Instructor Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[SA] [A] [U] [D] [BD] Med. Mode S.D. N Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 The instructor possessed the basic communications skills necessary to teach the course.</td>
<td>21 10 0 0 0 5 5 .47 31 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 The instructor clearly communicated ideas and information.</td>
<td>20 11 0 0 0 5 5 .48 31 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 The instructor clearly stated the objectives of the course.</td>
<td>21 9 1 0 0 5 5 .64 31 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 The instructor covered what was stated in the course objectives and syllabus.</td>
<td>17 12 2 0 0 5 5 .62 31 4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 The instructor came to class prepared to teach.</td>
<td>21 9 0 0 0 5 5 .79 31 4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 The instructor used class time effectively.</td>
<td>17 11 0 0 0 5 5 .49 28 4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 The instructor provided sufficient feedback.</td>
<td>12 14 1 0 0 4 4 .78 31 4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 The instructor fairly evaluated my performance.</td>
<td>12 12 5 2 0 4 4 .69 31 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor is a teacher I would recommend to others

https://www.ams-host2.com/etw/ets/et.asp

12/24/2007
Q21 students.


FOX, JAMES

Instructor Questions Responses Individual

Q22 What is your overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness?


FOX, JAMES

Instructor Questions Responses Individual

Q23 The instructor treated students with respect.

 Q24 The instructor acknowledged and took effective action when students did not understand the material.

 Q25 The instructor was available to assist students outside of class.

 Q26 The instructor displayed enthusiasm for the course.


Question: The strongest features of this course were:

Response Rate: 90.32% (28 of 31)

1 Classroom Lectures
2 Professor's immense first-hand knowledge of material
3 Interesting course material. Professor Fox is very knowledgeable and experienced in the field which makes the course more fun and informative.
4 Fox's experience in the field and his first hand knowledge is extremely apparent and makes the course that much more interesting.
5 the lectures.
6 The professors style of teaching and approach to the material.
7 Powerpoint slides were nptn. Online assignments were interesting.
8 lectures
9 The professors ability to engage the class and teach interesting topics.
10 Professor Fox is a brilliant teacher and his involvement in the field made the course not only exciting, but informative and extremely applicable to today's society's fascination and participation in violence. It greatly helped me understand what was going on to our warz from a different view.
11 James Fox Knowledge
12 Great subject, professor was knowledgeable and made lectures interesting.
13 The lectures were realy in depth and made me more aware of the present day criminal violence issues.
14 The lectures and the writing assignments.
15 EXTREMELY knowledgeable professor with a great personality

The teacher’s knowledge and experience with the material.

The teacher’s knowledge of the material and the way he taught it made all the difference.

Detailed lectures as well as Professor Fox’s expertise in the subject of Criminal Violence.

The interesting material.

The professor’s capability to engage the students in the classroom, and his knowledge and experience in the field.

The course materials were well chosen. I was impressed by the instructors’ knowledge of the subject through combined academic, professional, and personal experiences. His teaching strategies that involved the entire class in discussions, provoked thought and curiosity. He questioned the class, was open to questions, and answered them with enthusiasm and guidance. The Prof. and the TA were interested in teaching and cared that students learned the course material and any additional input they saw put to good use. This was probably the only course I took this semester that I felt I learned anything in. I always looked forward to attending and felt rejuvenated and full of new questions and possibilities when I got out of class.

In short, I thoroughly enjoyed it. I can only hope all of my teachers and TA’s next semester will be so interesting, educating, and passionate about their work and teaching.

Reading the book.

One of the first lectures I have enjoyed attending.

The class discussions.

Teacher very helpful and responsive to email.

I liked the clarity that using blackboard had and the availability of being able to do assignments online anytime throughout the day at your own home and convenience.

Some of the topics discussed were quite interesting so it was hard not to pay attention although at times it was quite distracting.

In class notes and in class movies.

Question: The best way to increase learning in this course would be to:

Response Rate: 77.42% (24 of 31)

1. N/A
2. Make powerpoint slides available on blackboard.
3. not have to read novels.
4. Have more writing assignments.
5. go to class
6. Possible have it be a two part course so it can focus more in depth on the topics covered
7. Possibly post the slideshows on Blackboard. I missed a few notes and having them available would greatly help.
8. Could have more discussion
9. Make class size smaller to accommodate discussions better.
10. To make sure we cover all the material in class that will be on the test, because when reading the material at times things can be overlooked, not knowing it was important enough to know it would be on the test.
11. none
12. Attend all classes
13. More quizzes and/or assignments to provoke studying of the material.
14. Nothing that I can think of.
15. Course need not be changed.
16. I think it is good the way it is.

24 Our professor has much experience in the area that this course covers. We were given the pleasure of hearing many first hand stories.

Faculty: FOX, JAMES

Question: Please describe areas in which this instructor could improve as a teacher.

Response Rate: 67.74% (21 of 31)

1 Don't let stupid questions from students take up too much class time
2 Keep lectures more organized by sticking to the order of the powerpoints.
3 Not applicable.
4 ease up on the grammar issue
5 Instructor could possibly make himself more available to students.
6 Avoid going off on tangents more, ignoring people who ask stupid questions.
7 n/a
   Be ready for class when he comes, everyday he spent at least five to ten minutes trying to get his computer to work, it was as if every day was the first day. If the class was smaller discussion would be great, but as it stands I think he did the best he could.
8 N/A
10 Just making sure to cover all the material in the class that will be on the test, especially if they are open ended questions.
12 None
13 None.
14 no suggestions
15 he interacts with the class, but even more open discussion would be great
16 No areas...the test are hard for a reason to make sure you know all concepts.
17 Better description or outlines for the tests, midterms, and final.
18 Everyone could improve, but Fox's class stands out so far from the rest in Criminal Justice that it would be nitpicky.
19 N/A
20 Don't have any.
21 There weren't enough grades so if a person didn't do well on the midterm then chances of doing well overall was less likely. I believe the midterm was difficult. I expected more important stuff to be on the midterm.

Faculty: FOX, JAMES

Question: Please offer additional comments on the relationship of the instructor and the students.

Response Rate: 35.48% (11 of 31)

1 Excellent TA
2 Very respectful to students are age. Very understanding to college kids thoughts.
3 great teach and great class.
4 Helpful in explaining confusing topics and encouraged discussions.
5 Always available and helpful. Very friendly.
6 He was really into class participation and what the class thought about matters in the course.
7 he was funny and knew an extensive amount on the subject of criminal violence

8 none

He was the only accommodating teacher when my two month old son was home with a lower respiratory infection and when I was in the hospital for meningitis for a week and missed my midterm. He didn't patronize me about missing class or turning an assignment in late as long as I knew the information and was working on the assignment. He wasn't on a power trip like some of my professors. He treated me like an adult. Like he knew I wouldn't miss class if I didn't have to and I was there to learn, not to mess around.

9 Prof. Fox was professional and down to earth. The hall outside of class was rang with conversations about Fox and the course material, and I don't think I ever heard anyone disappointed in the class, teacher, or TA. This was a good class and I have suggested it to many in the psychology and criminal justice majors.

10 I think he did a very good job. His strategy for teaching was very effective.

11 There were questions on the midterm that a lot of students didn't agree with the answer I believe issues like those should be looked into more.
2007-2008 Final Report of the Faculty Senate Committee for
NU Core Implementation April, 2008

Professor Thomas C. Sheahan, Chair (COE)
Executive Vice Provost Susan Powers-Lee,
ex officio Associate Dean Peggy L. Fletcher (CBA)
Associate Dean Richard Rasala (CCIS)
Associate Dean William J. (Jay) Gillespie (BCHS)
Professor Malcolm D. Hill, SAC Liaison (CAS)
Professor Stephen Kane (COE)
Professor Kathleen Kelly (CAS)
Professor Simon Singer (CCJ)
Nina LeDoyt, Office of the Registrar
Erin Pritchard, SGA representative

The NU Core Implementation Committee (previously known as the General Education Implementation Committee) met nine times from October 2, 2007 until April 10, 2008. There were three components of the charge to the committee, synopsized as follows:

1. Develop an implementation plan for writing workshops to train those instructors teaching each department’s writing-intensive (WI) courses.
2. Make a recommendation regarding the administration of the NU Core, in particular, recommend an administrative structure for issues such as approval of new courses and experiential learning modules.
3. Develop a recommendation for ongoing or periodic assessment of the NU Core that also satisfies NEASC guidelines.

An interim report was submitted to the Senate Agenda Committee (SAC) in December, 2007 to document progress to date, and to request that SAC work with the administration to address point 2 of the charge. The following sections provide the committee’s final conclusions and recommendations regarding the three charges to this committee. Charge 1: Writing Workshops for Writing Intensive (WI) Course Instructors Regarding the writing workshops, this was originally discussed at the 10/30/07 committee meeting and the committee continued to address this issue for the rest of its committee meetings. This was centered on how best to implement training for WI course instructors, and then how to sustain the courses in terms of uniform standards, resources for instructors, assessment, etc.

A survey was distributed to the unit heads by the Provost’s office (Executive Vice Provost Powers-Lee’s e-mail on Nov. 4, 2007) to verify WI course offerings and to ask about the level of training desired in the units. The results of this survey indicated only limited interest in workshops in Spring 2008, and the survey showed only slightly higher levels of interest for workshops that would be offered in Fall 2008. Later discussion indicated that this low level of interest may have reflected a lack of understanding about which courses are WI, and how the Core would impact individual instructors. While the committee believes that units would like to have resources available that they could use/access for training WI instructors at the unit level, the WI component of the Core still needs some level of standardization and University-wide assessment mechanism. In addition, there should be a coordinating department such as English that will be provided with additional resources to carry out this new mandate. While there was a definition of the WI component of the Core provided in the 2006-2007 General Education
Committee report to SAC, additional details need to be provided to help units and instructors understand the ideal model for delivering these courses. One model is provided in Appendix A, Guidelines for Writing-Intensive Courses, developed by the current committee. Committee members held differing opinions and perspectives on the level of resources necessary to implement the WI component of the Core, as well as on how specific this report should be with respect to resources (see Appendix B). While some of the work of overseeing the Writing Intensive courses may be routine, it was proposed that oversight also involves an intellectual commitment that can only be provided by faculty. Furthermore, resources for support of Writing Intensive courses by the units and faculty should be examined and provided as needed. Examples of such support could include establishing and implementing an assessment plan, developing and maintaining a resource WI web site, and offering workshops and other forms of faculty development. A focus group sponsored by this committee was held on March 27, 2008. Appendix C provides a list of attendees and observations/concerns of those present at the focus group.

The committee generally agreed that the administration should report to the Faculty Senate in Fall 2008 on the specific level of additional resource support to be provided to support the WI program.\(^2\)

Prior to these resources being allocated for WI courses, serious consideration should be given to developing a comprehensive resource website to publicize and support the Core, including WI. This should include sections for students and faculty to help them understand the various components of the Core. The site would also serve to market the Core as an essential, common curricular unit at Northeastern. The following resolutions are proposed:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost and Deans report to the Faculty Senate regarding funding and other resources that will be provided for effectively implementing Writing Intensive courses into the curriculum.

BE IT RESOLVED that a comprehensive website be developed and maintained to publicize and support the NU Core, including the Writing Intensive initiative. The website should include sections that explain the logic for our approach to a Core Curriculum, as well as operational sections that permit students and faculty to easily visualize the possible pathways that will enable students to satisfy the various components of the Core requirements. The site would also serve to market the Core as an essential, common curricular unit at Northeastern. The committee recommends approval of these resolutions.

Charge 2: Administration of the NU Core Throughout the year, the committee remained steadfast that an ad hoc committee such as this one should not be responsible for administering the Core. There are a number of issues being brought up by the units that need to be addressed by a University-wide committee and/or resource person. There were also concerns raised that the Registrar's website does not provide sufficient information for units to find answers to questions about the NU Core. Academic advisors are asking who they go to for authoritative answers about academic advising, timetabling, and other services. It requires an investment of faculty time and energy to establish the proposed learning communities, additional intermediate level courses, and capstone courses. A greater emphasis on writing argues for smaller classes in the courses where the intensive writing will be expected. This will mean more faculty, as well as additional thought and possibly training, or collaboration between English and other departments. The University should not impress this burden upon the faculty as an unfunded mandate. In addition to faculty salaries there are also likely to be additional costs. This will be neither easy nor cheap.

\(^2\) From General Education at Northeastern University: Final Report and Recommendations (3 April 2006): “It requires an investment of faculty time and energy to establish the proposed learning communities, additional intermediate level courses, and capstone courses. A greater emphasis on writing argues for smaller classes in the courses where the intensive writing will be expected. This will mean more faculty, as well as additional thought and possibly training, or collaboration between English and other departments. The University should not impress this burden upon the faculty as an unfunded mandate. In addition to faculty salaries there are also likely to be additional costs. This will be neither easy nor cheap.”
the NU Core, and there is currently no administrator or committee that is identifiable. At the
Mar. 13, 2008 meeting of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC), it was
agreed that that body would assume governance of the NU Core, upon the proposal of a
resolution by this committee and approval by SAC and the Faculty Senate. The following
resolution is proposed:

BE IT RESOLVED that the UUCC be given the responsibility for oversight of the NU Core,
including decisions regarding courses and forms of experience-based learning that may be
proposed to satisfy Core objectives; as well as periodically reviewing the various components of
the NU Core in order to ensure that the principles embodied in the NU Core and its specific skills
and competencies are carried out for all undergraduate students at Northeastern University. As
part of this process the UUCC will notify all curricular units in the University of changes it has
approved. The committee recommends approval of this resolution.

Charge 3: Assessment of the NU Core Prof. Sheahan, in conjunction with Executive Vice
Provost Powers-Lee, Dr. Kay Onan (Special Assistant to the President) and Nancy Ludwig
(University Planning and Research) developed a survey instrument to be distributed to all
faculty that will determine the depth and breadth of assessment currently being done at
Northeastern. The results of this survey were not available at the time of this report
submission. Appendix D provides the assessment document that was originally drafted by the
General Education Committee in 2006-2007, has been revised to include proposed methods
of assessment for the outcomes under each component of the Core.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approve the Assessment Framework Document
for the NU Core, Drafted October 2006 and Revised March 2008, as the framework within
which ongoing assessment of the NU Core will be undertaken.
The committee recommends approval of this resolution.
Appendix A. Model Guidelines for Writing-Intensive Courses The WI Requirement

The WI requirement is predicated on the purposes of writing in education: writing to learn, and writing to demonstrate or showcase learning. Among other things, the concept of writing to learn means that writing actually helps the student work through an intellectual problem. That is, writing contributes in myriad ways to learning itself: it affects how students remember concepts as well as how they understand, analyze, and synthesize problems and solutions. Writing to demonstrate learning, on the other hand, focuses on students’ final written product for assessment of mastery and related concerns. One of the key findings of the write-to-learn movement and later associated movements (such as Writing across the Curriculum and Writing in the Disciplines) is that students learn through writing only when they are given opportunities to revise. WI courses should, therefore, enable students to receive guidance in the drafting process (from peers, instructors, or both) before they hand in a finished product to be graded. For effective WI courses to be established throughout the university, the WI requirement needs to be unified by common principles which are flexible enough to accommodate writing in a variety of settings and circumstances. A suggested set of principles follows.

1. WI courses are discipline-specific content courses. WI courses are taught within each academic unit and focus on explicit disciplinary content. The writing must enhance the student’s learning of the course material. The motto is “Writing to Learn” rather than “Learning to Write.”

2. Students in a WI course should write frequently and regularly throughout the course. Much writing in a WI course may be “low stakes” writing including journals, blogs, responses to assigned readings, discussions of assigned problems, summaries, outlines, drafts of formal papers, peer reviews, and reflections on earlier work.

3. Students in a WI course should be given opportunities to assess, revise, and improve their writing. Some writing in a WI course should be “high stakes”; that is, some writing should be revised at least once prior to grading. Each student assesses her or his own drafts, and, in addition, receives feedback from peers and/or the faculty and teaching assistants. If possible and appropriate, electronic means should be used to simplify the distribution and feedback process.

4. WI course resources. Ideally, WI courses should be limited to 25 students. If this is not possible, then WI courses should be configured so that there is a ratio of 1 to 25 – for example, one professor to 25 students, or one professor plus one TA to 50 students (or one professor plus 2 TAs to 75 students, or, in departments/units that do not have TAs or enough faculty lines, some other appropriate arrangement, such as the use of part-time faculty). The department/unit determines the best use of resources to deliver WI courses. Since the implementation of WI courses will differ across the disciplines of arts, humanities, social sciences, sciences, engineering, technology, business, health, and criminal justice, the comments below should be taken as considerations but not as mandates.
1. Student evaluation in a WI course. In some courses, the production of one or more formal papers may be the primary student activity, and in that case, the writing should be an important component of the final grade. In other courses, the primary work of the students may be to create projects, engage in case studies, solve problem sets, analyze data, perform experiments, or prove theorems. In such courses, the writing should factor into the final grade in proportion to its place in the totality of the student work required.

2. Professional writing in the discipline. If the professional literature in a discipline is accessible to undergraduate students, then students in a WI course should become familiar with such literature. If the professional literature is too advanced for undergraduates, then students in a WI course should be given samples of the type of documents required in the course. The faculty should ensure that these samples are examples of both high-quality writing and good professional practice.

3. Writing and other forms of communication. When appropriate, a WI course should relate writing to other forms of communication such as oral communication; visual images and video; sound and music; slides, software for data acquisition, analysis, and presentation; animation; and simulation.
Appendix B. Models for Support of Faculty Teaching Writing-Intensive Courses

Workshops Initial (volunteer) workshops are necessarily introductory, and should include showcasing materials on the WI web site. Topics to be introduced:

1. Creating low and high-stakes writing assignments;
2. Using peer review (in the classroom, on BB, blogs, etc.);
3. Offering feedback for revision;
4. Responding to and grading papers/projects/documents, including developing grading rubrics.

Ideally, more detailed workshops could be offered (with volunteer participation) on each of the above topics. Moreover, research shows that the most productive kind of faculty development workshop involves reading student writing and discussing what is valued in academic writing as it is constructed within and across disciplines. Additional (volunteer) workshops could be dedicated to reading student work. In addition to workshops, there are other forms of support for faculty: one-on-one meetings with the Director/WI, “brown bags” for interested faculty, “teaching circles,” and in-class “visiting tutor” assignments (Writing Center tutors, or other experienced writing instructors can assist faculty running in-class workshops for students). Oversight of Writing Intensive Courses Entails:

• developing and implementing an assessment framework with measurable outcomes;
• providing pedagogical support for all faculty teaching WI courses;
• insuring that the standards for WI courses are being met;
• developing a community of faculty knowledgeable about and invested in teaching writing;
• serving as liaison to the Writing Programs Committee housed in the Department of English;
• insuring that course caps for WI courses are maintained;
• overseeing the WI resource web site;
• overseeing ongoing, internal funding; and,
• exploring options for external funding.
Appendix C. Notes on the Focus Group: NU Core Writing Intensive Requirement

(documented by Prof. David Kellogg) Attendees:
Mal Hill, Earth and Environmental Sciences. Earth materials class (300-level) using primary literature.

Brigit Smyser, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering. Intro to Materials Science with 96 students and above. Students write lab reports and memoranda. Grade is divided between writing (primary instructor) and course content (graded by TAs).

Neil Alper, Economics. Teaches capstone course as WI course. Writing includes seminar paper and presentation. 29 students in class.

Richard Rasala, College of Computer and Information Science. Teaches software development, information system design and development. TAs are not appropriate for assessing writing in this discipline as many are not native English speakers.

Kathleen Kelly, English. Director of Writing Program.

David Kellogg, English. Director of AWD.

Ronald Hedlund, Political Science. 2nd-year course with approximately 40 students, research, 3-4 papers.

David Schmitt, Political Science. Teaches capstone course (55 students) as writing intensive. Students reflect back on moments in their political science major, including the job search, experiential education requirement. They also write book reports and a research paper.

Nancy Kindelan, Theatre. Much student writing is reflective and interpretive, sometimes personal.

Major concerns:
- Class size, student/teacher ratio. Responding to writing takes a long time and is much harder to do effectively in a larger class.
- When WI courses are taught (before or after AWD). Relation of AWD goals to goals of course.
- Amount of writing and/or revision of writing in course.
- Who teaches course (tenure-track faculty, lecturers, TAs). Because TAs in some disciplines are predominantly ESOL, TAs may lack the English skills needed to teach (or grade) WI courses.
- Relation between writing and disciplinary course content. Are we teaching writing per se or the ways of asking questions and framing research in a discipline?
- Time spend grading in WI courses, especially with a large class size.
- The question of peer review. As a mechanism to relieve teachers of the extra burden in a WI course it seems promising. However, undergraduates may lack the disciplinary expertise to evaluate academic writing in a field they’re still entering.
Needs/Suggestions

Pedagogical workshops for WI teachers generally (on issues of peer review, evaluation)
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Workshops for smaller clusters of WI teachers (such as, for example, the sciences).
Support for smaller class sizes.
Incentives for teaching WI.
Appendix D. Assessment Framework Document for the NU Core Drafted October, 2006 Revised March, 2008 Mission Statement for the General Education (NU Core) Requirement

The purpose of Northeastern University’s institution-wide General Education (NU Core) requirement is to provide to our students a balanced and integrated structure that consistently builds scientific thought, mathematical thinking, quantitative reasoning, logical thinking, critical analysis, humanistic reflection, information literacy, communication skills, and creative habits of mind and practice, promotes practical applications, and encourages ethical awareness.

Learning Objective 1: Learning Communities
Learning Objective 2: Breadth and Depth of Knowledge
Learning Objective 3: Intensive Writing and Other Communications Skills
Learning Objective 4: Mathematical Thinking
Learning Objective 5: Comparative Study of Cultures
Learning Objective 6: Integrated Experiential Learning
Learning Objective 7: Senior Capstone

Learning Objective 1: Learning Communities

First-year students with similar interests will become acquainted with each other and with faculty in a structured environment. Students will be exposed to models of integration through faculty-guided experience that will draw some concepts from courses concurrently taken to bear on a problem or situation that is usefully informed by both areas of knowledge. Mechanism for Achieving the Objective: First-year learning communities will be established that consist of two or more courses in the same semester in which students are cohort-registered. The courses to be linked should be determined with this cohort registration requirement in mind. Further, the requirement of cohort registration is often met through required first-year coursework of a unit.

In some Learning Communities attention is paid formally in one or more courses to integrating the learning in the courses. A first-year English course is often helpful as a component of a learning community, but is not required to serve this function. Thematic Learning Communities (constructed around a broad theme, such as “Health”, “Environment”, etc.) will also be offered to students who have first-year open electives, but they can also include the required first-year courses in a student’s major.

Learning Outcomes Required for Courses to achieve this Objective

1. Students will demonstrate an ability to integrate learning from the two courses taken concurrently to fulfill this requirement.

2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the value of the community that they are participating in, and how that community will contribute to their learning and developmental experiences at Northeastern.
Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1. One or more assignments that clearly demonstrate the link between cohort enrollment in two or more classes, in which one or more assignments in one class relies on or is closely connected to material from the other.

2. Reflective assignments in which students present evidence that they have been exposed to principles or other means of identity for their learning community.

Learning Objective 2: Breadth and Depth of Knowledge

Students will be exposed to a broad, general education base, becoming acquainted with the methods of reasoning and inquiry across a variety of disciplines. In addition, students will acquire depth of knowledge in one area outside the major. Mechanism for Achieving the Objective: Students will take four courses in the following broad knowledge domains: Arts/Humanities, Social Science and Science/Technology, as follows:

- Three courses that are introductory-level, including one course that satisfies the student’s introductory major requirement. For example, Engineering majors would in all cases satisfy the Science/Technology Domain by their required introductory physics or chemistry courses. All Criminal Justice majors would meet the Social Science domain through their required psychology or sociology courses.
- One Intermediate- or Advanced-level course will be taken outside the major. Students might satisfy this requirement by completing: a mid-level course in the same area as one of their introductory-level courses; or, a minor or a dual, double, interdisciplinary, or independent major.

Learning Outcomes Required for Courses to achieve this Objective

1. For each of the three introductory courses, students will demonstrate an understanding of basic elements of a particular discipline or knowledge domain, that are considered essential for further study in that area.

2. For the Intermediate- or Advanced-level course, students will demonstrate that success in the course builds upon and/or applies learning from the introductory course in that discipline or knowledge domain. They will demonstrate knowledge of methods of thinking, the ability to identify issues or problems, and analyze and/or solve problems in that discipline or knowledge domain.
Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1. For the breadth requirement, documented exam, assignment or portfolio evaluation in which student performance in that course is compared with the course’s learning outcomes.

2. For the depth requirement, evidence in the learning outcomes for the Intermediate- or Advanced-level course that one more outcomes is dependent upon the introductory course in that discipline or knowledge domain. Further, direct evidence should be presented that students are able to identify issues/problems and then use the methods of thinking in that discipline to analyze and/or solve those problems.

Learning Objective 3: Intensive Writing and Other Communications Skills

Students will develop their critical thinking, writing skills, and other communications skills through coursework that progresses from an introduction to academic writing in the first year to discipline-based writing and other writing and communications experiences in the major.

Mechanism for Achieving the Objective: Students will take a sequence of four Writing Intensive Courses, as follows:

- A first-year writing course through the English Department.
- A course as part of a mid-curriculum cluster (Advanced Writing in the Disciplines [AWD] or approved equivalent).
- A course in the major that is writing intensive.
- The Capstone or comparable upper-level course that includes a writing-intensive component.

In order for courses to qualify as writing intensive courses in the major, emphasis must be placed on the writing process (multiple drafts, etc.) as well as on the content of writing.

Learning Outcomes Required for Courses to achieve this Objective

1. Students will demonstrate the ability to write well-reasoned, grammatically and stylistically correct papers.
2. Students will demonstrate in their written work the ability to critically analyze information and present the results of this analysis, including the use of discipline-specific graphics and/or information delivery.
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to use writing to create a clear and compelling (or persuasive) case to prove (or persuade).
4. Students will demonstrate continuous writing improvement both within a course and through the progression of the curriculum.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1. Through a writing portfolio, writing improvement in one or more writing assignments will be assessed by showing multiple drafts of that assignment.
2. Through a writing portfolio, writing improvement over the course of the student’s curriculum, for the first-year writing course through the capstone.
3. One or more assignments will include some form of graphical or other information delivery that complements the written work.
4. Learning outcomes for these courses will include one or more related to achieving this objective.

Learning Objective 4: Mathematical Thinking

Students will acquire a proficiency in mathematical thinking and basic problem solving skills. Mechanism for Achieving the Objective

All students at Northeastern must complete a college-level course in mathematical thinking and its application to posing and solving problems; typically students will fulfill this requirement during their first year at Northeastern. This requirement may be fulfilled by successfully completing either a calculus course or another approved course that emphasizes mathematical reasoning and problem solving.

At the intermediate level students must successfully complete a course that teaches either:
- Research methods in their discipline;
- Statistics in a manner appropriate to their degree program;
- More advanced mathematical thinking; or
- General principles of information and computation together with design, modeling, and problem-solving skills and technical skills in the use of computer software.

It is anticipated that some students will successfully complete these intermediate-level courses within their discipline. Learning Outcomes Required for Courses to achieve this Objective

1. For the first requirement, students will demonstrate the ability to pose and solve problems in one area of mathematics.
2. For the second requirement, students will demonstrate a proficiency in the use of analytical thinking to abstract information, quantify, model and/or problem-solve in an application area related to their major or in an intermediate or advanced mathematics course.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1. For the first requirement, documented exam or assignment evaluation in which student performance in that course is compared with the course’s learning outcomes.
2. For the intermediate requirement, one of the following:
   - Documented exam or assignment evaluation in a course in the major in which the learning outcomes include use of mathematical or statistical methods for data analysis and/or problem solving
   - For Intermediate- or Advanced-level mathematics or statistics courses, documented exam or assignment evaluation in which student performance in that course is compared with the course’s learning outcomes
- Documented exam, computer programming or other analytical modeling work that includes the use of computer software in courses for which the learning outcomes include such proficiency.

Learning Objective 5: Comparative Study of Cultures

Students will gain an appreciation for human differences and their consequences in the students’ present and future, with the goal of preparing students for responsible citizenship in an increasingly pluralistic and diverse world. Mechanism for Achieving the Objective The existing university-level Diversity Requirement would be continued. Specifically, students must complete successfully one course that will provide background knowledge, foster new perceptions, promote understanding and respect, and encourage constructive sensitivity to cultural pluralism as it relates to race, social class, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, and disability. An alternative to formal coursework is the completion of approved service-learning opportunities in local community centers or semester-long tutoring activities in local schools; Study Abroad with diversity-focused reflection component; etc. All of these alternatives to formal coursework would include a reflective component structured by faculty. Learning Outcomes Required for Courses to achieve this Objective

1. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the concept of diversity, a recognition of challenges to existing cultural definitions, and an appreciation for the role of diversity as it applies to students’ lives.

And one or more of the following:

2. Students will demonstrate a recognition of the contributions of other cultures, or minority groups within a culture, to the culture itself, or to the growth of human knowledge.
3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the issues, social structure, or cultural diversity represented in a non-western or non-dominant American culture.
4. Students will demonstrate an understanding of issues, social structure, or cultural diversity represented in a group that faces unique challenges in relating to a dominant culture as a whole.
5. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the social structures and dynamics in the United States that pose serious problems for minorities or other groups facing social or cultural challenges.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1. Documented exam, assignment or portfolio evaluation in which student performance in that course is compared with the course’s learning outcomes that include comparative study of cultures.
Learning Objective 6: Integrated Experiential Learning

Students will acquire skills and perspectives from experiences beyond the classroom by participating in an activity that is not focused on NU coursework. Mechanism for Achieving the Objective

Students will participate in either one short-term intensive activity or a longer-term, less intensive activity, as follows:

- Cooperative education.
- Undergraduate research.
- International experience.
- Student teaching.
- Service learning courses, or other approved volunteer or community service projects.
- Significant leadership role in student organizations.
- Clinical placements in the major.
- Participation in a defined number of department-focused student productions, performances or exhibitions.
- Approved courses that include significant experiential activity.

During their Senior Capstone, other courses and/or activities, all students should be prepared to reflect on the synthesis of their Experiential Learning with learning from those courses/activities.

Learning Outcomes Required for Courses/Experiences to achieve this Objective

1. Students will participate in an experiential learning component that is directly related to their major coursework.
2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between structured experiences outside the formal classroom environment and classroom learning acquired in related courses.
3. Students will demonstrate an ability to reflect on the relevance of their experiential learning component through either written reports or oral presentations.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1. Evaluation of reflective written assignments or oral presentations in which the student describes the application of knowledge, skills and/or competencies acquired in coursework to their experiential learning activity.
2. Documented exam, assignment or portfolio evaluation in which student performance in a course can be directly tied to knowledge, skills and/or competencies acquired during the experiential learning activity, as compared to the learning outcomes for that course that include such a connection.

Learning Objective 7: Senior Capstone
Students will demonstrate that they can integrate learning from coursework in the major, the General Education required coursework, and experiential learning experiences, and then synthesize this acquired knowledge to address a complex problem or produce other major work as the culminating experience of their undergraduate education.

Mechanism for Achieving the Objective

All students will complete one senior-level Capstone course within or related to their major[s] with an important focus on integrating the learning from different areas of their program[s]. Normally some written project would be one of the products of this Capstone, but other measurable outcomes (e.g., significant artistic or dramatic work) are also possible. Learning Outcomes Required for a Course to achieve this Objective

1. Students will demonstrate an ability to integrate learning from among coursework in the major, General Education requirement coursework, and experiential learning experiences.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to produce a significant, culminating work in their major, including designs, artistic and dramatic works, and reports on comprehensive research or other projects. These capstone products should reflect typical work done by those working in the student’s major field of study.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes Documented portfolio evaluation of a significant work in their major, ideally including a writing-intensive component that complements other work related to the discipline (for some disciplines, the writing-intensive component may be replaced by a significant artistic or dramatic work). This evaluation will include consideration of progressive mastery in the discipline from introductory and intermediate-level coursework, as well as the degree to which the student has integrated coursework in the major, General Education requirement coursework, and experiential learning experiences. These requirements will be documented in the learning outcomes for the capstone course.
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1
1 Introduction.

The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) was charged by the Senate Agenda Committee to review the state of merit raise procedures across the University. The detailed charge is contained in Appendix A of this report.

The FDC attempted to determine what the actual practice was at North-eastern by requesting replies from two sets of questionnaires. The first was directed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty and was an attempt to determine faculty attitudes toward the existing process, and seek suggestions for improvements. This on-line survey promised anonymity and was deliberately kept brief in the hope that these characteristics would encourage the largest number of responses. All questions allowed an open-ended answer. Questions 2–5 also allowed a Yes/No answer. In the end, 229 faculty responded. This questionnaire is discussed in Section 2 and is reproduced in Appendix B.

A second, longer questionnaire was sent to unit heads (department chairs and deans of single unit colleges) asking about the procedures used in their units and perceptions of adequacy. This 21-item questionnaire contained a mix of closed- and open-ended questions and solicited attachments of unit-based merit and workload procedures. Unfortunately, only 15 responses were received, despite several written and verbal reminders. This questionnaire is discussed in Section 3 and reproduced in Appendix C.

In addition, several deans were interviewed and we examined the merit raise data for the last two years.

In brief, a diverse array of procedures is in use across the University. Feelings about the process are also diverse. While there are good reasons for this diversity and sound arguments for local control, we believe that certain principles and practices should be common to all units. These are presented in Section 4 in a form that should easily lead to motions for consideration by the Senate.

Finally, Section 5 contains observations about the nature of the merit review process. We felt that these observations should not be cast as legislation, but rather be offered in the hope that they may prove constructive.
2 On the General Faculty Survey

2.1 Overview

To judge from the survey, the glass is more than half full. On most questions, more than 60% of responses were positive. However, a significant number of faculty felt that the current process is flawed. Those who were dissatisfied were not evenly distributed across units. Some units harbor a disproportionate number of faculty who feel strongly that something is broken, although they do not always agree as to where the problem lies.

A first sense of the overall response to the survey may be obtained by glancing at the percentages of Yes answers to questions 2–5. These figures are based on the total number of non-blank responses\(^1\) and were as follows:

2. Are the merit procedures in your unit clear to you? Yes 67%

3. Are the merit procedures in your unit fair as they relate to:
   (a) evaluating and rewarding meritorious teaching? Yes 61%
   (b) evaluating and rewarding meritorious research? Yes 62%
   (c) evaluating and rewarding meritorious service? Yes 65%

4. Is the overall process by which evaluations of teaching, research and service translate into merit raises fair? Yes 56%

5. Does the feedback from the merit review provide you with useful information for your ongoing development as a faculty member? Yes 48%

When we turn to the comments, we find a general concern about process across all sections of the questionnaire and all units. In some cases the concern is that too much time is wasted for little effect. Along with this we sometimes read of a willingness to leave the judgement up to the Chair or Dean. In some cases this seems to work well, and in other cases it does not. In the latter instance, a lack of transparency is often mentioned as a problem. One quote that echoes several others is, "Merit raises and the process take an

\(^1\)Typically (4 ± .3)% of the responses were left blank except for 7% on service.
enormous amount of time, a true evaluation is not usually done, deans/chairs sometimes play favorites, and no one seems particularly happy overall.”

Other general concerns are that the process is onerous, demeaning, divisive, and ineffective in promoting excellence.

There is a frequently expressed dissatisfaction regarding the definition and evaluation of excellence. This is often independent of process. However, it may sometimes reflect different, possibly competing, interests within a unit: teachers vs researchers; teachers of large introductory sections vs teachers of small high-level sections; team research vs solo research; vanguard vs rear-guard; etc.

2.2 Evaluation of Teaching

The most persistent and consistent theme is dissatisfaction with TCEP as a method for evaluating teaching. While we may hope that replacing TCEP with TRACE will be an improvement, the concern here goes deeper. Our colleagues are rightly concerned about teaching outcomes. There is a concern with formative as well as summative evaluation. Some would like to see a richer set of tools for evaluating teaching (peer visits, teaching portfolios, scrutiny of course material, video-taping teachers, etc.)

Some feel that teaching takes a back seat to research, with little concrete evidence, apart from rhetoric, that the University has the same commitment to teaching excellence that it has lately shown for research excellence. On the other hand, some feel that research is not sufficiently valued.

2.3 Evaluation of Research.

About 62% of the faculty who completed the survey considered that research was fairly assessed in the merit raise process. This measure varies from 53% to 88% in different colleges. The 38% of faculty who disagree expressed concerns in six areas.

1. Research is not weighted enough in merit raises.

2. It is unclear what is considered scholarship and how it is measured. Should scholarship be measured by grants, publications or something else?
3. Should research productivity be measured in terms of both quality and quantity?

4. Appropriate rates of output and metrics of research quality vary greatly across disciplines and even within disciplines. They may also vary in time. The evaluation process should periodically adapt to the changes in the research field.

5. Measurements on research are not transparent, and are often less clear than those set out for teaching performance. “Expectations in this regard are not clear.”

6. Research performance may not be fairly assessed in the evaluation process. For example, “Many of the faculty on the merit review committee are not tenure-track eligible and they do not have a clue how to assess this area of work.”

Research is the most contentious and generally divisive issue confronted in the merit raises process. It is also the most heterogeneous. It seems unavoidable that each unit must find and establish its own criteria, but this should be undertaken by a good-faith discussion among the faculty of the unit, and care must be exercised in the transparent and judicious application of the unit’s criteria.

2.4 Evaluation of Service

About 65% of the faculty who completed the survey felt that service was somewhat appropriately measured, and given appropriate weights. The 35% who did not agree that service was appropriately rated had a multitude of concerns. Primary among them was that the definition of service is quite unclear and arbitrary when evaluated, if, indeed, it matters at all. Often, only numbers of committee assignments are counted with no thought to contribution. In addition, there seems to be disagreement among units about how service to the unit, and service to the College, and service to the University are counted.

We have broken down comments on service into five categories, as listed below, with a head-count for each category. Some answers were placed in
more than one category since the sentiment expressed by the faculty member cut across two different ideas.

1. There is no good way to assess service. Service is unclear. 19 replies.

2. Service really doesn't matter. It is not important compared to teaching and research. 6 replies.

3. Service doesn't matter and is rarely rewarded in any case. 11 replies.

4. There is real confusion about service in departments vs the College vs the University. 8 replies.

5. Service is measured appropriately and there are clear criteria. 6 replies.

There seems to be a need for each unit to clarify what it means by “service”. Do units count service at the unit level, the College level, and the University level? How will they go about measuring service? Will units merely count formal assignments to committees? Will there be some feedback mechanism established, where members of committees will evaluate the performance of others on these committees?

2.5 Feedback

The Survey asked, “Does the feedback from the merit review provide you with useful information for your ongoing development as a faculty member?” If we look at the percentages of faculty answering “Yes” to all our Survey questions we see that feedback alone comes in below 50%. Units are not equal in this regard; the range on feedback is from 40% to 75% “Yes” answers. Some faculty were particularly emphatic in their expressions of dissatisfaction.

From among the comments on this item we have identified various themes which are listed below, set in sans-serif. Following each theme, an example is given. Keep in mind that most of the comments were provided by individuals who answered “No.” Thus, most of the responses are from individuals who are dissatisfied with the feedback process.
Receives no feedback or feedback without specificity: “I have received no feedback ever related to the merit review process.”

Feedback is not incorporated into professional development: “While the assigning of numerical scores is quite rational and clear, their use as a basis for mentoring/feedback is not carried out.”

Administration constrains faculty development: “Development as a faculty member must take place in spite of trench-level management operations.”

Oral feedback is given: “The merit review is coupled with a discussion with the Chair, who is better positioned to offer advice on further development.”

Rating scale/ranking is not meaningful: “The scaling (I believe it was 1-10, with a mean around 5 and within a standard deviation) is nonsense.”

Written feedback is helpful: “Strengths and weaknesses are addressed in the written comments.”

Personal relationships interfere with objectivity: “The faculty member was never told that he/she was not producing at an acceptable rate because of the personal relationship involved.”

Importance of service is minimized: “The merit process emphasizes that service doesn’t count.”

Merit is based on inadequate data: “The input data is not good enough to provide such information.”

Separate feedback from merit review: “We do not have separate annual and merit reviews. I think this would be helpful.”

Criteria are inconsistent: “The criteria change each year.”

Feedback is not timely: “The feedback is too late.”

Process is unclear: “It is also not clear who in the chain of command makes the decisions.”

It is clear that an important positive step would be for units to examine this aspect of faculty evaluation with a view to promoting growth through useful feedback. (It is not very useful either to merely tell someone that they fell below the standard or that it is thought that they can do better. Faculty, like students, need to know the ways in which they fell below the standard and in which they can do better.)
2.6 What Can Be Done?

If printed in full, the list of suggestions for improvement would have doubled the length of this report. In an attempt to capture some of the wisdom in this collective faculty effort we will aggregate and summarize the most frequent comments, but we will also quote from some more isolated but interesting remarks.

In decreasing order of frequency, the following points were made:

- I am satisfied with the process as it stands.
- More feedback, with clearer (possibly written) communication on what I could do to improve would be welcome.
- The pool of money is too small, and not worth the effort. Separate the cost of living from merit.
- Don’t use TCEP to evaluate teaching. (Use peer evaluation, video tape.)
- We need clearer, fair rules. Greater consistency is needed.
- Several classes of faculty encounter special problems that are not well addressed by the current process: junior faculty, senior faculty, co-op faculty, interdisciplinary faculty, women, and minorities.
- Reward teaching meaningfully.
- Give more attention to research quality and variety.
- There were several comments on whether the unit head or a committee should dominate the process, with voices on both sides of the question, usually reflecting dissatisfaction with the writer’s current situation, and a suspicion that the current mechanism supported bias.
- There should be an appeals process.

When viewed by unit it is clear that some units have more problems than others. However, there can also be great differences of opinion within a unit, as the following pair of quotes from within the same unit show:
“Compared to what I know from (working for 14 years) at top-10 institutions, [my unit’s] process is currently first rate.”

“Eliminate it. There is no evidence that merit procedures help, and there is ample scientific evidence that they reduce productivity…”

Here, with respect, and in no particular order, are some other interesting comments that do not fit neatly under the bullets above. Many more might have been added.

“Comprehensive documentation and circulation of all units’ merit criteria, review processes, and award systems, could go a long way toward informing and contextualizing individual units’ merit systems. …”

“…publicizing ‘best practice’ models in a non-coercive fashion might be a useful exercise for departments to consider.”

“There is not much money to divide and we should do it as quickly and efficiently as possible. I would like to see us give a straight lump sum to all. I find that good and important people—our chair and exec committee—each year waste excessive time trying to be fair. I cringe to think that whoever is reading this is wasting still more time!”

“Ideally, it would be possible to verify that faculty who claim to spend time on research are, in fact, spending time on research. The same is true for faculty who claim to spend a lot of time on extra teaching activities…”

“The department should be obliged to provide a list of the top journals and the top presses in our field. That list should also include the two or 3 journals in the major subfields (not area studies). That list should be ‘justified’ based on publications from our professional association, …, and faculty who publish in such venues should be rewarded accordingly.”

“Include student learning as a measure of teaching effectiveness.”

“I think the procedures should be reviewed every three years to ensure that they capture the range of activities in which the faculty engages.”

“Perhaps obtain input from ethnic minority faculty across departments and disciplines. This will at least acknowledge that there might be a problem which the university needs to address.”

“The chairman needs to have some mentorship! … As a female faculty member, while I support, tremendously, more female faculty and female faculty in key administrative roles, I am HIGHLY concerned about ill-prepared female faculty in such roles. If such people do a bad job then it reflects poorly on the status of [women in my profession] in general and is not encouraging to female students and female faculty alike.” [These are sentiments
that representatives of any group, including white Anglo-Saxon males, might echo."

"Include criteria other than student evaluations in evaluating teaching. Evaluate quality of publications."

"Acknowledge that different faculty members have different strengths. It helps no one to demand that every faculty member excel in every aspect of their job, when in reality most faculty members have specialized skills."

"Foremost, seriously consider abolishing it. Despite it's well-intended objectives, any perceived benefits are outweighed by the negatives: disenfranchisement, distrust, faculty apathy, lack of collegial cooperation, self-prediction, superficial service, and so on..."

3 On the Administrator Survey

In addition to the brief survey of faculty perceptions about the merit review process, the Committee surveyed all unit heads (department chairs and deans of single unit colleges) with a variety of questions related to the procedures used in their units and perceptions of adequacy. The 21-item questionnaire, reproduced in Appendix C contained a mix of closed- and open-ended questions and solicited attachments of unit-based merit and workload procedures.

Unfortunately, only 15 responses were received, despite several written and verbal reminders. Frankly, the Committee is troubled about the lack of responsiveness from certain quarters of the faculty, believing that it may suggest a worrisome degree of apathy on the part of some unit heads about the merit process or about the Faculty Senate’s role in governance matters.

It is also noteworthy that the responses were hardly representative of the institution: perhaps owing to the membership of one dean on the Committee, one college was well represented, while others were poorly or not at all reflected in the results. Thus, although some attempt can be made to characterize the results, this should not be considered as necessarily representative of the entire university.

Three questions pertained to the composition and selection of the unit’s merit review committee. With the notable exception of one college that utilizes administrator-based assessments, most departments maintained a faculty review committee generally elected rather than appointed.

The next series of questions concerned reviews of teaching, scholarship
and service. All units reported using the TCPEs plus other measures of teaching (e.g., peer review), usual measures of scholarship based on publications and presentations, and service. These are then combined either by a fixed weighting formula or by an individualized formula based on workload assignments. For the most part, administrators reported that they were very or somewhat satisfied with the processes, with few responses indicating any dissatisfaction.

In terms of quantifying performance and translating it into merit increments, all units maintain some type of metric: five-point scales were common, although some units appeared to have more elaborate scales. A variety of approaches is employed for translating performance into raises. A few units use the simplest calculation of apportioning dollars to merit points. Others base raise pool distribution proportionately to salary. Still others blend the two approaches: percentage and dollar distribution combined. Finally, most units do not provide for a set-aside pool for the unit head to modify the total distribution of merit funds.

In terms of timetable, most units base the review on calendar rather than academic year. Virtually all units provide faculty with written or verbal feedback prior to the establishment of raises. All but one have provisions for faculty to appeal the assessment prior to finalizing the distribution of merit funds, and the administrator from that one exception indicated the need for an appeals process.

Finally, other comments and responses indicated a lack of clarity in most units about the University's new workload policy. In addition, there were several comments that the small size of the merit pool in recent years was a concern among faculty and contributed to some degree of apathy about the process of merit distribution: akin to slicing up a pop tart rather than a large pie.

4 Proposed Principles of Merit Review Procedures.

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. While there are arguments for local control, certain principles and practices should be common to all units:
1. Assessments pertaining to merit should reflect individual faculty workloads, which in turn should be arranged consistent with the University workload policy.

   (a) Units vary considerably in terms of progress toward developing an approved workload policy. Units should finalize their workload policies so as to rationalize their merit processes.

   (b) Merit reviews should separately assess teaching, research/scholarship, and service, and combine the assessments into an overall weighted outcome/score based on the individualized workload.

2. Performance evaluations of all faculty in a unit should 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 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 should decide the extent to which the unit head has discretion to adjust performance evaluations and merit scores determined by the evaluation committee.

   (e) Because market inequities are normally handled through a separate process and pool of funds, neither unit heads nor deans should have set-aside funds drawn from the merit pool.

3. Units must have a clearly defined and timely appeals process in place. Faculty should 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.

4. Raise pools should be distributed based on percentages, rather than dollars. While various raise distribution models currently exist (most notably, all percentages, all dollars, and a split between percentages and dollars), there are several reasons to prefer the fully percentage approach.

(a) The raise pool is formed and distributed to units based on percentages of continuing faculty salaries.

(b) Merit raises at Northeastern over the past ten years have averaged 3.3%. During that same period, the rate of inflation in Boston has averaged 3.03%. In effect, therefore, merit raises have been cost of living raises (despite the unwillingness to refer to them as such) and increases in one's cost of living are proportionate to expenditures (and thus to salary). The fact that some faculty under a dollar-based system are mathematically prevented from achieving an increment equal to the raise percentage, no matter how strong the performance, is therefore problematic.

(c) Underlying dollar-based formulas is the belief that equal performance should generate an equal increase in compensation. However, a highly-paid senior faculty member will receive the increase for fewer years (before retirement) than a lesser paid junior professor, who has more years left in the profession. Thus, the cumulative effect of an adjustment in base salary benefits junior faculty more over the long-term. (Of course there exist deviations from the observation that senior faculty are paid more, but where such deviations occur they may be best addressed through market adjustments.) All this is to say that raises should be looked at in present value terms over the course of a career rather than one year at a time.

5. All faculty in a unit should 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.
6. All faculty should be given specific and timely written feedback in regard to the outcomes of their merit review that goes beyond merely providing a score. Feedback should be consistent with an individual's workload priorities. At minimum, the feedback should provide the basis for the merit scores in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, any area(s) of relative weakness should 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.

7. Evaluations for merit should 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.

5 Concluding Remarks.

No one who responded to the questionnaires seems opposed to excellence. However, some units seem so strongly divided on the best way to achieve it as to undermine that quest. The FDC has carefully shied away from trying to dictate mechanisms for evaluating scholarship, feeling that must be left strictly to the units. We have been slightly less cautious in regard to teaching, but there too we respect the variety of pedagogical issues faced by different units.
What seems clear to us is the advantage to every unit in carefully and collegially defining its own standards of excellence and making those standards evident to all its members. This calls for mutual respect and mutual support for each part of the unit's operation. It may well be that this approach will have the greatest effect in lifting the unit's standing, and consequently the salaries of its members.
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Appendices

A The Charge to the Committee.

TO: 2007 Special Senate Committee for Faculty Development:
Professor Thomas Sherman, Chair (Mathematics)
Professor Thomas R. Gilbert (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
Professor James Fox (Criminal Justice)
Professor Steven A. Morrison (Economics)
Professor Louis Kruger (Counseling & Applied Psychology)
Professor Shihwee Yang (CBA)
Dean Thomas Moore (CBA)

FROM: Professor Carol A. Gled, Chair, Senate Agenda Committee
Professor Bruns, Senate Agenda Committee Liaison
SUBJECT: Charge 2007

DATE: March 16, 2007

According to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Faculty Development Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate charged with the following general function:
This Committee shall be concerned with the rights and status of faculty personnel. Matters to be dealt with are standards of tenure, promotion, and advancement for University faculty; and questions of professional development, academic freedom, and economic welfare.

All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are evaluated annually. Section IV.E.2.b(1-3) of the Faculty Handbook currently contains several sections related to merit, including the process for determining merit and for making individual merit determinations, and the function of merit. Section IV.E.2.b.2) clearly states that the purpose of merit is guidance and reward. It also states that the criteria for merit and “the method by which merit evaluation results are applied to the determination of individual salary increases are determined by the Teaching Faculty.” Although most units have established procedures for merit, the Handbook notes: “Since differences exist among academic units, no single process is universally mandated.”

The Senate Agenda Committee, in consultation with the Provost, has acknowledged that the current process for merit distribution is flawed in many respects, and is need of review and revision. The Provost has described the distribution of merit salary increases across the University actually results in a small range of approximately ±.3%.

We therefore request that the Special Faculty Development Committee review the current language and procedures concerning merit, review outstanding resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate on 12/02/2002 (Salary Adjustments), and consider alternate models for distribution of merit. One such model, proposed by the Provost includes:

“Distribute 20% of the merit pool at the College level, in consultation with Chairs, to address merit equity across the college for faculty with comparable overall merit in teaching, research, and service. This approach addresses the issues of unequal distribution of merit across departments that vary from 3 to 40 faculty members in size. This approach also allows for consideration of service at college level.”

We also ask that the Committee consider the following:

- The role of faculty in the merit process and the final determination of merit:
• Ways to address guidance and faculty development through the process;

• Meaningful differentiation of faculty based on scholarship, teaching, and service through the department-based merit process;

• How changes would enhance transparency in the process;

• The effect on various Colleges, including small Colleges that do not have Department Chairs;

• Specific procedures to evaluate teaching, scholarship/research, and service (including service to College and University);

• The need for a University-wide process for evaluation and merit distribution;

• The need for a detailed set of criteria and considerations, including outcome measures such as scholarly publications, etc.

We anticipate that, pending this review, it may be necessary to propose changes to the sections of the Handbook that deal with merit and equity. We respectfully request that the Special Senate Committee for Faculty Development submit their report in electronic form to the Senate Agenda Committee no later than December 1, 2007.

B The Faculty Survey

The Special Faculty Development Committee on Merit has been charged with reviewing the processes for annual merit reviews of faculty at Northeastern. As part of this effort, we want to determine whether you believe the existing policies and procedures in your unit fairly evaluate and reward meritorious work. We ask that you take a few minutes to answer the questions below. Your response will be processed in a way that protects your anonymity. Note that you are not asked to identify yourself on the survey. As responses are processed they will be irreversibly separated from the e-mail addresses of the senders.

DIRECTIONS: Please identify your academic unit and then respond to Questions 1-4 by checking "Yes" or "No". If you check "No", please explain why you did. Click the [SEND SURVEY] button at the end to send your anonymous reply to a secure Faculty Senate database. If you have any questions you may contact me at t.sherman@neu.edu. Thank you for your participation.
— for the Committee, Thomas Sherman, Chair.

1. Your academic unit:

2. Are the merit procedures in your unit clear to you? Yes No
   Explain:

3. Are the merit procedures in your unit fair as they relate to:
   (a) evaluating and rewarding meritorious teaching? Yes No
       Explain:
   (b) evaluating and rewarding meritorious research? Yes No
       Explain:
   (c) evaluating and rewarding meritorious service? Yes No
       Explain:

4. Is the overall process by which evaluations of teaching, research and service
   translate into merit raises fair? Yes No
   Explain:

5. Does the feedback from the merit review provide you with useful informa-
   tion for your ongoing development as a faculty member? Yes No
   Explain:

6. What can be done to improve the merit review process?
   Explain:
C The Administrator Survey

Survey on Faculty Merit Procedures July 2007

The Special Faculty Development Committee on Merit has been charged with reviewing the processes for annual merit review of faculty at Northeastern with an eye toward potentially improving current practices. As part of this effort, we are collecting information about existing policies and practices employed by various academic units on campus.

We ask that you kindly take a few minutes to answer the series of questions given below. Preferably, you should respond by typing directly in the space provided below each questions, and then print and return the survey by mail.

It would be very helpful if you can supply us with a copy of your unit’s current merit procedures or guidelines as backup to your responses.

Thank you in advance for your assistance. We regret the imposition on your busy schedule. Your thoughtful replies will, however, help us meet our important objective.

1. Who evaluates the untenured faculty for the purpose of merit?

2. If different, who evaluate the tenured faculty for the purpose of merit?

3. By what process are the evaluators selected?

4. How is teaching performance evaluated?

   (a) How satisfied are you with the assessment process for teaching?

      Very satisfied
      Somewhat satisfied
      Somewhat dissatisfied
      Very dissatisfied
      Comments:

5. How is research/scholarship productivity evaluated?

   (a) How satisfied are you with the assessment process for research/scholarship?

      Very satisfied
      Somewhat satisfied
      Somewhat dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied
Comments:

6. How is service contribution evaluated?
   (a) How satisfied are you with the assessment process for service?
       Very satisfied
       Somewhat satisfied
       Somewhat dissatisfied
       Very dissatisfied
       Comments:

7. How is the performance in teaching, research/scholarship and service combined, if they are, to produce an overall assessment?

8. What scales or metrics are used in measuring performance?

9. How is performance translated into salary increments?

10. Are salary increments for merit based on dollars, percentages or some combination of the two? Explain.

11. Is any portion of the raise pool set aside for discretion by the unit head? If so, what portion is that and what guidelines are used to distribute set-aside funds?

12. Is the evaluation time frame based on calendar year, academic year, or some other period?

13. What information is provided faculty with regard to the distribution of the raise pool?

14. What kind of feedback do faculty members receive regarding their performance, and generally what level of detail is provided?

15. During the past academic year, at what point did your faculty receive their performance evaluation (as opposed to their actual raise)?

16. Is there any provision for appeals of merit review and/or salary increment? Please describe the appeals process.

20
17. What problems do you see in your unit's current approach or the overall University strategy with regard to merit review?

18. What features about your unit’s approach or the University’s strategy do you find particularly appealing?

19. Generally, what is the sense of your faculty regarding your unit’s and the University’s approach to merit evaluation?

20. Does your unit have an existing workload policy (if so, please attach a copy), and in what way is the merit process tied to the workload policy?

Are there any other comments you wish to provide the committee regarding the merit evaluation process?

Finally, please return this form with a copy of your unit’s merit review policies to:

 Faculty Development Committee
c/o Faculty Senate Office
442 Ryder Hall

Thank you once again for your time and consideration.

Your name:
Title:
Extension:
**Presentations to the Faculty Senate during 2007-08**

**President Joseph Aoun, 31 October 2007**

In October, the President focused his speech to the Senate on achievements within the Academic plan. First, the core curriculum, which is innovative in its inclusion of a requirement for experiential education; second, an added emphasis on international Co-op opportunities; third, added emphasis on translational and interdisciplinary research which, the President notes, has been a fundamental aspect of NU; and fourth, the Stony Brook initiative which focuses on the local community. He noted that the Academic Plan must focus on all aspects of the academic enterprise, i.e. faculty growth and development, infrastructure, graduate and professional education, Ph.D. programs, in order to become a successful reality.


**Senior Vice President Philomena Mantella, 14 November 2007**

Senior Vice President Mantella provided a report to the Senate on enrollment trends and characteristics of the entering classes in recent years. She noted that during the years 2001-07, everything about Northeastern has evolved, including price, student profile, family income, bed capacity, etc. The University has entered the electronic milieu for admissions, marketing, and direct feedback to prospective applicants. Alumni engagement in recruiting now includes efforts in 35 states. The Vice President noted that applications have doubled since the year 2000 and she presented growth by College. The retention rate continues to increase and the graduation rate has increased to 66%.

Minutes of the November 14, 2007 Senate Meeting may be found at: [http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings/20072008/documents/SENM111407.pdf](http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings/20072008/documents/SENM111407.pdf)

**Vice Provost for Graduate Education Luis Falcon, 27 February 2008**

Vice Provost Falcon provided a three-part overview of graduate programs as follows: background, changes in the past four year, and the current state of affairs.

In order to oversee the decentralized nature of graduate programs, the Provost’s Office graduate programs personnel has grown to four staff members working to set policy, oversee financial assistance, oversee program development, manage the paperless application system and assist the Colleges with nationwide marketing and recruiting. This has been undertaken to overcome past declines in applications/enrollments, a lack of graduate presence on campus, and a lack of resources.

Academic goals include realignment, strengthening recruitment operations, and aggressive marketing efforts. New efforts include rolling admissions and a new scholarship program for top admits as well as a paperless admissions process.
The Vice Provost also highlighted efforts being made to attract and retain top quality students to NU’s Ph.D. programs.

Minutes of the February 27, 2008 Senate meeting are available at:  

And the Vice Provost’s visual presentation may be found at:  

Senior Vice President John McCarthy, 12 March 2008

Senior Vice President McCarthy and Provost Abdelal updated the Faculty Senate on various aspects of the 2009 budget, including the process. The Vice President explained that, due to a new stand-alone credit rating, the University will refinance its debt with the assumption that the 2009 budget will not be impacted by the higher cost of money. He noted, however, that the remainder of 2008 could be severely affected.

Assumptions made for the 2009 fiscal year budget include a 5.8% tuition increase, an 11% increase in financial aid, and an overall budget increase of 9%. Costs associated with the academic enterprise account for 60% of the overall budget; the Academic Investment Plan accounts for 27% of the Academic Operating Expense increases.

Provost Abdelal elaborated on the following areas: faculty merit compensation, University staff merit compensation, faculty market adjustments, new faculty hiring, and various other areas of budget increases. The total increase in Academic Operating Expenses is $31.611M.

Vice President McCarthy closed the presentation by elaborating upon increases in support operating expenses and small capital project expenditures. The total proposed budget for fiscal year 2009 is $694.255M with net revenue increases for operations of $43.844M.

Minutes of the March 12, 2008 Senate Meeting may be found at:  

The Vice President’s visual presentation is available at:  
http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/about_faculty/documents/documents/FY09_Budget_Presentati on_to_Senate.pdf
0708-01 Resolution of the Faculty Handbook

WHEREAS revisions and resolutions to the Faculty Handbook, passed by the Faculty Senate between fall 2002 through spring 2005, remain largely unresolved; and

WHEREAS the Statement of the Faculty Senate in the Faculty Handbook states that “...modification and revision of the Handbook do not constitute simple updating of factual material or changes to conform to applicable laws, we believe that collegiality requires continued consultation between the Faculty Senate, Provost and President in order to maintain the vitality of this document as the basis of University governance. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that substantive changes to this Handbook for which procedures are not already mandated by the Handbook itself should receive the approval of the Faculty Senate.”

BE IT RESOLVED That each unsigned resolution pertaining to the Faculty Handbook receive a response from Northeastern University administration by noting approval or listing specific issues in dispute, with the expectation that a Faculty Handbook be in place by the end of spring 2008 semester.

(33-0-0)

Action by the President: Approved 11/14/07; BoT approval not needed per V. Lembo.
Comments: "A Faculty Handbook is an important governance document that, ideally, underscores the shared governance nature of the University. With that as our goal the administration will respond to outstanding Faculty Senate resolutions in a timely fashion. As to the timeframe for the updated Faculty Handbook, I can support the hope of having an updated Handbook by spring 2008 but I would not force the consultative process among the Senate Agenda Committee, the Provost's Office, the Deans and the President's Office to be more rapid that would result in a well thought out and well-supported document. Therefore, I support the concept of all deliberate speed be used in updating the Faculty Handbook."

0708-02 A spirit of shared governance.

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook, 2000-2001 Edition, declares in Section I.A.1. that, “The Teaching Faculty is represented by the Faculty Senate, which together with the Administration of the University, has the responsibility of maintaining and improving the academic standards of the University and making the functioning of the University more effective and harmonious.”; and

WHEREAS Northeastern University faculty members have raised significant concerns about faculty governance and participation in major University decisions and shaping the academic agenda;

BE IT RESOLVED That, in the spirit of shared governance outlined in the current Handbook, we respectfully request that the President, Provost and senior administration, including Deans, work with the Faculty Senate to ensure meaningful input and participation as well as transparency in the Northeastern University decision-making process to improve the functioning of the University.

(33-0-1)
**Action by the President:** Approved 11/14/07; BoT approval not needed per V. Lembo.

Comments: "It is my belief that participation by the Faculty Senate, Deans and other senior administrators, the Provost and the President in university-wide decision-making is an important part of ensuring a well-functioning and effective university. As stated in the Academic Plan, “We are an institution that values the community of faculty and staff members as essential partners in attaining this vision.”"

**0708-03 2006-07 Senate Committee for Financial Affairs Final Report**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the final report of the 2006-07 Senate Committee for Financial Affairs.

(32-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 11/14/07

**10-17-07 0708-04 Academic Policy Committee Resolution #1: Acceptance of the 06-07 Committee Report**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the final report of the 2006-07 Academic Policy Committee.

(30-0-1)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08; BOT appr not needed per VL.

**0708-05 2006-07 Academic Policy Committee Resolution #2: Recommendation for a more comprehensive Academic Integrity Policy**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the recommendation of the 2006-07 Academic Standing Committee to expand upon the recently amended Student Government Association’s Academic Integrity Policy, to include a more comprehensive statement about faculty options and institutional responsibilities, along the lines of Northwestern University’s and/or The Pennsylvania State University’s statements

(30-2-1)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08, Comment "I support the concern the faculty has expressed about this serious issue. I encourage the Senate to develop and refine its recommendations working with colleagues such as those in Student Affairs and in the Office of Legal Counsel.”; BOT appr not needed per VL.

**10-31-07 0708-06 2006-07 Academic Policy Committee Resolution #3 recommending consistent University-wide reporting mechanisms and report utilization for all instances of academic integrity violations.**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the recommendation of the 2006-07 Academic Policy Committee to recommend consistent University-wide reporting mechanisms and report utilization for all instances of academic integrity violations, including cases that are settled between a faculty member and a student directly as well as cases that faculty refer to the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolutions (OSCCR).

(33-0-0)
**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. Comment: “I support the concern the faculty has expressed about this serious issue. I encourage the Senate to develop and refine its recommendations working with colleagues such as those in Student Affairs and in the Office of Legal Counsel.” BOT appr not needed per VL.

---

0708-07  **2006-07 Academic Policy Committee Resolution #4 to review the restorative justice concept.**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the recommendation of the 2006-07 Academic Policy Committee to review the restorative justice concept further and determine whether to develop a restorative justice “track” within the range of permitted approaches to resolving violations of the Academic Integrity policy.

(26-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. Comment: “I support the exploration of best practices in resolving violations of the Academic Integrity policy and encourage the development of explicit actions.” BOT appr not needed per VL.

---

0708-08  **Name change: Part-time MBA Program to Evening MBA Program**

BE IT RESOLVED That the name of the Part-time MBA Program be changed to the Evening MBA Program in the Graduate School of Business Administration.

(25-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. BoT approval 6/7/08

---

0708-09  **Name change: MS in Electrical Engineering to MS in Electrical and Computer Engineering**

BE IT RESOLVED That the name of the MS in Electrical Engineering be changed to the MS in Electrical and Computer Engineering in the College of Engineering.

(25-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. BoT approval 6/7/08

---

**11-28-07**  **0708-10 FAC resolution #1 regarding merit increases**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for a merit raise pool of at least 5.0% for continuing faculty in fiscal year 2008-2009.

(31-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08; BOT appr not needed per VL.

---

0708-11  **FAC resolution #2 regarding equity pool**

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for an equity pool in fiscal year 2008-2009 that equals the total amount
of the market/equity gap between the salaries of Northeastern University faculty and those of faculty at peer institutions.

(34-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08; BOT appr not needed per VL.

---

**0708-12 FAC resolution #3 on continued collaboration**

Be it resolved that the administration continue to inform and consult with the Financial Affairs Committee as to the process and priorities used to distribute the equity pool.

(32-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08; BOT appr not needed per VL.

---

**12-12-07 0708-13 Integrated Student Academic Appeals Policy [Appeal of Final Grades] (from the 2006-07 Ad Hoc Student Handbook Review Committee)**

Be it resolved That the Faculty Senate approve the integrated Student Academic Appeals Policy [Appeal of Final Grades] consolidated by the Committee.

(19-8-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08; BOT appr not needed per VL.

---

**0708-14 Leadership Minor/ROTC Proposal**

**WHEREAS:** In 1972, the Faculty Senate established that a maximum of four quarter hours of Military Science (chiefly ARM) academic courses could be used toward graduation, leaving it to the discretion of the individual "Basic Colleges" to determine whether or not to permit any such use; AND

**WHEREAS:** the academic Military Science courses go through the same UUCC vetting process as all other credit-bearing courses; AND

**WHEREAS:** R.O.T.C. students must therefore earn a significant number of credits in addition to their College-based courses in order to both graduate and be eligible for commissions; AND

**WHEREAS:** several programs and Colleges are interested in permitting qualified students to minor in Military Science or related subjects: THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate amend this rule to permit individual Colleges to approve the use of up to twelve semester hours of credit in ARM coded courses for graduation at Northeastern University.

(23-1-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08; BOT appr not needed per VL.
BE IT RESOLVED That each full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty member be allocated not less than $2,000 yearly to promote academic development.

(20-11-1)

**Action by the President:**

---

**0708-16 Name change proposal, SPCS**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Master of Professional Writing and Information Design Program in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies be renamed the Master of Science in Technical Communication.

(32-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. BoT approval 6/7/08

---

**0708-17 Name change proposal, SPCS**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Certificate in Digital Media Program in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies be renamed the Certificate in Interactive Design.

(32-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. BoT approval 6/7/08

---

**2-13-08 0708-18 Master of Science in International Business**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Master of Science in International Business in the College of Business Administration as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 January 2008.

(31-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 3/14/08. BoT approval 6/7/08

---

**2-27-08 0708-19 On-line implementation of the new teacher evaluation tool (TRACE)**

**WHEREAS** the Senate previously voted to switch from the TCE Program to TRACE to be administered electronically,

BE IT RESOLVED That the University move immediately to implement TRACE electronically using the CourserEval 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).

(21-3-2)
2-13-08 0708-20 FDC resolution #1: Merit score and workload

*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:

- Assessments pertaining to merit shall reflect individual faculty workloads, which in turn should be arranged consistent with the University workload policy.

  (a) Units vary considerably in terms of progress toward developing an approved workload policy. Units shall finalize their workload policies so as to rationalize their merit processes.

  (b) Merit reviews shall separately assess teaching, research/scholarship, and service, and combine the assessments into an overall weighted outcome/score based on the individualized workload.

(31-0-0)

*Action by the President:* Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL

3-26-08 0708-21 FDC resolution #2: merit raise appeals process

*WHEREAS*…

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 week prior to the point when unit recommendations are submitted to the next level for further review.

(26-0-1)

*Action by the President:* Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL

0708-22 FDC resolution #3: faculty access to merit scores

*WHEREAS*…

All faculty members 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.
0708-23 FDC resolution #4: timely feedback on merit review outcome

WHEREAS …

All faculty shall be given specific and timely written feedback by their evaluators 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, research/scholarship, and service, as appropriate to each person’s workload. 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.

Action by the President: Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL

4-9-08 0708-24 FDC resolution #5: timing of evaluations for merit

WHEREAS…

Evaluations for Merit shall be performed early in the spring semester, with the assessment covering the previous calendar year.

Action by the President: Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL

0708-25 Additional reading day

BE IT RESOLVED That the University add a reading day to the spring semester calendar.

Action by the President: Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL

0708-26 Public Advocacy and Rhetoric program

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Public Advocacy and Rhetoric program to replace the Public Communication concentration in the Department of Communications/College of Arts and Sciences as approved by the UUCC on 7 February 2008.

Action by the President: Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL
**Action by the President:** Approved 6/7/08. BoT appr not needed per BoT.

---

**0708-27 Dual Major in Multimedia Studies and Digital Art and Dual Major in Multimedia Studies and Graphic Design**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Major in Multimedia Studies and Digital Art in the Department of Art & Design and in Multimedia Studies/College of Arts and Sciences as approved by the UUCC on 7 February 2008, AND

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Major in Multimedia Studies and Graphic Design in the Department of Art & Design and in Multimedia Studies/College of Arts and Sciences as approved by the UUCC on 7 February 2008.

(26-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 6/12/08; BoT appr 6/7/08 with comment: “Approved on basis of change of degree from BS to BFA. Dual majors covered by template policy.”

---

**0708-28 Dual Major Psychology and Education**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Major in Psychology and Education in the Departments of Education and of Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences as approved by the UUCC on 7 February 2008.

(23-0-3)

**Action by the President:** Approved 6/7/08; BoT appr 6/7/08

---

**0708-29 Doctorate of Education**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Doctorate of Education (EdD) in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on 26 March 2008.

(20-1-4)

**Action by the President:** Approved 6/7/08; BoT appr 6/7/08

---

**4-16-08 0708-30 Academic Integrity Policy**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Integrity Policy approved unanimously by the Northeastern University Student Government Association (SR-SP-07-101) and further endorse substitution of this policy for the current Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy.

(21-4-4)

**Action by the President:** Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL
BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed amendments to the
Academic Standing, Probation and Dismissal Policies for Full-time Undergraduate
Students as approved by the UUCC on 13 March 2008.

(26-1-2)

**Action by the President:**  Approved 4/30/08; BOT appr not needed per VL

**0708-32 Handbook Resolution #1**

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate voted unanimously in September 2007 that pending
resolutions pertaining to the Faculty Handbook be resolved with the goal of producing a
final document to be in place by the end of the spring 2008 semester;

Handbook resolution #1

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve Section VI.A.3 (Performance
Expectations) previously approved by the Faculty Senate on 18 November 2002 and
hereby submitted with amendments.

(27-0-1)

**Action by the President:**

**0708-33 Handbook Resolution #2**

WHEREAS ....

Handbook resolution #2

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve Section VI.A.7 (Grievance Process),
previously approved by the Faculty Senate on 2 December 2002 and hereby submitted
with amendments.

(25-3-0)

**Action by the President:**

**4-23-08 0708-34 Handbook Resolution #3**

WHEREAS ...

Handbook amendment #3

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve Section VI.A.8 (Tenure), previously
approved by the Faculty Senate on 14 April 2003 and hereby submitted with
amendments.

(33-0-1)

**Action by the President:**
0708-35 Handbook Resolution #4

WHEREAS …

Handbook amendment #4

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve Section VI.C. (Special Academic Appointments: Lecturer, Research Professor/Scientist/Scholar, Clinical Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Visiting Faculty) previously approved by the Faculty Senate on 23 March 2005 and hereby submitted with amendments.

(29-1-3)

Action by the President:

0708-36 Ph.D. in School Psychology

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Ph.D. in School Psychology in the Department of Counseling and Applied Education Psychology in the Bouvé College of Health Sciences as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 April 2008.

(31-0-1)

Action by the President: Approved 6/15/08; BoT appr 6/7/08

0708-37 Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approved the Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology in the Department of Counseling and Applied Education Psychology in the Bouvé College of Health Sciences as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 April 2008.

(33-0-0)

Action by the President: Approved 6/15/08; BoT appr 6/7/08

0708-38 Executive Master of Science in Criminal Justice Leadership

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Executive Master of Science in Criminal Justice Leadership in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 April 2008.

(32-0-0)

Action by the President: Approved 6/15/08; BoT appr 6/7/08

0708-39 Proposal to rename the School of Professional and Continuing Studies

BE IT RESOLVED That the School of Professional and Continuing Studies be renamed as the College of Professional Studies

(32-0-0)

Action by the President: Approved 6/11/08; BoT appr 6/11/08
0708-40 2007-08 Research Policy Oversight Committee (RPOC) Resolution #1

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish an Office of Grant and Contract Administration as outlined in the final report of the 2007-08 Senate Committee for Research Policy Oversight.

(31-0-2)

Action by the President: Approved 6/15/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

0708-41 2007-08 RPOC Resolution #2

BE IT RESOLVED That the Technology Transfer Office be given signatory authority and that it handle most of its own legal issues without necessarily requiring approval from the University Legal Counsel Office. Technology Transfer Office will determine if further legal assistance from the University Legal Counsel Office is necessary.

(20-3-2)

Action by the President:

0708-42 2007-08 RPOC Resolution #3

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish an Electronic Research Administration System to be used by researchers to monitor proposals for grants and contracts in real time as they proceed through the approval process and to facilitate management of awards after they are received.

(23-0-0)

Action by the President: Approved 6/15/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

0708-43 2007-08 Financial Affairs (FAC) Resolution #1

BE IT RESOLVED That the annual budget process conclude in advance of the date when Colleges and Departments need to develop the fall semester’s schedule of courses.

(21-0-6)

Action by the President: Approved 6/7/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

0708-44 2007-08 FAC Resolution #2

WHEREAS the budget process for fiscal year 2009 was relatively transparent and collaborative,

BE IT RESOLVED That the following practices become a formal part of the annual budget process:

a) multiple budget discussions between the Senate Committee for Financial Affairs (FAC), the chair of the Senate Agenda Committee (SAC), and the budget team
(i.e., the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance) prior to the development of the draft budget;
b) the scheduling of sufficient time for the FAC to provide feedback on the draft budget and to obtain responses on this feedback from the budget team prior to the presentation of the draft budget to the Board of Trustees; and
c) the presentation and discussion of the approved budget with the FAC and the chair of SAC prior to its public announcement.

(26-0-0)

**Action by the President:** “Informational, no action required” 6/7/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

**0708-45 2007-08 FAC Resolution #3**

BE IT RESOLVED That the FAC and the Senate Agenda Committee (SAC) be consulted prior to any administrative decisions (e.g., faculty hiring initiatives, a new master building plan, responsibility-centered management) that have significant University-wide budgetary implications.

(28-0-0)

**Action by the President:** “Informational, no action required” 6/7/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

**0708-46 2007-08 FAC Resolution #4**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Division of Human Resources Management consult with the FAC and SAC on a timely basis concerning significant changes in benefits that are being considered.

(29-0-0)

**Action by the President:** “Informational, no action required” 6/7/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

**0708-47 2007-08 NU Core Implementation Committee Resolution #1**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Provost and Deans estimate the resources necessary for the effective implementation of Writing Intensive courses into the curriculum.

(26-0-0)

**Action by the President:** Approved 6/7/08; BoT appr not req per V. Lembo

**0708-48 2007-08 NU Core Implementation Committee Resolution #2**

BE IT RESOLVED That a comprehensive website be developed and maintained to publicize and support the NU Core Curriculum, including the Writing Intensive initiative. The website should include sections that explain the logic for the University’s approach to the Core Curriculum, as well as operational sections that permit students and faculty to easily visualize the possible pathways that will enable students to satisfy the various components of the Core requirements. The site would also serve to market the Core Curriculum as an essential, common curricular unit at Northeastern University.
0708-49 2007-08 NU Core Implementation Committee Resolution #3

BE IT RESOLVED That the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) be responsible for oversight of the NU Core, including decisions regarding courses and forms of experience-based learning that may be proposed to satisfy Core objectives. The UUCC will also periodically review the various components of the NU Core in order to ensure that the principles embodied in the NU Core and its specific skills and competencies are carried out for all undergraduate students at Northeastern University. As part of this process, the UUCC will notify all curricular units in the University of changes it has approved.

0708-50 2007-08 NU Core Implementation Committee Resolution #4

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Assessment Framework Document for the NU Core, drafted October 2006 and revised March 2008 (Appendix D of the 2007-08 Senate Ad hoc Committee for NU Core Implementation final report) as the framework within which ongoing assessment of the NU Core will be undertaken.

0708-51 2007-08 Recommendation of the Academic Policy Committee regarding grade inflation

BE IT RESOLVED That it is the sense of the Faculty Senate that grade inflation/compression exists at Northeastern University as outlined in the final report and analysis from the 2007-08 Senate Committee for Academic Policy. SAC is encouraged to continue to monitor this situation through charges to future APC committees.

0708-52 Report and recommendations of the 2007-08 Senate Committee for Information Technology Policy

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate establish the Standing Committee for Academic Software Application and Technology Assessment and Adoption, as described in the 2007-08 report of the Senate Committee for Information Technology Policy, to review proposed academic software acquisitions for distribution through the Northeastern On Demand service or standard software distribution services. A budget for new software needs should be allocated for this purpose. Current software budgets for academic units should not be taken to increase the central software repository. Finally, in
the future, the need for additional software allocations should be reviewed and recommended on a regular basis.

(18-3-2)

Action by the President: