

November 07, 2004

Faculty Senate annual report: 2003-2004

Northeastern University - Faculty Senate

Recommended Citation

Northeastern University - Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate annual report: 2003-2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate Annual Reports*. Paper 2.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005766>

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

2003-2004 Faculty Senate Annual Report

Robert P. Lowndes
Chair, Senate Agenda Committee
7 November 2004

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION2
II. SENATE INITIATIVES IN SUPPORT OF TOP-100 STATUS4
1. Senate Agenda Committee4
2. Special Academic Policy Committee4
3. Special Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee6
4. Special Faculty Development Committee7
5. Financial Affairs Committee8
6. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Information Services Policy Committee11
7. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Library Operations and Policies Committee12
8. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Research Policy Oversight Committee14
III. SENATE INITIATIVES RESPONDING TO FACULTY CONCERNS14
1. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Faculty Handbook Revision Committee14
IV. OTHER SENATE AGENDA COMMITTEE ACTIONS16
1. Workload Policy16
2. Search Committee Procedures17
V. COMMITTEES: MEMBERSHIP AND OUTCOMES17
1. Senate Standing Committees17
2. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Senate Committees18
3. Administrator Oversight Evaluation Committee and Evaluation Committees....	19
4. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Search Committees20
5. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Mediation Committees22
6. University Committees22
VI. SENATE RESOLUTIONS AND OUTCOMES: Resolutions 1-4524

I. INTRODUCTION

The 2003-04 Faculty Senate had an intensive and productive year. In addition to an ambitious agenda again focused on supporting the quest for top-100 status, the Senate also addressed a wide range of other important issues including initiating the drive for the Academic Investment Plan, multiple efforts to enhance the curriculum to attract still higher caliber students to the University, and the ongoing draft for a new *Faculty Handbook*. The legislative agenda was sufficiently busy that it again necessitated the need for periodic weekly meetings of the Senate and, for the first time, on occasions, continuation meetings in the same week. In summary, the Senate adopted 45 resolutions involving (resolution number shown in parenthesis and described more fully in Section VI):

Academic Investment Plan

- **increase number of tenure-track and tenured faculty (#7)**
- **restore the Colleges' non-salary operating funds via \$2 million annual increases from 2005-08 (#8)**
- **address Library's budget shortfalls for collections via \$1 million increases in 2005 and 2006 (#9)**
- **address inflation costs of Library materials (#11)**

Admissions and Enrollment Management

- as a priority, **student admissions be strongly correlated with academic units' carrying capacity (#43)**
- create new **policies for transfer students concerning their academic preparedness and their admissions locus (#44)**
- develop **systems to identify and support students at risk (#13)**
- provide coordinated **support for undergraduates seeking grant funding for graduate education (#42)**
- enhance and promote **interdisciplinary programs** to recruit and retain higher caliber students (#38)
- enhance and promote **study abroad programs** to recruit and retain higher caliber students (#39)
- enhance and promote **the honors program** to recruit and retain higher caliber students (#40, 41)
- **annual report on enrollment to be given to the Senate by Provost and SVP for Enrollment Management (#14)**

Classrooms

- move urgently to **construct new classrooms to correct for current shortages, especially in the 20-30 and 50-60 seat ranges (#22)**

Faculty

- recommendation for a **5% merit increase for faculty salaries for 2004-05 (#5)**
- recommendation for a **\$1.6 million faculty equity pool for 2004-05 (#6)**
- effective 2004-05, faculty to provide an **on-line syllabus for each course (#16)**
- recommendation for a comprehensive **faculty workload policy (#21)**
- creation of **non-tenure track research professor ranks (#37)**

Faculty Handbook

- 8 resolutions on **sections IV and V of the new Faculty Handbook (#15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25)**

Organizational

- name change for Department of Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering to **Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (#1)**
- name change for University College to **School of Professional and Continuing Studies (SPCS) (#26)**
- recommend that the **SPCS be authorized to offer undergraduate and graduate degrees (#28)**
- creation of an **Academic Council for Lifelong Learning** in the SPCS (#27)
- creation of a new **School of Technological Entrepreneurship (#32)**

Programmatic

- recommendation to **internationalize the curriculum in all colleges (#45)**
- new **Bachelor of Science in Health Science (#36)**
- new **Master of Science in Information Assurance (#33)**
- new **Master of Science in Technological Entrepreneurship (#31)**
- new **Clinical Doctorate in Audiology (#35)**
- new **Clinical Doctorate in Physical Therapy (#34)**

The following sections II-VI summarize details of the 2003-04 Senate's activities and outcomes for its actions.

II. SENATE INITIATIVES IN SUPPORT OF TOP-100 STATUS

1. Senate Agenda Committee

After broad consultation with the members of the faculty and senior administration, the Senate Agenda Committee (SAC) determined that the primary focus for the 2003-04 Faculty Senate would again be initiatives in support of the University's goal for top-100 status among national research universities. SAC therefore presented charges to key Senate committees that addressed issues with the potential to advance our academic reputation, and with the potential to enhance our attractiveness to academically stronger student cohorts, two critical elements for our progress towards top-100 status.

For 2003-04, SAC began a pilot initiative that created "Special Standing Committees." The Special Committees consisted of a regular Standing Committee of the Senate plus additional members, usually drawn from the academic deans. The effort was intended to draw a broader expertise and viewpoint into the consideration of certain academic initiatives. The effort was generally viewed as a success by both faculty and administrators.

The 2002-03 Faculty Senate passed resolutions creating three new Standing Committees of the Senate: the Information Systems Policy Committee, the Library Policies and Operations Committee, and the Research Policy Oversight Committee. The creation of these new standing committees constitutes a change in the Senate bylaws and such a change requires a faculty referendum vote. SAC decided to hold the referendum on these new standing committees as part of the expected referendum necessary for parts of the new *Faculty Handbook*, and to proceed in the interim to establish these new committees as *Ad Hoc* Committees but following the general charges and membership prescribed by the Senate resolutions.

Background information for the charges to the various Senate Committees was given by the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee in his address to the University in September 2003, and in his report *Life on the Edge* to the Senate, both of which can be found on the Senate website at <http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu> (under Archives 2003-04, Committees, Senate Agenda Committee, Reports).

The following gives a summary of Senate initiatives given to Senate Special and Standing Committees in support of the quest for top-100 status.

2. Special Academic Policy Committee.

Background

Fostered in part by serious concerns raised by leaders from both the public and private sectors about the need for a more broadly educated citizenry and workforce to address the challenges of the 21st century, there has been an intensive national effort during the last decade to develop new innovative general education programs that address these challenges. The outcomes are programs that integrate the formerly separate components of core curricula, electives, and the majors. They provide subject matter breadth and depth as well as embracing educational innovations such as interdisciplinary team teaching, learning communities, experiential education, and student-team problem solving.

Over the years, Northeastern has several times contemplated the task of creating a university-wide general education program, but the scheduling constraints imposed by cooperative education, and for some colleges a very tight curriculum, have prevented this from coming to fruition. To many, our Academic Common Experience (ACE), which is to some extent a modified form of Ernest Boyer's "enriched major," achieved the lowest common denominator approach to general education. ACE is not generally

viewed as providing any competitive advantage, and there is a question as to whether it will satisfy the 2008 decennial accreditation review by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

In planning for a university-wide general education component, it is important to articulate our goals and values for the undergraduate programs. We can agree that students must graduate with a well-rounded academic and experiential education that prepares them for their next chapter in life, whether that is in graduate school or at the start of their first career. To this end, we know that we must offer them a broad educational opportunity to encourage their experimentation and exploration in our courses and programs. Most importantly, we must provide our students with an education that gives them the courage and enthusiasm to go out and create a better world. The 21st century demands educated citizens who are prepared for change and equipped to meet challenge. Our graduates must possess the intellect, the flexibility and the skills to deal with the technological and social changes that will continue to transform society, and an enhanced ability to turn theory into practice. They must have the breadth of learning experiences that prepare them for more than one career, and they must have an education to cope with global interdependence. An innovative general education component can provide strong support to achieve all of these values and goals.

Charge

The Senate Agenda Committee therefore asked the Special Committee on Academic Policy to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following two-part charge:

1. Taking into account the needs of students for general, interdisciplinary and contextual education in preparation for life and work in the twenty-first century, the Committee was asked to recommend an innovative template for a general education component for Northeastern students that will satisfy these, that will provide competitive advantage to recruit and retain still higher caliber students to the University, and that will provide enhancement for the University's academic reputation. The Committee was asked to generate such a program for all students even if it appeared that constraints facing some units would preclude all students from participating. The Committee was asked, if it so chose, to suggest ways in which its proposal might be modified or adapted to fit programmatic limitations.
2. The Committee was asked to include in its recommendations: a delineation of the specific goals of the general education requirements; how those goals would be achieved; the approval process for courses to be included in the general education requirements; a management process to oversee the administration of the requirements; a review process to monitor the effectiveness of the requirements and to recommend and approve change; and an estimate of the one-time and continuing costs of the general education requirements scheme proposed.

The Committee was asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 15 March 2004.

Outcomes

1. Consistent with its general authority to unilaterally review such issues as classrooms, the regular Standing Committee on Academic Policy issued a report entitled "The Committee Report on Classroom Usage Patterns and Preliminary Recommendations" which was released February 2003. This report, along with three supporting information documents, is available on the Faculty Senate website at: <http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu> (under Archives 2003-04, Committees, Academic Policy Committee, Reports).

The resolution adopted by the Senate, and subsequent actions on it, based on this Committee Report, are given in Section VI of this Annual Report, resolution #22.

2. Because of the overload of business, the Special Committee's Report on the two charges addressing a general education program could not be considered by the 2003-04 Senate. Their report is available on the Faculty Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Committees, Academic Policy Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/academic_policy/APC-GenEdRep-4-15-04%20with%20Appendices1-4.pdf

and was acted on by the 2004-05 Senate. The actions taken are described in the minutes of the Senate meeting of 13 October 2004 and are available on the Faculty Senate website at:

<http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings/2004-05/10/minutes10-13-04.pdf>

3. Special Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee

Background

The higher caliber students whom we now seek to matriculate place a much greater emphasis on traditional measures of academic excellence than our earlier student cohorts. They are much more concerned with the academic reputation of both the institution and the major. They are also far more concerned with the academic offerings beyond their intended major such as the quality of the general education program, the quality of the honors program, the ability to double major, the ease of changing major, opportunities in study abroad programs, undergraduate research opportunities, and the experiential education opportunities beyond coop, as well as teaching and advising standards and the like. They are looking for challenging and exciting opportunities that will prepare them for their next chapter in life which will increasingly embrace graduate school before work.

To this end, one focus for the 2003-04 Special Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee was to determine what enhancements in our academic programs would further strengthen our attractiveness to the still higher caliber students that we seek to attract and retain at Northeastern.

The second focus was a strong concern by the colleges, based on the distribution of students admitted for 2003-04, that there be a greater coordination between the academic sector and the admissions and enrollment sector so that the number of students admitted to each academic unit would be consistent with each academic unit's resource capacity.

Charge

The Senate Agenda Committee asked the Special Committee to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following two charges:

1. Beyond teaching and general education, what enhancements in academic programs will further strengthen our attractiveness to the still higher caliber students that we seek to attract and retain at Northeastern?
2. The Committee was asked to make recommendations on how current protocols to develop the magnitude and distributions of freshman admissions' targets can be strengthened to maximize the caliber of the incoming class while being consistent with available college resources.

The Committee was asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 15 March 2004.

Outcomes

The Committee report on these charges is available on the Faculty Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Committees, Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/enrollment_admissions/EAPCCom_mrpt3-15-04.pdf

Resolutions adopted by the Senate, and subsequent actions on them, based on the Committee Report are given in Section VI of this Annual Report, resolutions # 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.

4. Special Faculty Development Committee

Background

Classroom teaching is the most important activity for any institution of higher education. Excellence in teaching can shape an institution's academic reputation and can serve as a strong magnet for recruiting the highest caliber students. In addition, of course, excellence in classroom teaching is a very strong contributor to student retention and graduation. Classroom teaching, therefore, plays a pivotal role in three categories of the *U.S. News* rankings – academic reputation, selectivity, and graduation and retention – and was consequently identified as the general area for the focus of the 2003-04 Special Faculty Development Committee.

Charge

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

“Excellence in teaching is influenced by a wide range of parameters embracing such aspects as high-level recognition of and rewards for excellence in teaching in merit raises, tenure and promotion, and awards of university chairs and professorships; an appropriate array of special awards for excellence in teaching; appropriate levels of faculty development funding for instructional development; the highest-quality technology-enabled classrooms and teaching laboratories; the highest-quality support for classroom demonstrations, laboratory experiments, and field experiences; the highest quality instructor and course evaluations; appropriate class sizes; excellence in support centers such as the Center for Effective Teaching and the Ed Tech Center; and well managed protocols that place the best teachers in the most appropriate courses for the University's best strategic interests.

Based on, but not confined to, the above components that may influence excellence in teaching, prepare a detailed report on what strategic steps should be taken, and by when, to achieve a still greater commitment to, and environment of, teaching excellence at Northeastern.”

The Committee was asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 1 March 2004.

Outcomes

Because of the overload of business, the Special Committee's Report on excellence in teaching could not be considered by the 2003-04 Senate. Their report is available on the Faculty Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Committees, Academic Policy Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/faculty_development/FDCRep%2BRes4-08-04.pdf

and was being acted on (at the time of going to press) by the 2004-05 Senate.

5. Financial Affairs Committee

Background

The focus for the 2003-04 Standing Committee on Financial Affairs was faculty salaries, enhanced investment in the basic colleges, improvements to the budget process, and investments in new buildings and facilities.

A key area for improvement that will support our top-100 goal continues to be faculty salaries. Two major factors in the *U.S. News and World Report: 2004 America's Best Colleges* rankings were directly related to salaries: academic reputation (25% of the total ranking) and faculty resources (20% of the total ranking).

Academic reputation depends on the quality, commitment and successes of the professoriate. Faculty salaries play a vital role to this end. Competitive faculty salaries are essential for both the retention of existing faculty and recruitment of new faculty. Last year, Northeastern's *U.S. News 2003* ranking for academic reputation slipped somewhat to 125th, down from 105th in the 2001 rankings. The 2004 rankings for academic reputation show us at 112th.

Thirty-five percent of the faculty resources category in the *U.S. News* rankings is determined by faculty salaries and benefits adjusted for regional differences in cost of living from indices from Runzheimer International. According to the *US News*, Northeastern's ranking for faculty resources has declined steadily over the past several years. In 1996, for example, Northeastern's overall national ranking was 138th but its ranking for faculty resources was 96th, this latter then being Northeastern's best ranking of any of the factors used (i.e., academic reputation, retention, faculty resources, selectivity, financial resources, alumni giving, and graduation rate). Since 1996, Northeastern's ranking for faculty resources deteriorated markedly from being its best component to its worst component at 195th in 2003. In 2004, Northeastern's overall ranking is 127th, but its ranking for faculty resources, although notably improved from 2003, was 147th – still its worst ranking of any of the components used.

A second key area for change concerns investments in the Colleges. During the five-year period from fiscal 1998 to fiscal 2002 (the most recent data available to SAC) the total budgets for the six Colleges (i.e., not including University College) increased by 16.8% compared to the 38.9% increase for all other budget areas. As a result, the College budgets slipped from 35.1% to 31.2% of the total operating budget during fiscal 1998-2002. While this reflects important investments in the University infrastructure, SAC believed that investment in the Colleges needed to become a special priority in 2003-04. A particular component of this need, though not the only one, concerned the declining size of the professoriate. During the previous two years, reports to the Senate described a significant decline in the size of the professoriate since 1990-91 despite a sharp increase in recent years in the full-time student headcount to above the headcount levels in 1990-91. A similar report to the Senate in the fall of 2003 showed these trends unchanged. In the fall of 2002, the basic colleges had a total of 594 tenured and tenure-track faculty compared to 590 (2000), 635 (1996), and 775 (1990). The full-time student headcount (i.e. the total of full-time undergraduates and graduates including those from the School of Law) in the fall of 2002 was 16,941, compared to 16,456 (2000), 14,135 (1996), and 16,239 (1990). What was further troubling was that this decline in the professoriate appeared to have been compensated for via a sharp increase in full-time lecturers and the like.

A third key area for change is the University budget process. The President accepted recommendations from the 2002-03 Faculty Senate for improvement in the budget process, especially the operations of the Committee on Funding Priorities (CFP). For 2003-04, therefore, faculty representation on the CFP was increased, more detailed information about the University budget was to be presented to the CFP, and the CFP was now also to be aware of, and involved in, the so-called contingency budget allocations.

A fourth key area concerned investments in new buildings and facilities. During the previous five years, more than \$300 million had been invested in new facilities, with the major focus being on improving the dormitories. There was little transparency or involvement of the academic deans or the faculty in this investment. A major concern was the need for major investments in classroom facilities and new research facilities.

Charge

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

1. Based on current information and any other analyses that it might wish to undertake, the Committee was asked to make recommendations on appropriate merit raises and equity adjustments for 2004-05, with a particular emphasis on restoring Northeastern's earlier competitive advantage. The recommendation for equity/market adjustment raises should include consideration of matchmate data collected by the Office of University Planning and Research, appropriately adjusted for cost of living factors if possible. The Committee was asked to present its recommendations on these matters to the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee by 20 October 2003.
2. In close collaboration with the Provost and academic deans, the Committee was asked to assess carefully the needs for new investment in the colleges with a special focus on increasing the size of the professoriate in the basic colleges. The Committee was asked to present its recommendations on these matters to the Faculty Senate in its meeting scheduled for 12 November 2003. The Committee was also charged to work constructively to achieve these goals within the Committee on Funding Priorities.
3. For 2003-04, all members of the Financial Affairs Committee were to serve on the Committee on Funding Priorities. The Committee members should consider all appropriate issues as they relate to the well being and success of the University. The Committee members were asked to report back on the progress of the Committee on Funding Priorities in a timely and appropriate manner. Along with the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee, the Financial Affairs Committee was asked to carefully consider any suggestions for further improving the annual budget process, and to report back to the Senate on this by no later than 1 March 2004.
4. The Committee was asked to present recommendations on how to establish a meaningful participation by the academic sector in establishing priorities for investments in new buildings and facilities, and to report back on this matter to the Senate by no later than 1 March 2004.

Outcomes

1. The Committee Report on Merit Raises, Faculty Equity, and Investment in the Colleges was released in October 2003 and can be found on the Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Committees, Financial Affairs Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/financial_affairs/FACRep10-23-03.pdf

Resolutions adopted by the Senate, and subsequent actions on them, based on this Committee Report on Faculty Salaries, are given in Section VI of this Annual Report, resolutions # 5, 6, 7, and 8.

2. The Committee report on the Annual Budget Process was released in March 2004 and can be found on the Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Financial Affairs Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/financial_affairs/FACRep2-26-04.pdf

The failure in the 2003-04 discussions on the 2005 budget was the serious mismatch between the recommendations of the Committee on Funding Priorities (CFP) to the Budget Committee, and the resulting recommendations from the Budget Committee to the President. This Financial Affairs Committee report addressed these issues. Instead of discussing these in the Senate, the SAC raised the report's concerns about the process and outcomes of this year's budget directly with the President, and the following represents a summary of these discussions:

The particular concern was that, after an extensive effort by the CFP, its recommendations were diluted or reversed by the Budget Committee, essentially across the board. The funds recommended for the top priorities of the CFP were routinely diminished and the funding of items with a low priority was increased, often significantly. In some cases, items not considered by the CFP were funded by the Budget Committee. All of this was troubling to both the SAC and FAC, especially since all members of the Budget Committee also sat on the CFP.

It was understood that the CFP's role is to recommend priorities rather than craft a budget. It was agreed that there should be no surprises with significant items suddenly appearing in the Budget Committee's recommendations that had not been discussed in the CFP. It was agreed that the interface this year between the CFP and the subsequent recommendations of the Budget Committee could have been, and should have been, handled in a better way. To this end, it was agreed that there needed to be a longer period for possible reconciliation between the CFP and the Budget Committee before the budget is formally sent on to the President.

The following summarizes the positions of the President or SAC for each of the three substantive resolutions in the FAC report:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommends that the membership of the University Budget Committee be expanded to include the Chair of the Financial Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The President believed that this would open the door to other constituencies to also be represented on the Committee. While understanding this, SAC did not necessarily agree that other constituencies have the same standing as the faculty. The notion that the FAC Chair be added as an observer was also discussed.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommends that the final report of the Committee on Funding Priorities be made public before the budget is presented to the Board of Trustees.

Rather than release its final report to the Budget Committee, it was agreed that, at the end of the process, the CFP will release a written statement, including the possibility for minority reports,

about the budget recommended by the Budget Committee to the President. This will therefore allow any reconciliation between the initial reports of the CFP and the Budget Committee to be addressed while facilitating an opportunity to present greater transparency for the budget process, especially in those areas where disagreement exists.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommends that every effort be made to reconcile any differences between the recommendations of the Committee on Funding Priorities and the Budget Committee before the budget is submitted to the Board of Trustees.

It was agreed that the language in this resolution should be changed to delete “Board of Trustees” and insert in its place “President”.

3. The Committee report on Future Building Plans was released in April 2004 and can be found on the Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Financial Affairs Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/financial_affairs/FACRep-Space-Bldg4-14-04.pdf

This report was received too late to be considered by the 2003-04 Faculty Senate and so will be considered by the 2004-05 Faculty Senate.

6. Ad Hoc Information Services Policy Committee

Background

Last year, the Faculty Senate approved the disbandment of the University Technology Council and to replace it with a new standing committee of the Senate to address issues in information systems and telecommunication systems that are related to the teaching, research, and service functions of the academy. The generalized scope of operations for the new standing committee was as follows:

a. The Committee shall be concerned with all questions relating to the development, maintenance, security, and availability of information systems and infrastructures;

b. 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;

c. 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.

Such a change to create such a new committee also requires a vote of the faculty at large, and this is planned for later this academic year when all relevant changes to the Faculty Handbook are completed. In the interim, the Senate Agenda Committee established this Committee as an *ad hoc* committee of the Senate but pursuing its scope of operations as defined above.

Charge

The Senate Agenda Committee therefore asked the *Ad Hoc* Committee to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following charge:

1. To recommend the appropriate level of IT support for teaching in general, and for college-based teaching and support laboratories in particular.
2. To recommend the appropriate level of IT support for computational research and research training infrastructure on campus.
3. To review and make recommendations regarding convergent and emerging technologies including those on Campus and those in support of distance and mobile computing needs.

The Committee was asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 15 March 2004.

Outcomes

The Committee report on these charges was received in April 2004 and can be found on the Senate website at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_adhoc/info_systemspolicy/InfSystPolRep4-07-04.pdf

The report was unable to be considered by the 2003-04 Faculty Senate due to a lack of time. The report was considered by the 2004-05 Faculty Senate and details of the resolutions passed can be found in the minutes of 15 September 2004 and 22 September 2004 on the Faculty website at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings/2004-05/09/minutes09_15_04.pdf

and

<http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings/2004-05/09/minutes9-22-04.pdf>

7. Ad Hoc Library Operations and Policies Committee

Background

Last year, the Faculty Senate approved the creation of a new standing committee of the Senate – the Committee on Library Policies and Operations. Its scope and charge was approved by the Senate as:

- a) *The Committee will consist of seven faculty from across the University who collectively utilize the range of Library resources and services. In addition, the Dean & Director of the University Libraries shall serve as an ex officio member. To facilitate continuity of policies and responsiveness to faculty needs with respect to information resources, delivery, and utilization across the University, the Committee shall also establish continuing liaison with the Senate's Standing Academic Policy, Information Systems Policy, and Research Policy Oversight Committees.*
- b) *This Committee shall be concerned with policy issues involving libraries' strategic planning, infrastructures and resource adequacy, collections development and maintenance, program and service development, and other matters of concern to the faculty as the institution strives to achieve and retain status as a top one hundred teaching and research university.*

c) This Committee shall also act as a forum for discussion on matters related to the Libraries and may act as an advocate for the University Libraries.

Such a change to create such a new committee also requires a vote of the faculty at large and this is planned for later this academic year when all relevant changes to the Faculty Handbook are completed. In the interim, the Senate Agenda Committee established this Committee as an *ad hoc* committee of the Senate but pursuing its scope of operations as defined above.

In recent years, investments in our academic operations, especially in the basic colleges, have been limited. For example, the total operating budget for the University rose by 39% from \$282 million in fiscal 1998 to \$393 million in fiscal 2003. During this period, though, the library budget increased by just 9%, total basic college budgets rose by only 27.5%, but all other budgets rose by an average of 45%.

There is a growing realization that we must now look with some urgency at investments in the academic enterprise, especially in the basic colleges, if we are to sustain our rankings advance.

This year, therefore, consistent with this and our further advance towards top-100 status, the Senate Agenda Committee is presenting charges to its committees with a special focus on investments enhancing our academic reputation and on enhancing our academic endeavors to attract still higher caliber students, two critical elements for our progress towards top-100 status. The University Libraries, of course, play a vital role for both these critical elements.

Charge

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

1. The Committee will advise the Dean of Libraries on policies, strategic plans and operations of the Libraries.
2. The Committee will assess the state of the University Libraries, and prepare a report with recommendations on how they should be strengthened to better provide for the information resources and information literacy needs of faculty and students for their teaching, learning and research, consistent with our top-100 institutional goal. This report may include recommendations in the areas of space, facilities, staff, collections, services and technology and should be submitted to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than 1 November 2003 in order that any recommendations might be considered within this year's budget process.

Outcomes

The Committee report on these charges can be found on the Senate website (Archives, Committee on Library Policies and Operations, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_adhoc/lib_pol&operations/LibPols%2BOpsCmtRep10-23-03.pdf

Resolutions adopted by the Senate, and subsequent actions on them, based on the Committee Report are given in Section VI of this Annual Report, resolutions #9, 10, 11, and 12.

8. Ad Hoc Research Policy Oversight Committee

Background

Last year, the Faculty Senate voted to replace the Research Council with a new Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate – the Research Policy Oversight Committee. This was established to review and assess the direction and implementation of the University's research mission, advocate for its needs, review periodically and make recommendations on its research resources, infrastructures, and policies, serve as a research "ombuds-body" to address structural impediments and faculty complaints, and work with the Provost, the Senior Vice President for Administration & Finance, the Senior Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and the President to insure the best possible environment for research and scholarship. The Committee was to be composed of nine research-active faculty appointed for staggered three-year terms jointly by the Senate Agenda Committee and the Provost. In addition, the Vice Provost for Research and a representative of the President shall serve *ex officio* on the Committee.

Charge

For 2003-04, no specific charge was made to the Committee. Rather, it served as an advisory committee to the Provost to highlight critical areas for improvement and change.

III. SENATE INITIATIVES RESPONDING TO FACULTY CONCERNS

1. Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Revision Committee

Background

In 1999, the Senate Agenda Committee established a Faculty Handbook Revision Committee to update the *Faculty Handbook*. The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee grew out of a resolution passed by the Faculty Senate on 3 May 1999, that a committee be convened to rewrite the tenure and promotion sections of the *Faculty Handbook*. Subsequent discussions of the Agenda Committee with President Freeland led to agreement that this committee should review the entire *Handbook*.

In the Spring of 2001, the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee delivered a *Draft for a New Faculty Handbook*, details of which can be found in the Archives section of the Faculty Senate website at:

www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees02_03/senate_adhoc/handbook_review/handbookdraft.pdf

The draft was significantly different in format and content from the current operating *Faculty Handbook*. The 2000-01 Faculty Senate began deliberations on the new draft in the Spring quarter, but very serious concerns were raised about the draft both in the 2000-01 Faculty Senate and from the faculty generally. The 2000-01 year ended with the Senate deliberations unfinished on the *Draft for a New Faculty Handbook*.

The *Faculty Handbook* is an extremely important document addressing many legal issues, contractual obligations, property rights, and due processes. It is vital for the faculty that these not be compromised, eroded, or unwittingly changed in any way. Given the importance and complexity of the *Draft for a New Faculty Handbook*, and the extensive concerns raised with it, the 2001-02 Senate Agenda Committee decided to suspend further Faculty Senate discussions on the draft and to proceed in the interim by referring the draft to a new committee – the *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee. The purpose

of this Committee was to prepare a report that would facilitate an eventual Faculty Senate deliberation leading to a new *Faculty Handbook*.

Charge

The 2001-02 Senate Agenda Committee asked the *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee to carefully evaluate the *Draft of a New Faculty Handbook* (excluding the sections already acted on by the Senate) to ensure that the integrity and substance of the current operating *Faculty Handbook* and the *Operations Manual*, including any related changes subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate, was maintained, and to present a report that would facilitate a productive discussion in the Faculty Senate on this issue. The report was to address, but was not confined to, the following issues:

1. The identification of all substantive changes in material, either by addition or by deletion, not covered in the current *Faculty Handbook* and *Operations Manual*, but which has been approved by the Faculty Senate or promulgated by the Administration (with dates and details of these actions where possible).
2. The identification of all other changes in material, either by additions or deletion, not covered in the current *Faculty Handbook* and *Operations Manual*.
3. Within the items covered in (b), the identification of all material that might impact the collective faculty interests, and/or the integrity of the current operating *Faculty Handbook* and *Operations Manual*.
4. Make recommendations for Faculty Senate action on any or all of the above.
5. Make a recommendation on whether or not the current practice should be continued of having material germane to faculty interest contained in a separate *Faculty Handbook* and *Operations Manual*.

The Committee was originally asked to present its recommendations on these matters by no later than 25 January 2002. However, the task proved more extensive than originally anticipated. An *Interim Report on Section VI of the Handbook* was received in late Spring of 2002, but too late for consideration by the 2001-02 Faculty Senate.

During 2002-03, the Senate completed its initial deliberations on Section VI of the Handbook. The *Interim Report* is available in the Archives section on the Faculty Senate website at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees02_03/senate_adhoc/handbook_review/hb_interim_report.shtml

During 2003-04, the Senate completed its initial deliberations on eight resolutions concerning Sections IV and V of the *Faculty Handbook*. The resolutions adopted by the Senate, are given in Section VI of this Annual Report, resolutions #15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 25.

IV. OTHER SENATE AGENDA COMMITTEE ACTIONS

1. Faculty Workload Policy

Background:

Faculty workloads generally have three main components: teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service. It is the ongoing belief of many faculty that faculty workloads, and especially teaching loads, are high at Northeastern. There is also a growing sense that faculty workloads have grown steadily larger in recent years due to burgeoning administrative assignments and new management practices.

It is critical that Northeastern has competitive teaching loads in order to recruit and retain high-quality faculty, and to provide appropriate high-quality environments for teaching and research that are commensurate with our top-100 goal. Teaching loads that are too high may not yield the optimum educational experience for students, and will provide constraints for the accomplishment of high-quality research and scholarship. Such outcomes will affect our academic reputation.

The common measure for defining teaching loads is the number of courses taught per academic year. In using this measure, however, especially for comparisons with loads at other institutions, care must be taken to normalize for factors such as the number of credit hours involved (many institutions operate with three-credit courses rather than the four-credit course approach at Northeastern). In addition, many institutions provide additional weighting for courses with large student enrollments, and for graduate courses. At the academic unit level, it is recognized that teaching loads will vary by discipline and by factors such as the unit's activity in graduate and research programs. For individual faculty members, it is recognized that the weighting of the components of a faculty member's load may need to change over time to reflect activity levels in these.

Accordingly, the 2002-03 Faculty Development Committee was asked to develop a report on this issue with the following three-part charge:

1. Based on practices at other top-100 matchmate institutions, establish a measure or a set of measures (i.e., number of courses, number of students, class-time, etc.) by which teaching loads can reasonably be defined and compared.
2. Recommend a collegial process by which competitive teaching loads can be established for each unit.
3. Recommend a collegial process by which periodic reviews of individual faculty workloads can be made to ensure a faculty member's continuing development and to provide appropriate support and resources to that end.

The Committee was asked to report back on these matters by no later than 14 March, 2003. A preliminary Committee Report was received in May 2003. However, the Senate Agenda Committee asked the Faculty Development Committee to revise parts of its Report. The revised Report was subsequently received in June 2003, but too late to be considered by the 2002-03 Senate.

Outcomes

During 2003-04, the 2003-04 Senate Agenda Committee worked with the 2002-03 Faculty Development Committee and the Provost to address a number of issues on the proposed workload policy. In March 2004, the revised report of the 2002-03 Faculty Development Committee was released and the Senate Agenda Committee brought a resolution on workload policy to the Senate. The SAC's resolution was substantially in agreement with Faculty Development Committee report but with some important changes.

The report of the 2002-03 Faculty Development Committee on Workload Policy can be found at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees02_03/senate_standing/faculty_development/FDCWorkloadPolicyReport.pdf

The full text of the workload policy brought by SAC to the Senate, and approved by the Senate, is given in Section VI of this Annual Report in resolution #21.

2. Senate Search Procedures

Background

During the 2002-03 academic year, President Freeland shared a number of concerns with SAC that he had with the search procedures for academic administrators. His primary concerns were that he (and other senior academic administrators on occasions) should have greater involvement in establishing search committees, and that searches took too long. While SAC vigorously disagreed with both these premises, SAC did agree to work with the President and Provost to try to develop a draft for new search procedures for ultimate consideration by the Faculty Senate. This proved to be an extensive effort with many draft iterations between SAC and the President and Provost during the 2002-03 and 2003-04 academic years.

Outcome

Although no final agreement had been reached on the new draft between SAC and the administration, SAC was uncomfortable prolonging this effort further without feedback from the Senate. In April 2004, therefore, SAC brought the draft document on search procedures to the Senate; the draft document can be found on the Senate website (under Archives 2003-04, Senate Agenda Committee, Reports) at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/committees03_04/senate_standing/senate_agenda/AcadSchProced-for-Senate4-09-04.pdf

The outcome was that the vast majority of the elected and appointed members of the Senate preferred the existing procedures. The discussion is reported in the minutes of the 21 April 2004 and the associated report of the Committee of the Whole, found on the Senate website at:

http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings03_04/2003-2004/04/minutes04_21_04.pdf

V. COMMITTEES: MEMBERSHIPS AND OUTCOMES

1. Senate Standing Committees

Special Academic Policy Committee

Professor Gerald H. Herman, Chair (History)

Professor Arvin Grabel (Electrical & Computer Engineering)

Professor Nancy Kindelan (Theatre)

Professor Thomas O. Sherman (Mathematics)

Professor Edward G. Wertheim (CBA, Human Resources Management)

Professor William E. Wray (Arts & Sciences, Cooperative Education)

Vice Provost Malcolm D. Hill, *ex officio* (Undergraduate Education)

*Dean Jack R. Greene (College of Criminal Justice)

*Dean Stephen R. Zoloth (Bouvé College Health Sciences)

Special Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee

Professor Dennis R. Cokely, Chair (American Sign Language)
 Professor Brendan Bannister (CBA, Human Resources Management)
 Professor T. Anthony Jones (Sociology & Anthropology)
 Professor John H. Portz (Political Science)
 Professor Bahram Shafai (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Senior Vice President Philomena V. Mantella (Enrollment Management & Student Affairs)
 *Dean Larry A Finkelstein (Computer & Information Science)
 *Dean James R. Stellar (Arts & Sciences)

Special Faculty Development Committee

Professor Carol A. Glod, Chair (Nursing)
 Professor Anthony P. De Ritis (Music)
 Professor Thomas R. Gilbert (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
 Professor Ganesh Krishnamoorthy (CBA, Accounting)
 Professor Philip E. Serafim (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 *Dean Allen L. Soyster (Engineering)
 *Dean Ira R. Weiss (CBA)

Financial Affairs Committee

Professor Wesley W. Marple, Jr., Chair (CBA, Finance & Insurance)
 Professor Louis J. Kruger (Counseling & Applied Educational Psychology)
 Professor Hameed Metghalchi (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Michael T. Vaughn (Physics)
 Professor Bruce A. Wallin (Political Science)

* Indicates member of the Special Standing Committee but not the Standing Committee

2. Ad Hoc Senate Committees***Ad Hoc Information Systems Policy Committee***

Professor Arun Bansil, Chair (Physics)
 Professor Joseph Ayers (Biology, Marine Science Center)
 Professor Helen Connolly (Economics)
 Professor Anthony P. De Ritis (Music)
 Professor Robert P. Futrelle (Computer & Information Science)
 Professor Graham Jones (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
 Professor Eric L. Miller (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Carey M. Rappaport (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Mustafa R Yilmaz (CBA, Management Science)
 John W. Cipolla, Vice Provost, Graduate Education
 Leslie Hitch, Director, Academic Technology Services
 Linda D. Allen, University Registrar
 Robert Weir, Vice President, Information Services, *ex officio*
 John Guilfoil, SGA representative
 Bahar Bilgen, GPSA representative

***Ad Hoc* Library Policies and Operations Committee**

Professor John Casey, Chair (Computer & Information Science)
 Professor Mansoor M. Amiji (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
 Professor Arun Bansil (Physics)
 Professor Donna M. Bishop (Criminal Justice)
 Professor Gerald L. Bursey (Political Science)
 Professor Harlow L. Robinson (Modern Languages)
 Professor Ronald J. Willey (Chemical Engineering)
 Dean Edward Warro, *ex officio* (University Libraries)

***Ad Hoc* Research Policy Oversight Committee**

Provost Ahmed T. Abdelal, Co-Chair (Provost)
 Professor Robert P. Lowndes, Co-Chair, (Physics)
 Professor Ahmed Busnaina (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Matthias Felleisen (Computer & Information Science)
 Professor Jeffrey A. Hopwood (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Graham Jones (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
 Professor Barry L. Karger (Chemistry & Chemical Biology, and Barnett Institute)
 Professor Albert Sacco (Chemical Engineering)
 Professor Michael B. Silevitch (Electrical & Computer Engineering, and CenSSIS)
 Professor Srinivas Sridhar (Physics)
 Professor Vladimir P. Torchilin (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
 Professor Carol M. Warner (Biology)

3. Administrator Oversight Evaluation and Evaluation Committees**Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee**

2004-2005

Professor Gerald H. Herman, Chair (History)
 Professor Dana H. Brooks (Electrical & Computer Engineering), replaced A. Gabel 4/04/04
 Associate Dean Jeffery A. Born (Business Administration)
 Professor Elizabeth C. Cromley (Architecture)
 Professor Edward L. Jarroll (Special Assistant to Provost)

2003-2004

Professor Gerald H. Herman, Chair (History)
 Associate Dean Jeffery A. Born (Business Administration)
 Professor Elizabeth C. Cromley (Architecture)
 Professor Arvin Gabel (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Edward L. Jarroll (Special Assistant to Provost)

Committee to Evaluate Walter W. Buchanan, Director, School of Engineering

Professor Timothy J. Sage, Chair (Physics)
 Professor Sara J. Wadia-Fascetti (Civil & Environmental Engineering)
 Professor Nasser Fard (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Carl W. Nelson (CBA, General Management)

Dean Shirley M. Russo (Health Professions & Science, University College)

Status: Report released 20 May 2004.

Committee to Evaluate Jack R. Greene, Dean, Criminal Justice

Professor Robert A. Schatz, Chair (Pharmaceutical Sciences)

Professor Paul J. Bolster (CBA, Finance & Insurance)

Professor Joan Fitzgerald (School of Education)

Professor John G. Flym (Law)

Professor Thomas H. Koenig (Sociology & Anthropology)

Status: Report released 15 April 2004.

Committee to Evaluate Allen L. Soyster, Dean, Engineering

Professor Kenneth P. Baclawski, Chair (Computer & Information Science)

Professor Rae Andre (CBA, Human Resources Management)

Professor Jorge V. Jose (Physics)

Professor Robert C. McOwen (Mathematics)

Professor Carol M. Warner (Biology)

Status: Report released 20 May 2004.

Committee to Evaluate James R. Stellar Dean, Arts & Sciences

Professor James Molloy, Jr., Chair (CBA, General Management)

Professor Donna M. Bishop (Criminal Justice)

Professor Norman R. Boisse (Pharmaceutical Sciences)

Professor Hameed Metghalchi (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)

Professor Vladimir P. Torchilin (Pharmaceutical Sciences)

Status: Report released 1 June 2004.

Committee to Evaluate Edward Warro, Dean, University Libraries

Professor Inez Hedges, Chair (Modern Languages)

Professor Mansoor M. Amiji (Pharmaceutical Sciences)

Professor Graham Jones (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)

Professor Eric L. Miller (Electrical & Computer Engg)

Professor Timothy J. Rupert (CBA, Accounting)

Status: Report released 5 April 2004.

4. Ad Hoc Search Committees

CBA Dean Search (External)

Professor Gloria J. Barczak, Co-Chair (CBA, Marketing)

Professor Ravi Ramamurti, Co-Chair (CBA, General Management)

Professor Thomas M. Begley (CBA, HRM)

Professor Bruce H. Clark (CBA, Marketing)
 Dr. Neal Finnegan (Chairman, Board of Trustees)
 Professor John E. Kwoka, Jr. (Economics)
 Professor Mario Maletta (CBA, Accounting)
 Professor Shelia M. Puffer (CBA, General Management)
 Professor Don R. Rich (CBA, Finance & Insurance)
 Professor Marius M. Solomon (CBA, Management Science)
 Dean Stephen R. Zoloth (Bouv e)
 Mr. Allyson Savin, SGA Representative
 Mr. Paul Hammerstrand, GPSA Representative

Outcome: Dr. Thomas E. Moore, Vice President, Babson College, appointed Dean.

Law, Policy & Society Director Search Committee (Internal)

Professor Robert L. Hall, Chair (African American Studies)
 Professor Ballard C. Campbell (History)
 Professor Richard A. Daynard (Law)
 Professor James A. Fox (Criminal Justice)
 Professor Heidi Vernon (CBA, General Management)

Outcome: Professor Joan Fitzgerald appointed Director.

Mechanical & Industrial Engineering Chair Search Committee (External)

Professor George C. Adams, Chair (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Ramaiya Balachandra (CBA, Management Science)
 Professor Thomas P. Cullinane (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Hamid N. Nayeb Hashemi (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Mishac K. Yegian (Civil & Environmental Engineering)

Outcome: Professor Hameed Metghalchi appointed Chair.

Music Chair Search Committee (Internal)

Professor Leon C. Janikian, Chair (Music)
 Professor Allen G. Feinstein (Music)
 Professor Judith Tick (Music)
 Professor Don Edwin Lewis (Center for the Arts)
 Professor John Casey (Computer & Information Science)

Outcome: Professor Anthony P. De Ritis appointed Chair.

Philosophy & Religion Chair Search Committee (Internal)

Professor Stephen L. Nathanson, Chair (Philosophy & Religion)
 Professor William J. DeAngelis (Philosophy & Religion)
 Professor Laura L. Frader (History)
 Professor James R. Hackney (Law)
 Professor Patricia M. Illingworth (Philosophy & Religion)

Outcome: Professor Susan Setta appointed Chair.

Physics Chair Search Committee (Internal)

Professor Darien Wood, Chair (Physics)
 Professor Stephen W. McKnight (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Susan G. Powers-Lee (Biology)
 Professor Jeffrey B. Sokoloff (Physics)
 Professor Mark C. Williams (Physics)

Outcome: Professor Jorge V. Jose appointed Chair.

Political Science Chair Search Committee (Internal)

Professor William G. Mayer, Chair (Political Science)
 Professor Laura L. Frader (History)
 Professor Robert E. Gilbert (Political Science)
 Professor Richard O'Bryant (Political Science)
 Professor Marjorie Platt (CBA, Accounting)

Outcome: Professor John H. Portz appointed Chair.

Visual Arts Chair Search Committee (External)

Professor Thomas Starr, Chair (Visual Arts)
 Professor Ann M. Galligan, (Coop, Arts and Sciences)
 Professor Neal Rantoul, (Visual Arts)
 Professor John Casey (Computer & Information Science)
 Professor Don E. Lewis (Center for the Arts)

Outcome: Professor Kali Nikitas, Design Department Chair at Minneapolis College of Art and Design, appointed Chair.

5. Ad Hoc Mediation Committees

Grievance Committee #2

Professor Carol A. Glod, Chair (Nursing)
 Professor Anthony J. Devaney (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Thomas O. Sherman (Mathematics)

Grievance Committee #3

Professor Daniel J. Givelber, Chair (Law)
 Professor Christopher J. Bosso (Political Science)
 Professor Stephen G. Harkins (Psychology)

6. University Committees

Excellence in Teaching Awards Judging Committee

Professor Marilyn A. Cairns (Cardiopulmonary Sciences)
Professor Carol A. Glod (Nursing)
Professor Jeffery A. Hopwood (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
Professor Don E. Lewis (Center for the Arts)
Professor Uichiro Narusawa (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
Professor Peter S. Rosen (Earth & Environmental Sciences)
Professor Michael L. Woodnick (Communication Studies)

Interdisciplinary Writing Committee

Vice Provost Malcolm D. Hill, Chair (Undergraduate Education)
Professor Sharon M. Bruns (CBA, Accounting)
Professor Stephen D. Burgard (Journalism)
Professor John Casey (Computer & Information Science)
Professor Kathleen Kelly (English)
Professor Don Edwin Lewis (Center for the Arts)
Dean Mary E. Watson (School of Health Professions)

Klein Lectureship Committee

Professor Robert P. Lowndes, Chair (Physics)
Professor John W. Cipolla, Jr. (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
Professor Shelia M. Puffer (CBA, General Management)

Outcome: Professor Robert E. Gilbert, Department of Political Science, selected as the 2004 Klein University Lecturer.

University Standing Appeals Committee on Tenure

Professor Donna M. Bishop (Criminal Justice)
Professor Anthony J. Devaney (ECE)
Professor Robert Futrelle (Computer & Information Science)
Professor John E. Kwoka (Economics)
Professor Anthony Iarrobino, Co-Chair (Mathematics)
Professor Karl J. Lieberherr (Computer & Information Science)
Professor Mary Loeffelholz (English)
Professor William F. Miles (Political Science)
Professor Ronald Maurant (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
Professor David M. Phillips (Law)
Professor William Sanchez (Bouv e)
Professor Vladimir P. Torchilin (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
Professor Carol M. Warner (Biology)
Professor Mustafa R. Yilmaz, Co-Chair (CBA, Information Operations & Analysis)

VI. SENATE RESOLUTIONS AND OUTCOMES

10/08/03 0304-01. Department Name Change – Mechanical, Industrial, and Manufacturing Engineering to Mechanical and Industrial Engineering:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the proposal to change the name of the Department of Mechanical, Industrial, and Manufacturing Engineering to Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, as approved by the Department and the College of Engineering. (31-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 4/02/04. Approved by Trustees 4/29/04.

0304-02. 2002-03 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #1:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate accept the report of the 2002-03 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee. (31-0-0)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-03. 2002-03 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #2 – Enterprise Reporting System:

WHEREAS university data necessary for reporting and analysis is currently stored in separate administrative systems (i.e., Registrar, Human Resources, Admissions, etc.), making the integration of data across systems time consuming and inconsistent, and

WHEREAS the availability of data to the colleges and schools of the university for the purposes of reporting and analysis is limited due to the diffuse structure of our existing administrative systems,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the current Enterprise Reporting Project and the implementation of the first release of the system related to Registrar and Human Resource data scheduled for Fall of 2003. The Senate further encourages the administration to continue development of this project to include data from other key systems within the university and to enable the colleges and schools of the university to have access to reporting data that will inform academic planning and resource allocation. (31-0-0)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

10/22/03 0304-04. Resolution of Appreciation to President Freeland:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate wishes to express its gratitude and appreciation to President Freeland for coming to the Senate on 10/22/03 and engaging in an understanding dialogue on the common issues we face as a faculty and administration. (33-0-0)

Action by President: Approved “with thanks!” 11/04/03.

10/29/03 0304-05. Financial Affairs Committee Resolution #1 – Merit Raise Pool:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for a merit raise pool of 5% for continuing faculty in the Fiscal Year 2005. (30-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0303-06. Financial Affairs Committee Resolution #2 – Equity:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for \$1.6 million in Fiscal Year 2005 to close the currently identified market/equity gap between the salaries of NU faculty and faculty at peer institutions. (31-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04: “I do not believe the ‘gap’ is \$1.6 million and therefore disagree with the statement embedded in this resolution. The data showed the ‘gap’ to be more like \$480 Thousand.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-07. Financial Affairs Committee Resolution #3 – Increasing Size of the Professoriate:

WHEREAS, by any reasonable benchmark the University has too few tenure-track and tenured faculty relative to its number of students, and the current ratio jeopardizes the instructional and research goals as well as the academic reputation of the University,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee that the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty be increased each year until Northeastern achieves a ratio that is competitive with Tier II (*U.S. News and World Report* ranked institutions between 51 and 126) research universities by Fiscal Year 2008. (31-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04: “This is an appropriate aspiration provided we continue to make progress toward our top-100 goal.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-08. Financial Affairs Committee Resolution # 4 – College Non-salary Operating Funds:

WHEREAS, the basic Colleges (Arts and Sciences, Bouvé College of Health Sciences, Business Administration, Computer Science, Criminal Justice, and Engineering) have received insufficient non-salary operating funds to support high quality instruction and research,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee that the non-salary operating funds for the academic programs be increased by \$2 million each year during Fiscal Years 2005-08 in support of teaching, research and service. (31-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04: “I would need to see some evidence for this assertion before finding it persuasive.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-09. Ad Hoc Committee on Library Policies and Operations Resolution #1 – Remediating Library Operating Budget Shortfalls

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Committee on Library Policies and Operations that the University move immediately to remedy the Library’s budget shortfalls so that it can fulfill its critical mission of providing access to information for the Northeastern community by increasing the annual funding for library collections by a minimum of \$1,000,000 for FY05. (31-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04: “I share the goal of increasing the library budget.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-10. Ad Hoc Committee on Library Policies and Operations Resolution #2 – Increasing Funding for Library Collections and Operations:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Committee on Library Policies and Operations that the funding for library collections and operations be increased by an additional annual amount of \$1,000,000 for FY06. (31-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04: “I share the goal of increasing the library budget.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-11. Ad Hoc Committee on Library Policies and Operations Resolution #3 – Covering Inflationary Costs of Library Materials:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Committee on Library Policies and Operations that the University henceforth consider as a high priority additional funds annually to cover the inflation costs of library materials. (29-0-2)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04: “I share the goal of increasing the library budget.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-12. Ad Hoc Committee on Library Policies and Operations Resolution #4 – Open Access:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate urges the Committee on Library Policies and Operations to investigate increasing use of open access journals and other means to reduce the inflation rate for library materials. (29-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

11/12/04

0304-13. 2002-03 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #3 – Students at Risk:

WHEREAS, despite the fact that the University's retention efforts have effectively focused on systemic improvements like financial aid that drive improved University performance, individual students may still leave the University due to adjustment issues, academic support needs or dissatisfaction, and

WHEREAS, for these students active management of retention depends on the quality of timely identification of indicators of distress and individual-level intervention,

BE IT RESOLVED that the day colleges in concert with the Senior Vice President of Enrollment Management implement the following recommendations to further the University's current retention efforts:

- 1) Develop systems to identify students at risk for leaving Northeastern University, early in their academic program;
- 2) Develop rapid intervention systems to support students who are dissatisfied or distressed to avoid students transferring to another university;
- 3) Continue and expand exit interviews to develop a rapid feedback loop (using information obtained in the exit interviews) to identify and intervene with at-risk students. (26-2-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-14. 2002-03 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #4 – Annual Reports to the Senate:

WHEREAS, the Provost and the Senior Vice President of Enrollment Management are to continue to refine and implement the long-term admission and enrollment strategy that Northeastern University has formulated to allow Northeastern to achieve a ranking of “top 100” national research universities, and

WHEREAS, the Provost and the Senior Vice President of Enrollment Management review, on an ongoing basis, those issues identified as affecting student enrollment and refine Northeastern's strategies, in a timely manner as necessary, in order to enroll the most qualified student population,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost and the Senior Vice President of Enrollment Management report their findings to the Faculty Senate on an annual basis early in the fall semester. (28-0-1)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

11/19/03 0304-15. 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*. (19-0-2)

This resolution was reconsidered and re-voted (See #0304-18 below) on 1/14/04.

12/10/03 0304-16. SGA Resolution Requiring Online and Hardcopy Syllabi:

WHEREAS: The course syllabus is an essential component to instruction and a crucial piece to a student's academic outlook, AND

WHEREAS: The availability, circulation and distribution of course syllabi vary greatly among respective colleges, AND

WHEREAS: Northeastern University is committed to providing equal access for all students regardless of disability status, AND

WHEREAS: Northeastern University currently provides education and instruction for faculty at the Education Technology Center in programs that notably expand students' access to information such as Blackboard, AND

WHEREAS: Students' web access to course syllabi would greatly improve the level of communication between faculty and students and enhance the availability of information on and off campus, AND

WHEREAS: Students are not always able to make contact with their professors or instructors, to request information that might otherwise be available in a syllabus, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED: That every undergraduate course, lab, recitation, section adjunct, module, and seminar taught at Northeastern University provide an up-to-date online version of the syllabus, AND THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED: That 50% of syllabi per college (as defined above) be available via the internet by the end of the first full academic semester after this legislation is approved and 100% by the first academic semester thereafter, AND THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED: That each Academic department will maintain a directory of courses offered with access directions to each individual course's syllabus. This directory will reside both in the department's office and on its website. (24-1-4)

Action by President: Informational, 1/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

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: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

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: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

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: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

0304-20. Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Review Committee Resolution #4 – V.I (Tutoring):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section V.I (Tutoring) 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*. (35-0-2)

Action by President: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

3/10/04 **0304-21. Workload Policy Resolution:**

WHEREAS it is vital that Northeastern University establish competitive workloads and teaching loads in its quest for top-100 research university status,

AND WHEREAS the goal of such workloads and teaching loads must be to ensure equity while recognizing and supporting faculty members' diverse strengths, talents and contributions to the University,

BE IT RESOLVED that the following Workload Policy be implemented University-wide in the 2005-06 academic year, providing all resources necessary have been made available to the units concerned:

1. Matchmate Workloads

A normal workload for faculty at research universities includes instruction, research/scholarship/creative activities, and service. An equitable workload policy must emphasize equity of total workloads, rather than equity in one or two components of the workload.

Academic units vary in their contributions to the University mission ranging from units that focus primarily on undergraduate education to those with substantial graduate and research programs, and so it is understood that the components of the workload policy will vary from one unit to another.

The faculty of each department, school or similar unit, in consultation with the Dean of the College and the Provost, will designate matchmates for the academic unit and will establish the metrics of its own workload policy based on these matchmate comparisons. At the very least, the matchmate data must identify the mode, range, and average for the teaching load of each matchmate unit.

2. Teaching Loads

Each academic unit may define its teaching loads based upon the number of courses, the number of credit hours taught, or classroom contact time, as appropriate. Either way, academic units should allow for adjustments in teaching load for very large classes, writing-intensive courses, supervision of doctoral theses, research/scholarship/creative activity, high service loads, and the like.

3. Tenure-Track Faculty Workloads

Tenure-track faculty must meet the expectations of teaching, research, and service as articulated in the policy on promotion and tenure in the Faculty Handbook. Therefore, newly hired tenure-track assistant professors will be assigned a teaching load reduced by at least one four-credit course (or its equivalent in the unit) in each of their first two years at the University to provide the opportunity for developing their teaching and scholarly efforts. Furthermore, service expectations will be more limited than for tenured faculty.

4. Time Purchase

Faculty members with grants or contracts may purchase course or credit hour releases. The buyout, whether in terms of courses or credit hours, will be proportional to the normal teaching load of the unit and the weight placed on teaching relative to service and research/scholarship/creative activities and will be based on the faculty member's salary (including fringe benefits). This rate of purchase assumes that the faculty member will carry his/her normal service responsibilities. The rate of purchase will be set at a proportionately higher level for faculty seeking to purchase released time from both teaching and service. A complete buyout of teaching responsibilities is not normally possible for more than one academic year at a time. The funds used by a faculty member for time purchase will remain in the faculty member's department or equivalent unit. All time purchases are subject to the approval of the Dean of the School or College.

5. Merit and Equity Raises

The specific weighting of the components of a faculty member's workload must be followed in the determination of a merit or equity salary increase for the faculty member.

6. Workload Evaluation Committee

Every department or similar unit will establish in its bylaws a performance evaluation committee consisting of at least two members of the tenured faculty plus the department

chair or unit head. The committee members will be chosen by a method agreed to by the unit. On a periodic basis of no more than five years, as determined by the bylaws of the department or equivalent unit, the Workload Evaluation Committee will review the contributions and effectiveness of each faculty member in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities and service based on the matchmate data for workloads or teaching loads from comparable units and on information for each faculty member such as annual reviews, curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations, publication records, service activities and the like. After completing these reviews, the Workload Evaluation Committee will establish workloads for the faculty within the unit with respect to research/scholarship/creative activities, teaching and service. In making these individual determinations, the committee shall also take into account the cumulative impact of the individual assignments on the ability of the unit to fulfill its responsibilities to students and to the University, and identify any additional resources needed under the proposed assignments to carry out the unit's responsibilities. Each determination shall be made after consulting with the individual faculty member involved. Normally, this assignment shall be made with the consent of the faculty member. Each unit will also establish an appeals mechanism for faculty members who disagree with the workload profile established by the committee. Although the particular workloads may vary from person to person or from time to time, each faculty member is expected to contribute to some extent to each of the three areas. The individual workload assignment is formally made upon approval of the unit head and/or Dean of the College or School to which the individual is assigned. (27-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04: "Subject to commitment by Provost and Deans that this policy will increase rather than decrease coverage of sections by full-time faculty and that we will continue progress toward achieving agreed-upon percentage of section coverage by full-time faculty as part of implementing Academic Investment Plan." Approved by Trustees 6/04/04.

Response by SAC: The President's proviso given above was unacceptable to SAC because one interpretation of the language given in the proviso allowed for a key component of the resolution to be negated while retaining the rest. Assuming this was not meant, the SAC suggested the following language to the President for the proviso: "Subject to commitment by Provost and Deans that, in implementing this policy, course coverage by full-time faculty in any department will not be reduced. Rather, in any department, where match-mate data and review of offerings indicate a need to reduce the average teaching load, that such reduction will occur only through the addition of full-time faculty, contingent on budgetary availability and priorities. Furthermore, implementation of this policy should not negatively impact progress toward achieving agreed-upon percentage of overall section coverage by full-time faculty as part of implementing Academic Investment Plan." On 10/26/04, the Provost informed SAC that the President agreed with and accepted this clarification.

0304-22. Academic Policy Committee Resolution on Classroom Usage Patterns:

BE IT RESOLVED, as an operations premise, that the administration accepts that reasonable excess capacity in the general use classroom inventory must exist so that the University can properly align classroom configuration with pedagogical objectives.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recognizes that the ongoing shortage of appropriate classrooms, particularly in the 20-30 seat and 50-60 seat ranges, acts to inhibit curricular reform, teaching innovation, and student satisfaction. The Senate

therefore encourages the University administration to identify space not currently used for instruction, and, working in close consultation with faculty, design and quickly build as many state-of-the-art general use classrooms of these sizes as is practicable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate encourage the University to plan for further construction to relieve the overcrowding of the specialized classrooms and laboratories that now exist in various fields where increasing student demand cannot be met effectively due to classroom capacity limitations;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate encourages the Administration to develop coherent multi-year replacement programs and budgets to maintain the currency and operational readiness of classrooms and related instructional facilities and that it insure that appropriate numbers of fully cross-trained technical staff be available to support classrooms whenever they are being used. (25-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-23. Ad Hoc Handbook Review Committee Resolution #1 – Section IV.H (Conflict of Commitment and Interest):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section IV.H (Conflict of Commitment and Interest) presented in the Revised Draft (2/27/04) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*. (24-0-0)

Action by President: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

0304-24. Ad Hoc Handbook Review Committee Resolution #2 – Section IV.J.1 (Patent Policy):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section IV.J.1 (Patent Policy) presented in the Revised Draft (2/27/04) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*. (25-0-0)

Action by President: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

3/17/04

0304-25. Ad Hoc Handbook Review Committee Resolution #3 – Section IV (Copyright Policy):

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves Section V.J.2 (Copyright Policy) presented in the Revised Draft (2/27/04) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*. (26-0-0)

Action by President: Not sent to President, pending final Senate action.

0304-26. University College Renaming and Reorganization Resolution #1 – Rename UC to School of Professional and Continuing Studies:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the name of University College be changed to the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, to better reflect its primary role as Northeastern's continuing education college for adults and working professionals seeking part-time education. (25-0-1)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 4/29/04.

0304-27. University College Renaming and Reorganization Resolution #2 – Academic Council for Lifelong Learning:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Academic Council for Lifelong Learning be established and authorized to serve as the academic approval and oversight board for all undergraduate and graduate degree credit activities of the School of Professional and Continuing Studies. The membership and authority of the Academic Council for Lifelong Learning shall be:

1. Membership: The permanent members of the Academic Council for Lifelong Learning include the Vice President for Adult and Continuing Education (*ex officio*), the Associate Dean for Graduate and Professional Education of the School of Professional and Continuing Studies (*ex officio*), the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs (*ex officio*), and the Vice Provost for Graduate Education (*ex officio*). In addition, the committee membership shall include three Associate Deans, each from a different day College [including the Law School], selected by the Provost, and seven tenured faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee. The Associate Deans and the faculty shall serve staggered terms and may be reappointed. The Vice President for Adult and Continuing Education will serve as chair.

2. Scope of Authority and Responsibilities: The Academic Council for Lifelong Learning shall be responsible for conducting the academic business of the School, including such matters as the evaluation and approval of new credit-bearing courses and curricula, the review of existing courses and curricula, the review of existing degree programs and the review and recommendation of new degree programs, the permitting of academic variance, and other academic concerns. The Academic Council will be responsible for voting the granting of degrees, and as such it will review and approve the credentials of undergraduate and graduate students for the purpose of granting degrees. The Academic Council may establish its own internal processes and by-laws for how it will function and operate. (25-0-1)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 6/04/04.

0304-28. University College Renaming and Reorganization Resolution #3 – Authorization to Offer Degrees:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the School of Professional and Continuing Studies be authorized, as an independent college, to offer degrees. (26-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 6/04/04.

0304-29. University College Renaming and Reorganization Resolution #4 – Degree Oversight:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT where there is an existing or proposed accredited degree offered by University College (example: BSBA w/business), such degree may be offered by the renamed School of Professional and Continuing Studies in conjunction with a day-college, but the authority to offer such degrees, along with the oversight for those degrees, remains with the day college, unless the college that currently holds degree-granting authority agrees to relinquish its authority. (26-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 6/04/04.

0304-30. University College Renaming and Reorganization Resolution #5 – Degree Approval Process:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT new degree programs proposed by the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, must follow the approval processes of the university; however, the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council are authorized to develop and submit to the Senate for formal approval expedited approval processes for the designated lifelong learning degrees and credit bearing programs in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies which mirror the expedited approval processes already designed for University College undergraduate and graduate certificates. (26-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 6/04/04.

4/01/04

0304-31. Interdisciplinary Master of Science in Technological Entrepreneurship:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Interdisciplinary Master of Science in Technological Entrepreneurship as approved by the Graduate Council on 13 February 2004, to be offered in an appropriate academic unit. (29-6)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 4/29/04.

0303-32. Proposal to Establish a School of Technological Entrepreneurship:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposal of 4 February 2004 to establish a School of Technological Entrepreneurship. (24-11)

Action by President: Approved 4/05/04. Approved by Trustees 4/29/04.

4/07/04

0304-33. Interdisciplinary Master of Science in Information Assurance:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the Interdisciplinary Master of Science in Information Assurance proposed by the Colleges of Computer and Information Science and Criminal Justice as approved by the Graduate Council on 12 March 2004. (34-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04. Approved by Trustees “with 3-year review” 6/04/04.

0304-34. Clinical Doctorate in Physical Therapy:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Clinical Doctorate in Physical Therapy as approved by the Graduate Council on 12 March 2004. (35-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04. Approved by Trustees “with 3-year review” 6/04/04.

0304-35. Clinical Doctorate in Audiology:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Clinical Doctorate in Audiology as approved by the Graduate Council on 12 March 2004. (35-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04. Approved by Trustees “with 3-year review” 6/04/04.

0304-36. Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences as approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on 8 January 2004. (27-7-2)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04. Approved by Trustees “with 3-year review” 6/04/04.

4/08/04 0304-37. Creation of Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty Ranks :

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate endorse the establishment of the faculty ranks of Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Assistant Professor, with the duties, rights and responsibilities detailed in the proposal from the Office of the Provost, and to be included in the revised *Faculty Handbook* among Special Academic Appointments (section VI.C). (21-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 5/12/04. Approved by Trustees 6/04/04.

4/21/04 0304-38. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #1 – Interdisciplinary Programs:

WHEREAS, interdisciplinary initiatives within and across Colleges are a valuable recruiting vehicle for the still higher caliber students the University seeks to attract, and

WHEREAS, a number of interdisciplinary majors currently exist within the University, and

WHEREAS, a single source for promoting these interdisciplinary activities has not existed, and

WHEREAS, interdisciplinary activities between Colleges often present resource and programmatic challenges that require Provostial intervention; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend regular publication of a single University Interdisciplinary Studies promotional piece and that a single University-wide Interdisciplinary Studies web site be created.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that mechanisms be put in place at the University and College levels to inventory all interdisciplinary operations, assess their budgetary needs, and properly fund and support the programs. (28-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 11/15/04: “This is something I support in principle but any funding needed will need to come through appropriate budget channels.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-39. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #2 – Study Abroad:

WHEREAS, the number of students participating in study abroad has increased regularly, and

WHEREAS, study abroad opportunities are a valuable recruiting vehicle for the still higher caliber students the University seeks to attract, and

WHEREAS, the University must continue to provide these students with challenging and enriching study abroad opportunities; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that the current inventory of study abroad sites be expanded, when possible and practical.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That study abroad programs be strengthened and expanded through an expanded menu of initiatives including, but not limited to, faculty-led for-credit study trips, special summer programs made possible by the new academic calendar, and alumni/student study trips.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that representatives from the Office of International Study Programs and other internationally focused units on campus, such as the Bachelor of Science in International Business program, the International Student and Scholar Institute, and International Co-op, work together as a group in order to explore specific ways in which study abroad and other international activities could be strengthened and could benefit from the heightened synergies arising from such increased cooperation. (25-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 11/15/04: “This is something I support in principle but any funding needed must come through an appropriate budget process.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-40. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #3, first two parts – Honors Program:

WHEREAS, the Honors Program is a vital recruitment and retention vehicle for the higher caliber student that the University seeks to attract and retain, and

WHEREAS, the annual Honors cohort comprises slightly more than ten percent of the incoming fall freshman class, and

WHEREAS, Honors students will be required to take at least one Honors Seminar beginning in the 2004-05 academic year, and

WHEREAS, Honors Seminars provide opportunities for Honors students to have enhanced and enriched academic experiences with the University’s best faculty members, and

WHEREAS, the present number of Honors Seminars is insufficient to meet the projected demand for honors Seminars; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that the University provide the necessary support and encouragement to the Honors Program to double the annual offering of Honors Seminars by the 2005-06 academic year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that all academic units actively seek ways to support the Honors Program. (22-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 11/15/04: “This is an important goal to pursue; implementation will be dependent on availability of tenure/tenure track faculty to teach honors courses as well as budgetary resources.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-41. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #3, third part – Honors Program:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate encourage all day colleges to work toward making teaching an Honors Seminar part of a faculty member’s regular annual teaching load. (27-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 11/15/04: “I believe this is essential to achieve if we are to have a first rate Honors program.” Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-42. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #4 – Undergraduate Support for Grant Funding for Graduate Education:

WHEREAS, the undergraduate student population that the university is recruiting, admitting and retaining fits well the profile of students who will pursue graduate education, and

WHEREAS, the University seeks to expand the number of graduate students and programs, and

WHEREAS, supporting students who are seeking grant funding for their graduate education not only benefits the students but also fosters a positive image of the University; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that the Provost’s office actively implement measures to provide coordinated support for undergraduate students seeking grant funding for graduate education. (25-1-0)

Action by President: Approved 11/15/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-43. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #6 – Admissions Office and Provost Office Coordination on Academic Unit Carrying Capacity:

WHEREAS, each academic unit within the University at the departmental level has an annual instructional carrying capacity, and

WHEREAS, the faculty and facility resources within a unit can vary positively or negatively on an annual basis; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED That no later than November 1 of each year each academic Dean within the University provide the Provost's office with a projection of his or her respective college's carrying capacity for the upcoming academic year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Provost's Office work with the Admissions Office to incorporate these projections into the number of freshmen and transfer students that will be admitted to the unit for the upcoming academic year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That increases in enrollment from one student source should be accompanied by a concomitant decrease in other enrollment sources or by an appropriate reallocation of resources.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That if a unit's carrying capacity must be exceeded, then the Provost's office authorize allocation of all necessary and appropriate resources at the earliest possible moment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That said authorization, in anticipation of trustee approval of the overall budget, be given to the unit heads by the last week in January. In addition the University should work towards improving the alignment of its budgeting cycle with authorizations to hire. (25-0-0)

Action by President: Approved 11/15/04: "These are exactly the kinds of concerns that appropriately charged administrators must take into account in making decisions about admissions, transfer and enrollment." Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-44. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #7 – Transfer Students:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That such recommendations, if any, be submitted to the Faculty Senate no later than March 15, 2005. (25-0-0)

Action by President: Approved by President 11/15/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.

0304-45. 2003-04 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution #5 – Internationalizing Curricula:

WHEREAS, students are living in an increasingly internationalized world, and

WHEREAS, employers will increasingly expect recruits to have knowledge of other nations and cultures as well as global economic and political forces, and

WHEREAS, major universities in the US are already moving towards internationalized curricula, and

WHEREAS, the University needs to improve and protect its ability to attract the best students,

BE IT RESOLVED That steps should be taken to ensure that colleges be encouraged to put in place mechanisms to provide an international understanding of their field of specialization, an understanding of global processes in general, and knowledge of other cultures. These mechanisms may include, but shall not be limited to, a combination of curriculum requirements, special study projects, junior year research projects, and study/work abroad.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That any steps taken towards a common core curriculum for the University take into account the need to internationalize said curriculum. (15-5-1)

Action by President: Approved by President 11/15/04. Per Board Secretary, Trustee approval not required.