

April 14, 2003

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/14/2003

John G. Flyn
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Flyn, John G., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/14/2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 25.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005328>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: JOHN G. FLYM, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2002-2003 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 14 APRIL 2003

Present: (Professors) Alper, Alverson, Aroian, Baclawski, Bannister, Barnes, Brookins, Bruns, Ellis, Flym, Gilmore, Hall, Herman, Khaw, Kane, Lowndes, Metghalchi, Morrison, Ondrechen, Platt, Powers-Lee, Serafim, Shafai, Sherman, Sherwood, Wallin, Wray
(Administrators) Abdelal, Meservey, Onan, Pantalone, Stellar

Absent: (Professors) Hearn, Hope, Vaughn, Wertheim
(Administrators) Greene, Mantella, Putnam, Soyster, Zoloth

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

- I. **Minutes.** The minutes of 31 March were approved.
- II. **SAC Report.** Professor Lowndes reported the following.
 - A. **Meetings.** SAC met twice since the last Senate meeting. The Senate has a great deal of business to cover before the end of the year. We will try to send materials well in advance, but in some cases only a few days for review will be possible, and action must be swift due to the necessity for certain matters to also be considered by the Trustee at their scheduled meetings. We apologize in advance therefore for the short notice in distributing some of these materials.
 - B. **Proposed Bylaw Change in University College.** Last year's Senate approved resolutions granting separate degree-granting authority to UC, and specifically for a non-accredited BS in Management Studies. At that time, the accreditation rules of the AACSB, CBA's accrediting body, allowed for business programs to be accredited by unit rather than by institution as in earlier times. However, in late June, the AACSB subsequently changed its rules back to accrediting at the institution level again. This change has led to some consternation because CBA is due to be accredited next year, and its self-evaluation is under way. SAC received a draft document last week entitled "Proposed Bylaws of University College for Establishing a Business Administration Governing Faculty," which embraces the notion that UC now be allowed to offer accredited business programs. SAC has asked that the CBA faculty review the proposal and take a position on it before it proceeds any further.
 - C. **Proposed Transfer of Special Education Programs.** SAC has received a proposal to transfer the graduate, undergraduate, and certificate programs in Special Education in Bouvé's Department of Counseling and Applied Psychology to the School of Education in the College of Arts and Sciences. As soon as the Arts and Sciences College Council approves the proposed transfer, the proposal will be brought to the Senate for its consideration.
 - D. **Proposed Semester Conversion Resolution on Academic Standing Probation and Dismissal Policies.** SAC received a draft proposal on this last week. SAC will send the final proposal to the Academic Policy Committee for its review, and providing their report can be done quickly, SAC will schedule this for the Senate agenda on April 28, in time to meet the April 30 catalogue deadline.
 - E. **Institutional Management Practices Committee Reports.** The report from the Committee on Institutional Management Practices on its evaluation of Information Services has been received and will be on next week's Senate agenda. SAC has also received a draft of this Committee's report on Research Infrastructure and this will also be coming to the Senate in the near future.

F. **Biotechnology Masters Degree.** Professor Lowndes indicated that he would, at the appropriate time, move to change today's agenda to bring forward the item on a proposed Masters degree in Biotechnology for consideration as soon as the Handbook motion on tenure was completed.

G. **Next Senate Meeting: Monday, April 21, at 11:45 a.m. in Raytheon**

III. **Provost's Report.** Provost Abdelal reported the following.

A. **CBA Accreditation.** Although it had appeared before last June that we could seek accreditation of CBA independent of the part-time programs offered by University College, this is no longer the case. The University as a whole is considered for accreditation so that any Business programs we offer, regardless of where they are located, will have to be part of the review. Provost Abdelal emphasized that a committee composed of CBA and UC leaders is working toward the goal of meeting accreditation standards when the site visit team arrives in January. He assured the body that additional resources would be available to fill the required number of full-time positions.

B. **Matchmate Process.** The matchmate process is complete. Provost Abdelal's office has all the data, and the colleges are working on their recommendations. After determining the gap, \$1.25M will be incorporated. It is also important that in a number of cases, at full professor or assistant professor rank, there was a positive rather than negative difference due to hiring faculty at competitive salaries. When calculating the gap the positive difference was not included. The term "net deficit" comes from adding all the deficits where they exist in a rank in a department. The net deficit is \$2.6M. The new positive is \$1.3M for the professor and assistant professor ranks.

IV. **Question and Discussion Time.**

A. Professor Sherwood asked about the associate professor rank, which was not mentioned in the Provost's discussion of the matchmate study. Provost Abdelal responded that the deficit usually is at that rank. He had sent general guidelines with the understanding that money intended for a department should be used for that department, unless the college can provide convincing reasons otherwise.

B. Professor Bruns expressed concern about the University College issue and accreditation in CBA. She recalled that the Senate had voted last spring to give University College the right to offer a bachelor's degree in management. This was approved by the Trustees, contingent on a positive AACSB decision. Since the decision was negative, does UC have the right to offer the degree or must another vote be taken? Provost Abdelal responded that he has been focused on the resource issue in order to meet the standards for full-time faculty. Assuming that UC is operating as a separate entity until further action is taken, we have to figure out how it is going to be governed, hence the proposal for bylaws, which will come to the Senate.

Vice Provost Meservey added that the group that crafted the bylaws--Deans Weiss and Born and Professor Molloy from CBA, and Deans Stoessel and Leach from UC--designed a model of governance that would allow UC to move forward in developing curricula. Some of its language comes from the AACSB regulations in terms of faculty who are academically and professionally qualified to have the principal oversight of curricula. Also included are qualified full-time academic professionals within UC and participating faculty, some of whom are part-time but are long-term contributors to UC programs. The group tried to balance the need for a unit to move in a direction different from our other colleges with the need to safeguard the unit's academic quality. New programs would still come through the UCC or the Graduate Council, just as other college programs do.

Provost Abdelal noted that the expertise in Business Administration resides in the College of Business. He and Dean Weiss had agreed that, regardless how it is accomplished, accreditation is a unified process in which the leadership of both CBA and UC would be involved.

Professor Bruns recalled that the Senate had made an important decision regarding accreditation in its legislation last year predicated on one set of factors. Since those factors have changed, she wondered whether it would be necessary to have another vote.

Professor Lowndes noted that, while the Trustees' caveat was somewhat ambiguous, the preamble to the resolution was not. It read,

WHEREAS,

- **the intent is to offer separate University College business degree programs**
- **the details of implementing this separation need to be refined**
- **new UC students who wish to matriculate into a bachelor's level business degree will need to be entered into non-AACSB accredited business programs**

His understanding was that existing programs could continue and that oversight of existing programs would continue to be with CBA. In question is whether UC can proceed with the new bachelor's degree. The Agenda Committee needs to consider the matter, and perhaps University Counsel should be consulted with regard to context. It is important for the University that accreditation be attained. He also urged that the CBA faculty be fully informed and have the opportunity to take a vote.

- V. ***Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Review Committee Report***. Discussion continued on Resolution #9, which read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.A.8 (Tenure) presented in the Revised Draft (4/30/02), as amended, from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Professor Wallin asked about the implications of the Family Leave Act upon the tenure process. Professor Ellis explained that the committee had considered it. Maternity leave is the only one where extension of the time to tenure is automatic, but the section allows for this to occur with other kinds of leaves. Professor Herman added that some of the standards for maternity and parental leaves were negotiated a couple of years ago by the Women's Advisory Committee and the Provost. At issue is the effect on the "tenure clock" if the leave extends beyond a term.

Motion. Professor Herman called the question but withdrew the motion in deference to Professor Onan.

Professor Onan cited the sentence that read, "If the candidate does not meet the escrow requirement within ninety (90) calendar days of submitting the written request for arbitration to the Provost, the Provost will notify the candidate that the request for arbitration is deemed to be withdrawn" (1/22/03 Revised Draft, section d.2)(b), p. 12). She thought ninety days too long.

Motion. Professor Onan moved to replace "ninety (90) days" with "thirty (30) days", and the motion was seconded.

Professor Onan expressed concern about the last sentence in the first paragraph of section (d) (p. 12), which read, "The parties may be represented by outside counsel during arbitration proceedings." Professor Ondrechen noted that the University has brought in outside counsel and therefore the candidate should have the same option. Professors Ellis and Herman each emphasized that faculty members have always had the right to outside counsel in arbitration.

Professor Ellis explained that, in passing the grievance procedure (VI.A.7, 4/30/02 Revised Draft, p. 17), this Senate had already approved the language specifying ninety days.

Professor Herman noted that ninety days would be consistent with other arbitration timelines. Professor Onan countered that tenure cases differ from other arbitration cases because their outcomes dictate whether one will have a continuing relationship with the University. Therefore, they should be handled in a timelier manner.

Vote on Professor Onan's amendment: FAILED, 10-19.

Motion. Professor Lowndes called the question, and the motion was seconded.

Vote on cloture: PASSED, 24-2-1.

Professor Ellis read the changes that the Senate had approved previously.

Vote on Resolution #9, as amended: PASSED, 30-0-1.

- VI. **Motion**. Professor Lowndes moved to reorder the agenda in order to consider the Biotechnology proposal after the vote on Handbook Resolution #9, to be followed by the remainder of the Handbook resolutions. There was no objection.
- VII. **Proposed Multi-track Professional Masters Degree in Biotechnology**. Professor Powers-Lee moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Multi-track Professional Masters Degree in Biotechnology as approved by the Graduate Council on 14 March 2003.

Professor Powers-Lee yielded the floor to Professor Jarroll who yielded to Professor Amiji.

Professor Amiji provided a brief summary of the multi-track program.

Discussion focused on the method of admission to the program. Professor Amiji referred to page 8 of the proposal, which outlined the admissions process. He emphasized that the program initially would be administered by an admissions committee of faculty from the three participating colleges.

Professor Metghalchi noted that the table on page 7 indicated that two spring courses would end in the middle of a term. Professor Amiji replied that it had been necessary to carve a mid-spring to end-of-summer internship, but many of the students will come from biotech companies and there will be flexibility in the program over three years.

Professor Metghalchi asked whether a thesis would be required, and Professor Amiji replied that a thesis would not be required.

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

Vote: PASSED, 29-0.

Dean Stellar expressed thanks to Professors Lee, Detrich, Amiji, and Jarroll.

VIII. Additional Questions and Discussion.

Professor Ondrechen asked whether the goal was for all programs to be accredited, including those in UC. Provost Abdelal responded that it had not been the goal a year ago when it was believed that the accrediting organization would be willing to consider a full-time program independent of the part-time program. Since the AACSB was not willing to consider that, the goal is now to have full accreditation of all programs.

Professor Metghalchi expressed concern that departments with recently hired chairs would be penalized in terms of the matchmate process. Provost Abdelal replied that the analysis was complex. We are competing with other universities who also have named chairs in their averages, and we need to be open to nuances in making allocations that can be justified.

Professor Sherwood pointed out that a chair's salary was a drastic leap and urged that accommodation be made. Provost Abdelal responded that we would not meet the gap of \$2.6M this year, as we have only \$1M, but there are other opportunities to make corrections. He added that the guidelines are reasonable, and if deans make persuasive arguments he will be open to them.

IX. Continuation of the *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee Report. Professor Ellis moved Resolution #10, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.A.9 (Promotion) presented in the Revised Draft (4/30/02) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Professor Ellis had distributed changes to the Promotion section of the 4/30/02 Draft. These read as follows:

Section VI.A.9.b -- **Insert** new final paragraph (from current Faculty Handbook II.C.2.f [p. 40]):

The unit Promotion Committee, acting on a two-thirds vote from those faculty members eligible to serve on the unit Promotion Committee, may appeal any promotion decision that goes against its recommendation. In such a case, the Provost must refer the decision to an *ad hoc* committee of scholars composed of members not affiliated with the University who are specialists in the candidate's field. This committee shall be composed of not less than three nor more than seven scholars jointly agreed to by the Provost and the unit Promotion Committee. The *ad hoc* committee's decision shall be accepted as binding on the Provost (4/30/02 Revised Draft, p. 31).

Section VI.A.9.c -- **Replace** first paragraph with (parallel to language approved in VI.A.8.h, tenure procedure):

The Provost is responsible for assuring proper processing of promotion cases, including maintenance and return of dossiers. If a candidate or others directly involved in the promotion process become concerned that the University, college, school, and/or unit promotion procedures have not been followed, they must contact the Provost. The Provost will determine whatever steps are reasonable and appropriate to insure that the promotion process is followed in a fair and timely manner by the relevant individuals and committees and communicate these steps to all parties involved.

Professor Ellis pointed out that, where the current handbook is silent on the issue, this revised section recognizes that promotion to full professor entails a higher level of expectation than promotion to associate professor.

He emphasized that the inserted final paragraph answers concerns raised in earlier Senate discussions. This language maintains the promotion appeal process currently in effect. The changes in Section VI.A.9.c make it consistent with what was just approved in the tenure section.

Professor Alper suggested that the inserted material on appeals would work only if the promotion committee is informed of the results at the various levels. Professor Ellis replied that he would accept this as a friendly amendment.

Professor Herman suggested adding, "for information purposes" after "should be provided to the Promotion Committee".

Discussion continued on whether the May 1 deadline should be changed because, under the semester system, May 1 will fall at or after the end of the spring term. Professor Herman replied that nontenure promotion cases are handled after tenure cases, and while another deadline might be set, it would not be met.

Professor Ellis observed that there are no published deadlines about exactly when contracts for the next year are issued and must be signed. Vice Provost Meservey reported that under the semester system faculty contracts will be issued in early April with a return date of April 30.

Professor Lowndes pointed out that the schedule is unavoidably tight and queuing is inevitable because it is not known which of the cases that come to the Provost's Office will be approved. He suggested that ten days might be overly optimistic.

Professor Bruns asked why the second paragraph on page 31 stipulated that "all or the majority of the committee members must be full professors". Professor Ellis responded that it is left to the unit to decide, and some units feel that one promotion committee can do it all.

Professor Herman spoke to the two issues. He explained that the committee had extended the deadline as far as possible, with the understanding that, if an appeal is registered and finally concluded, a revised contract can be issued. On the matter of promotion committees, he pointed out that departments that have only two full professors may prefer not to go outside the department, and some departments feel that an all-purpose promotion committee is sufficient. The Handbook Review Committee, not wanting to tread too heavily on the existing practices of individual departments, had created a minimum threshold beyond which they can go if they think it appropriate.

Motion. Professor Morrison moved to amend by deletion of "or the majority" on page 31, second paragraph, line 3, and the motion was seconded.

Motion. Professor Morrison also moved to delete the following text from that sentence: "the unit's procedures may require that all the committee members be full professors".

As time had run out, the Senate adjourned.

Adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Flym, Secretary
Faculty Senate

