IRis

Northeastern University

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

January 01, 2003

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes : 04/21/2003

John G. Flym
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Flym, John G., "Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes : 04/21/2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes.* Paper 26.
http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d1000533x

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, 21 APRIL 2003

Present: (Professors) Alper, Alverson, Aroian, Baclawski, Bannister, Barnes, Brookins, Ellis, Flym, Hall, Hearn, Herman, Khaw, Lowndes, Metghalchi, Ondrechen, Platt, Powers-Lee, Serafim, Shafai, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wallin, Wertheim
(Administrators) Abdelal, Greene, Mantella, Meservey, Onan, Soyster, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bruns, Gilmore, Hope, Kane, Morrison, Sherman, Wray
(Administrators) Pantalone, Putnam, Stellar

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

I. **Minutes**. Consideration of the minutes of 14 April was postponed, as they had just been distributed.

II. **SAC Report**. Professor Lowndes reported the following.

A. **Meetings**. SAC met once in regular session since the last Senate meeting, and once with President Freeland and Provost Abdelal.

Professor Bedard, Chair of the CBA Faculty Policy Committee, had asked to attend part of the regularly scheduled meeting to discuss CBA concerns with UC's Management Studies baccalaureate programs. SAC shared with Professor Bedard the background on the new draft of proposed UC bylaws that would govern what is now an accredited Business program, and that at SAC's request, the Provost had agreed to send these to all CBA faculty for their input and action. The Senate may now have to act on two new resolutions. Because the resolution the Senate approved last spring was for a non-accredited program, another resolution would be needed to make it clear that UC would have the authority to offer an accredited Business Management program. The final version of the proposed UC bylaw revisions will also require Senate approval. The overriding concern is to ensure that the University gets accreditation in the best possible way.

The meeting with President Freeland and Provost Abdelal focused exclusively on academic search procedures. The President used the meeting to pursue his issues concerning the academic search procedures. The President believes he has too little input and that the existing procedures relying on elections, etc., are too time consuming. The Agenda Committee pointed out that the procedures have worked well for the last thirty years and moreover reflect a fine balance between faculty and administrator input that has been the essence of the strong collegiality that has shaped the University over this time. The Agenda Committee stressed that the deans, the Provost, and the President have tremendous access at the moment, barely balanced by the committee's role. They have the ability to pick the timing of the search, to define whether it is internal or external, to present a specific charge to the search committee that can explicitly define the kind of person and qualifications that they seek, and then to select the finalist of their choosing from a shortlist. All of this is substantial input that shapes and defines what the search committee must do. That is powerful input. It was agreed that SAC and the President will prepare position papers for possible improvements in the search procedures by May 1 in preparation for a longer meeting on May 16 on this issue. Whatever comes from the discussion will be brought to the Senate for approval.

B. **Next Senate Meeting: <u>Monday, April 28, at 11:45 a.m. in Raytheon</u>**.

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

A. **Semester Conversion**. Summer compensation, faculty contracts, and chair contracts still need attention. The conversion was expected to be budget-neutral, but that is not the case, so the remaining details are being addressed in an effort to make minimum impact on the budget.

B. **Procard**. Concerns that have arisen about procurement by faculty with research and grant contracts are being addressed by a new model, through which procurement in departments and colleges can be processed by a professional staff. This would relieve faculty of the responsibilities for accounting and paperwork they experienced under the Procard system.

IV. **Question and Discussion Time**

A. Professor Alverson asked how travel would be handled under the new system. Provost Abdelal responded that a system of reimbursement might work better than the Procard and that advancements should be possible.

B. Professor Hall asked where faculty might go for travel reimbursement. Provost Abdelal referred him to the Finance Office, which developed the procedures.

C. The floor was yielded to Professor McKnight who asked whether a faculty committee might be established to work with on implementation of the new system, as the Procard had provided considerable flexibility to researchers. Provost Abdelal replied that meetings would be held with deans and chairs with regard to what is in place and what is needed. A research-active faculty committee can be considered when a framework has been developed. Travel will come into the discussion in the second phase. Professor Alverson noted that faculty would want input in that area as well.

V. **Continuation of the *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee Report**. Resolution #10 was under discussion. It read as follows:

> **BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.A.9 (Promotion) 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 Morrison's motion, which had been seconded and was still on the floor, was to delete "or the majority" ***and "; the unit's procedures may require that all the committee members be full professors"*** (4/30/02 Revised Draft, p. 31, paragraph 2, sentence 2).

Discussion followed with strong support for the amendment. There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote on Professor Morrison's amendment: PASSED, 29-1-2.

Professor Ellis distributed the following text as a friendly amendment to replace section VI.A.9.a, paragraph 3:

> Promotion to full professor recognizes a faculty member's professional achievement at a level beyond that expected for promotion to associate professor and the expectation that this level of attainment will be sustained or exceeded in the future.

Vice Provost Meservey suggested that the date for candidates to notify their departments that they want to be considered for promotion be April 1 instead of May 1.

Professor Ellis noted that the May 1 date means May 1 of the previous year, adding that May 1 for the President's decision is a bit late. The current Handbook (p. 40) gives March 31 as the date for the last decision to be communicated by the Provost, which might be good to use under the semester system.

Vice Provost Meservey noted that in some years classes will end around April 30 and faculty may be gone soon thereafter.

Professor Ondrechen favored March 31 as the date for the candidate to apply for promotion.

Professor Onan thought the date should be earlier.

Professor Vaughn suggested April 15.

Professor Platt suggested March 1.

Professor Ellis indicated that he would accept March 31 for both procedures.

Professor Herman pointed out that the March 31 deadline has not been met for decades, but the May 1 date has been met more often than not.

Professor Ellis observed that the semester calendar will move up by a month so that March 31 would be even later by comparison.

Provost Abdelal recommended coupling tenure and promotion to bring them into the same cycle. Professor Herman responded that this would create a workload problem.

Professor Alper pointed out that the deadline for the department to advise a tenure candidate says May 1 in the 4/30/02 draft (p. 22). Professor Ellis replied that the dean has to advise the candidate by April 1 and the candidate has until May 1 to respond.

Motion. Professor Alper moved to change the date for the candidate to notify the unit head to initiate the promotion process (p. 31, paragraph 1) from May 1 to March 15.

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

Vote on Professor Alper's amendment: PASSED, 28-0-0.

Professor Ellis reminded the body that his friendly amendment, which had been accepted, was for March 31 to replace May 1 as the date for the President's decision to be forwarded to the candidate (p. 31, paragraph 4).

As there was no further discussion, the Senate turned to a vote on the main motion.

Vote on Resolution #10, as amended: PASSED, 30-0-0.

Professor Ellis moved Resolution #11, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

> **BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Sections VI.A.11.a (Sabbatical Leaves) and VI.A.11.b (Professional Leaves) 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 explained that the only change in this section was the deletion of the first paragraph (p. 33).

Motion. Professor Lowndes moved to change "an academic year" to "two semesters" (p. 32, last sentence). This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Herman noted that the University would have a hybrid system of term lengths next year, which could create confusion in some areas. Professor Ellis added that sabbatical leave policy had never been based on workload but on the calendar.

Discussion elicited some inconsistencies in the text. Professor Ellis withdrew his motion in order to return the section to the committee for further revision.

Professor Ellis moved Resolution #12, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

> **BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.A.12.a (Resignation and Abandonment) 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 reported that the committee had made no substantive changes to this section, but what is new defines the circumstances under which someone could be considered as having abandoned his or her position.

Professor Herman explained that the policy on abandonment had been developed about fourteen years ago in response to two tenured faculty members having disappeared for extended periods without notification. The department was hard-pressed to conduct their classes and deal with their students. The University then began a process by which positions could be declared vacant and abandoned, which would allow departments to hire other faculty.

Discussion followed on the number of weeks that should be allowed to elapse before the Provost can take action, such as two weeks or four weeks, or some other time period.

Provost Abdelal suggested that the focus be on teaching over other responsibilities to the University.

Professor Flym noted that willful abandonment should not be considered in the same way as absence due to illness or other emergency. Professor Ellis replied that exceptional circumstances were included in the wording.

Professor Sherwood pointed out that absence from a class was not the same as abandonment. Professor Herman agreed and added that all faculty, not just those with tenure, would be part of the process.

As time had run out, a motion was made to adjourn.

Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Flym
Secretary, Faculty Senate