

May 19, 2003

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 05/19/2003

Dee Vigeant
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Vigeant, Dee, "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 05/19/2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 30. <http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005377>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: DEE VIGEANT for THE SENATE AGENDA COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2002-2003 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 19 MAY 2003

Present: (Professors) Alper, Alverson, Aroian, Baclawski, Bannister, Barnes, Brookins, Ellis, Hall, Herman, Khaw, Lowndes, Metghalchi, Morrison, Ondrechen, Serafim, Shafai, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wallin, Wertheim, Wray
(Administrators) Abdelal, Mantella, Meservey, Onan, Pantalone, Soyster, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bruns, Flym, Gilmore, Hearn, Hope, Kane, Platt, Powers-Lee, Sherman
(Administrators) Greene, Putnam

Convened by Provost Abdelal at 12:02 p.m.

- I. **Minutes.** The minutes of May 5 were approved.
- II. **SAC Report.** Professor Lowndes reported the following.
 - A. **Meetings.** SAC has met twice since last week's Senate meeting, once in regular session and once later in the week with President Freeland and Provost Abdelal.

Meeting with the President and Provost. Discussion focused on search procedures. Drafts and proposals were exchanged, but no conclusions were reached; therefore, SAC would at the appropriate time move that item F on the agenda be postponed, as details are not ready to be shared.

SAC's Regular Meeting. SAC discussed the remaining reports, which are substantial. The Institutional Management Practices Report on Research Management will be sent out in advance of the June 2 agenda. Please note that this meeting will begin at approximately the usual time (11:45 a.m.) and may run as late as 2:30 p.m.

Organizational Meeting of the 2003-2004 Senate. This meeting will begin at 11:00 a.m. The sole agenda item will be the election of next year's Agenda Committee. Senators who are continuing should plan to attend both meetings.
 - B. **Resolution.** President Freeland approved the April 28 Resolution on Academic Standing, Probation, and Dismissal; Trustee approval is not necessary.
- III. **Provost's Report.** Provost Abdelal had no report.
- IV. **Question and Discussion Time.** There were no questions.
- V. **Criminal Justice Ph.D. Program Proposal.** Professor Sherwood moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Ph.D. in Criminology and Justice Policy in the College of Criminal Justice as approved by the University Graduate Council on 9 May 2003.

The floor was yielded to Professor Bishop and Associate Dean McDevitt.

Professor Bishop explained that no similar doctoral program is available in the New England area, and market analysis has indicated that a need exists for researchers and senior administrators trained in criminology and justice policy. The creation of this program is a top priority in the college's strategic plan to maintain academic prestige and to blend the doctoral program into the college's plans for faculty and student recruitment.

The master's program is only a one-year program, which presents a problem for researchers whose work extends to two or more years. The proposed doctoral program would help support faculty research, attract a more diverse student body, and expand outside funding.

Discussion followed. Items of concern included the following: training in quantitative methods; the timing of offering statistics courses and whether they should be required or elective; and the timing of qualifying exam requirements. Dean McDevitt agreed to take these, and other concerns mentioned in the external reviewers' letters, under advisement.

Professor Ondrechen asked whether high tech aspects would be included. Professor Bishop responded that the two tracks would include (1) causes and prevention of crime, and (2) justice policy with regard to police, courts and correction agencies, while forensics would be found in chemistry or biochemistry rather than criminal justice. Dean McDevitt added that the college was in the process of developing a funding base to address the high tech issue.

Professor Metghalchi expressed concern that the qualifying exam should be given earlier than the fourth year. Professor Bishop replied that it actually would be given at the end of the third year.

Professor Ondrechen asked whether three years of course work were the norm in that discipline. Provost Abdelal replied that more course work is the norm in the social sciences.

Dean Soyster noted that homeland security is becoming an area of interest. Dean McDevitt agreed and replied that Criminal Justice has been involved with the Institute on Security, the Olympics, and the Democratic Convention, which may prove fruitful in terms of future resources.

Dean Stellar pointed out that doctoral programs are expensive and offered to help Criminal Justice in making connections. He added that students should not have too much course work.

Professor Wray asked whether a course in ethics would be offered. Professor Bishop replied that it is part of the proposed curriculum. Dean McDevitt added that it is elective but perhaps should be required.

Professor Ondrechen asked whether people from various disciplines have been brought together to discuss homeland security. Provost Abdelal responded that some joint discussions have been held but more could be scheduled that would include CJ.

Dean Soyster asked how the six four-credit course sections would generate \$672,000 in additional tuition revenue. Provost Abdelal replied that funds would be shifted by having teaching assistants replace lecturers, and there would be a saving, but the budget still needed revision.

Dean Zoloth expressed concern about the large number of master's courses that would continue for doctoral students. He suggested eliminating some electives in favor of a stronger core for doctoral students.

Professor Onan asked whether a revised proposal would be brought to the Senate for a vote. Dean McDevitt replied that the proposal was intended for fall of 2004, which would allow time to advertise and refine the program. Professor Onan pointed out that the document passed by the Senate would be the defining one for action by the Board of Trustees.

Discussion ensued as to whether to bring the revised proposal back on June 2, as the Board meets on June 6.

Professor Ellis explained that the trustees require two weeks' notice for their agenda items. He recommended not waiting until almost the day of their meeting.

Professor Lowndes said there were two options beyond voting today on the resolution. First, he had been informed that the two-week rule might be waived by the Trustees on this matter, so that if the College of Criminal Justice could quickly make any changes they deemed necessary, the Senate could postpone the vote on the resolution until its June 2 meeting and still make the Board's Academic Affairs Committee meeting on June 5. Second, if more time was needed to make the changes, then the Senate could postpone the matter until September with perhaps little impact, since the program was not due to commence until the fall of 2004.

Professor Sherwood urged support of the proposal because its concept was unique and because it would make a difference in terms of having a product to offer prospective students and the new faculty who will be coming to campus in the fall. Professor Onan agreed that the proposal was worthy of support and indicated that she would vote for it on condition that the Provost review the revised version by the end of the summer.

Dean Stellar suggested that the Budget Narrative be revised to indicate that new revenue should not be expected, that the Provost make the recommended changes, and that the Agenda Committee review the other items, such as revised exam dates, less course work, and more research work with new faculty. He would then be willing to vote in favor of the proposed program.

Motion. Professor Herman moved to postpone discussion until June 2, and the motion was seconded.

Professor Alper asked whether the proposal would have to go back to the Graduate Council. Provost Abdelal replied that it would not.

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

Vote to postpone: PASSED by unanimous voice vote, 28-0-0.

VI. **Quasi Committee of the Whole: Search Procedures.** With no objection, this item was postponed until a report is ready for the Senate to consider.

VII. **Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Review Committee Report**

Resolution #12, still on the floor from the previous meeting, 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*.

Motion. Professor Metghalchi moved to amend page 2, paragraph 2 by the addition of "on or before November 15", and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Discussion followed on whether to formalize a policy document or put guidelines in a procedural manual. Senators generally agreed that the latter was preferable.

Motion. Professor Onan moved to delete part of item b on page 3, which read, "While the time on such leave does not typically count toward tenure in the case of untenured faculty," and to add at the end of the remaining portion of that sentence, "and implications for tenure consideration and sabbatical eligibility, as appropriate." The sentence would then read, "The letter granting the leave should specify any expectations for research during the leave year and implications for tenure consideration and sabbatical eligibility, as appropriate."

Professor Sherwood asked whether the presumption was that this type of leave would count toward tenure. Professor Onan replied that it would be neutral in terms of presumption.

Professor Herman added that professional leaves vary and are awarded on a case-by-case basis.

Professor Sherwood wondered whether an applicant could be penalized by being told the leave would count toward tenure. Provost Abdelal replied that this could be a difficult area. His sense was that it should not count toward tenure unless specified. A professional leave is an opportunity to enhance professional development without teaching or service, but the challenge to achieve the right balance of teaching, research, and service is also important.

With regard to the tenure clock, Professor Ellis reminded the Senate that it had previously approved the following text in section VI.A.8.e of the 4/30/02 Revised Draft: "A faculty member who has taken a leave of a full academic term or more from his or her academic position during the academic year may request a one year delay in tenure consideration. This request is made through the unit head and dean to the Provost. In the case of maternity leave the request for tenure delay will be automatically approved and there will be no expectation of scholarship in the year in which the leave is taken. In the case of other leaves, the unit head, dean and the Provost must all approve the delay for it to be granted. The amount of scholarship the faculty member is expected to undertake during the additional year will be described in the letter from the Provost granting the delay."

Dean Stellar pointed out that many use post docs to get external letters in support of their tenure, adding that he, too, favored case-by-case analysis in granting leaves.

Professor Lowndes agreed that anyone on tenure track who takes a leave has an advantage and added that Professor Onan's motion allowed for a fair and level playing field.

Professor Morrison noted that some faculty do not return after a leave. Professor Ellis noted that he had surveyed a number of other institutions, all of which rule that faculty are due back after a year, whether on paid leave or not.

Motion. Professor Morrison moved to delete the following sentence: "Unless otherwise specified in the letter granting the leave, faculty on professional leave must return to the University for at least one academic year after completion of the leave." The motion was seconded.

Vice Provost Meservey explained that a one-year professional leave has an option for an additional year's renewal, restricted to two years. She agreed to check on the fringe benefits.

Professor Herman noted that some faculty have had to repay the University.

Vote on Professor Morrison's amendment: FAILED, 8-17-3.

Vote on Resolution #12, as amended: PASSED, 26-1-1.

Adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dee Vigeant
for the Agenda Committee