

June 02, 2003

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 06/02/2003

John G. Flyn
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Flyn, John G., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 06/02/2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 31.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005389>

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, 2 JUNE 2003

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

Convened by Provost Abdelal at 11:52 a.m.

I. **Minutes.** The minutes of May 12 and May 19 were approved.

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

A. **2003-04 Senate Agenda Committee:**

The following Senators were elected to the Agenda Committee at the organizational meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate:

Senate Vice Chair/SAC Chair: Professor Robert P. Lowndes (Physics)

Secretary: Professor Charles H. Ellis, Jr. (Biology)

Members: Professor Thomas A. Barnes (Cardiopulmonary Sciences)
Professor Sharon M. Bruns (Accounting)
Professor John G. Flym (Law)
Professor Steven A. Morrison (Economics)

B. **Meetings.** In SAC's meeting with the President and Provost two weeks ago, SAC had asked that the process started last year by agreement between SAC and the President to return to the process used in earlier times, where the administrators appointed were in leadership positions but with faculty rank. SAC specifically asked that the number of academic deans be increased to six from the four this year and the two last year. SAC was very pleased to learn that this was accepted and that all of next year's appointed members are of faculty rank and include six college deans.

SAC has met three times since the last Senate meeting, twice in regular session and once with the Deans Council. The meeting with the Deans Council explored ways by which greater collaboration and communication between the Senate and the Deans Council might be fostered. It also discussed possible common strategic issues for next year's Senate; establishing a more open budget process and a focus on teaching and learning were two issues raised as important issues.

C. **New Programs.** SAC has approved the following Certificates of Advanced Graduate Study in the School of Nursing:

Acute Care Nurse Practitioner
Community/Public Health Nursing
Neonatal Nurse Practitioner
Nursing Administration

Nurse Anesthesia
 Primary Care Nursing - Adult, Pediatric, and Family Nurse Practitioner
 Psychiatric/Mental Health Clinical Nurse Specialist
 Psychiatric/Mental Health Nurse Practitioner

- D. **2003-04 Senate Meetings.** Next year, Senate meetings will be held in the Wednesday activities hour, from 11:45-1:25. The first meeting is scheduled for either Wednesday, 24 September or Wednesday 8 October. All meetings save one will be in Raytheon. A full schedule will be sent to continuing Senators very shortly.
- E. Professor Lowndes concluded by expressing his appreciation to the members of the Senate for their support throughout the year in furthering the progress of what has been a very extensive agenda. He also thanked Provost Abdelal for his careful handling of Senate discussions and for his collegial participation in Senate matters.
- III. **Provost's Report.** Provost Abdelal also thanked Senators for all their contributions. He particularly enjoyed the weekly discussions and indicated that he looks forward to a continuation of the collegial approach to dealing with issues.
- IV. **Question and Discussion Time**

Professor Hall noted that Professor Panford, Chair of the African-American Studies Department, had been appointed Vice Provost for Access Programs, and he expressed concern that Professor Panford would fill both positions on a half-time basis without further consultation with the Department. Provost Abdelal responded that his office had been seeking a tenured faculty member who would be willing to contribute a portion of his or her time to the new position, and he was pleased to appoint Professor Panford. He added that he liked the model of having tenured faculty take on additional roles within the University.

- V. **Criminal Justice Ph.D. Program Proposal.** Professor Sherwood moved the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Ph.D. in Criminology and Justice Policy in the College of Criminal Justice.

The motion was seconded, and the floor was yielded to Professor Bishop.

Professor Bishop reported that the proposal had been revised based on the Senate's May 19 recommendations.

Professor Fox briefly described the revisions, which included an outline of the Statistics/Method Sequence, an additional required course, and a revised budget-financial analysis.

In response to questions from Senators, Professor Fox explained that six new faculty have been hired for the fall term, that Criminal Justice is in good terrain for mapping technologies, and that he has done some work with artificial intelligence, data mining, and early warning systems. Also, he was confident that the quantitative and qualitative research methods courses are adequate.

Dean Greene thanked the Senate for raising issues at the last meeting that were of help in further polishing the proposal. He addressed the three topics that had caused concern - qualifying exams, interdisciplinary partnerships, and the budget. On the issue of qualifying exams, he explained that students would be evaluated annually by a faculty committee. This would afford two or three revisits of their progress toward candidacy. Students who already have a master's degree may take less time. The College of Criminal Justice is comfortable in adhering to the national norm for criminology and criminal justice comprehensive exams to be taken three years from a baccalaureate degree.

Dean Greene reported that Criminal Justice was very proud of its interdisciplinary partnerships across the University - virtually with every college as well as the School of Law. Although the program will not be multidisciplinary, the College of Criminal Justice, with a Ph.D. program, will be a stronger partner, balancing the internal coherence of the program with collaboration outside the College.

Dean Greene pointed out that the revised budget omitted any resources that would be generated by courses taught by doctoral students. Doctoral students would help improve the quality of the research platform as well as the reputation of the University and the College, which would in turn attract more highly qualified undergraduate students. Greater control over resources that guide doctoral student development and the practica required in the curriculum will result in a system whereby the doctoral students who teach courses will forge better links with our undergraduates than part-time faculty do. He expected the number of transfer students to go from 60 to 100. All of the economic implications for the College produce about a 3 to 1 share toward University expenses.

Professor Vaughn expressed concern that the Graduate Council had not raised the issues in question before the proposal came to the Senate. Dean Greene responded that the Graduate Council had indeed raised some of those questions, but the presumption was that the adjustments would be made over a period of months preceding the start of the program in 2004.

Professor Platt noted that the program seemed expensive and asked whether additional revenues might be expected. Dean Greene replied that all doctoral programs are expensive, but this program costs \$700K, half of which will be borne by existing researchers in CJ, so the University will bear 46% over the next five years. He added that doctoral students with grants would augment resources.

Professor Platt asked the scope of potential resources. Dean Greene replied that the College provides considerable resources to the University and that a full professor who will arrive in September has a \$601K grant, which has four research positions to look at Homeland Security and Al Qaeda.

In response to concern raised about course loads, Dean Greene explained that the students who come into the program will have an administrative and teaching support role. The standard course load for graduate students in criminology and criminal justice is consistent with those at the other twenty universities that provide this kind of education.

Professor Ondrechen expressed concern that having the qualifying exam in the fourth year might not give students enough time for dissertation and research. She thought two years a short time to undertake research and write the thesis. Dean Greene explained that this is the norm in the discipline, adding that students who finish their coursework earlier can take their qualifying exams earlier.

Dean Stellar pointed out that the University needs doctoral programs of high quality and that this program will not stay the same but will evolve its character in appropriate ways.

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

Vote: PASSED by unanimous voice vote, 37-0-0.

- VI. **Financial Affairs Committee Report on the Budget Process.** Professor Wallin moved Resolution #1, which read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the report of the Financial Affairs Committee recommending changes in the annual budget process.

The motion was seconded. There being no discussion, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote: PASSED, 32-0-0.

Professor Wallin moved Resolution #2, which read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend the adoption of the recommendations in the report for improved faculty participation on the CFP, for more detailed longitudinal budgetary information being made available to the CFP, for detailed monthly reports to the CFP on revenues and actual budgetary expenditures throughout the fiscal year, and for the CFP to be involved in making priority recommendations on major one-time expenditures within a fiscal year.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Wallin explained that the Financial Affairs Committee (FAC) had surveyed eleven faculty who had served on the Committee on Funding Priorities (CFP) in order to evaluate the process. Nine had responded. The general feeling was that they were not involved in budget decisions; the priority recommendations usually found their way into the budget; only five faculty on a committee of twenty or more was not sufficient; meetings were scheduled at times that conflicted with faculty teaching times; and members were not given enough information with regard to longitudinal data on trends of revenue and expenditures. Last year, more money came in than was budgeted, after the CFP had submitted its priorities. Decisions are made at the end of the year in which the CFP has no input. The FAC believes that the CFP should be constituted for the whole year and should have input on priorities throughout the fiscal year.

Dean Stellar liked the spirit of the resolution but thought it complicated. He suggested that that focus be on the two main issues - access to information on the base budget and contingency, one-time expenditures.

Professor Aroian advocated better communication and a spirit of sharing.

Professor Ellis suggested that a third item of importance be a collaborative effort in looking at the entire budget so that the CFP could see areas for improvement.

Dean Stellar cautioned against diluting the focus, which should be on the longitudinal and incremental aspects of the budget.

Professor Lowndes urged the Senate to proceed with the resolution. He pointed out that when additional revenue comes into the University that is not in the budget it is not reported. He wanted to see the expenditures, citing Vice President Mucciolo's report to the Senate in which he stated that \$23M had been held in anticipation of debt interest that turned out to be 5% instead of 8%. Professor Lowndes stressed the need for transparency and input to the CFP on expenditures.

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

Vote on cloture: PASSED, 26-6.

Vote on Resolution #2: PASSED, 28-3-2.

- VII. **Resolution on New Standing Committee on Library Policies and Operations.** Professor Herman moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That Senate-based faculty governance with respect to the University Libraries be restored by the creation of a Standing Senate Committee on Library Policies and Operations.

- 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.**

Professor Herman stressed the importance of the University Libraries in achieving our top-100 goal.

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

Vote: PASSED, 31-0-0.

- VIII. **Institutional Management Practices Committee Report on Research Management.** Professor Herman moved Resolution #1, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate accept the Institutional Management Practices Committee's Report on Research Management.

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

Vote: PASSED unanimously by voice vote, 31-0-0.

Professor Herman moved Resolution #2, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the University recognize research as a university priority in its move toward the top tier of academic institutions, and that resources commensurate with other top 100 universities be allocated to the research mission.

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

Vote: PASSED, 31-0-0.

Professor Herman moved Resolutions #3 and #4, and the motion was seconded. The resolutions read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that a standing Research Policy Oversight Committee be 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

shall be composed of six 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.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends to the President that the current University Research Council be eliminated and replaced by the Committee established in Resolution 3 as the University's principal advisory Committee on Research and Scholarship.

Motion. Professor Vaughn moved to increase the number of research-active faculty from six to nine, and the motion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

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

Resolutions #3 and #4, as amended, read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that a standing Research Policy Oversight Committee be 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 shall 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.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends to the President that the current University Research Council be eliminated and replaced by the Committee established in Resolution 3 as the University's principal advisory Committee on Research and Scholarship.

Vote on Resolutions #3 and #4: 32-0-0.

Professor Herman moved Resolution #5, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate commend the Provost for the reforms he has thus far achieved in the area of Research administration and encourage him to continue working to reduce impediments and improve the efficacy, morale, and stature of the research community at Northeastern.

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

Vote on Resolution #5: 32-0-0.

- IX. **Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Review Committee Report**. Professor Ellis moved Resolution #13, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.A.12.b.3 (Dismissal of a Faculty Member for Cause) 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 pointed out that this was the last of the resolutions from section VI.A. He outlined the revisions to the 4/30/02 Revised Draft, which appeared on page 2 of the 5/06/03 draft of section

VI.A.12.b.3. At the informal, probable cause stage, "neither the University nor the faculty member is entitled to representation by an attorney," but at the formal hearing stage, "the faculty member is entitled to counsel and an academic advisor at the faculty member's expense."

He explained other differences from the existing procedure, which has not yet been used, that were suggested by the first Handbook Revision Committee. First, the current procedure has the Senate Agenda Committee appointing a hearing committee to investigate and determine probable cause at the informal stage, and the formal Hearing Committee is appointed from members of either the current Agenda Committee or the previous four Agenda Committees. That procedure could take so much time that it would impede Senate operations. The proposed procedure has the Agenda Committee conducting the informal probable cause step, and then appointing six tenured faculty to serve on the Hearing Committee. The Agenda Committee also appoints a hearing master to conduct the fact-finding hearings for the Hearing Committee.

Professor Ondrechen expressed concern that the Agenda Committee would be overburdened by having to conduct lengthy hearings. Professor Ellis responded that the Agenda Committee, which is essentially elected twice - by faculty colleagues and by Senators - holds a position of trust in the University community and therefore is the body most likely to conduct a fair review.

Professor Lowndes expressed concern about the possibility of a conflict of interest. Professor Herman responded that the Agenda Committee is the group least likely to have a conflict of interest because it would be concerned about the rights of a fellow faculty member and would bend over backward to ensure that there is not even the appearance of conflict of interest.

Professor Lowndes suggested establishing a standby committee each year to determine probable cause if a case is brought forth.

Professor Powers-Lee suggested that the defendant be given a number of peremptory challenges to hearing committee appointments.

Professor Flym noted that, while he understood the concern about conflict of interest, he did not think it a serious risk. He preferred the proposed process to one that is perhaps overly complicated.

Professor Platt suggested that, if a case were to arise where there was a conflict of interest, the Agenda Committee could select a committee to consider probable cause.

Professor Sherwood agreed and noted that the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences follows this procedure.

Professor Lowndes explained that he had raised the issue for two reasons. The primary reason was the potential for conflict. Once one has seen the details of a case, one might be influenced, consciously or unconsciously, when selecting the hearing committee. The other reason is that a dismissal case would be difficult to undertake in addition to the regular duties of the Agenda Committee.

Professor Vaughn was opposed to having a standby committee because an unanticipated conflict of interest would still be possible. He pointed out that, in terms of time, the informal phase of the procedure would be less burdensome than the formal hearing phase.

Professor Sherwood favored having peremptory challenges in the process of appointing the committee.

Professor Ellis acknowledged that the Agenda Committee could be considered tainted because, when appointing the hearing committee, its members are aware of the bill of particulars. On the other hand, the Agenda Committee, although aware of the charges from the President, must determine if there is sufficient evidence to proceed with hearings.

Professor Vaughn pointed out that the hearing committee would need five votes for dismissal, one more than is required in an ordinary civil case. He supported the procedure as proposed and was opposed to peremptory challenges.

Professor Sherwood pointed out that the Tenure Appeals Committee knows an individual has been denied tenure when an appeal is brought, so that being informed of the charges would not necessarily constitute a conflict of interest in a dismissal case.

Professor Lowndes declared himself convinced that an Agenda Committee could handle the proposed procedure.

Vice Provost Meservey thought five votes seemed high and suggested that four might be more reasonable. Professor Ellis replied that five is the number in the current Handbook. He emphasized that dismissal is a very serious matter.

Vice Provost Meservey still favored four votes and added that, if the vote is not to dismiss, the procedure ends at that point.

Professor Herman pointed out that the report would still go to the President. He favored five votes in order to sustain the judgment, should the case end up in court.

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

Vote: PASSED, 29-0-0.

- X. **Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Resolution on Evaluation of Outcomes from Semester Conversion.** Vice President Mantella moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

WHEREAS, Northeastern is carefully monitoring financial changes associated with semester conversion and

WHEREAS, the University is carefully monitoring student retention, applicant pool size, yield and matriculating credentials to determine whether there are changes associated with semester conversion and

WHEREAS, other universities have witnessed varying degrees of success associated with semester conversion,

BE IT RESOLVED That the University also obtain data including analysis of trends pre- and post-semester conversion on the following issues surrounding semester conversion yearly for at least five years:

- 1) **How well needs of students are met during the conversion itself. We would expect to look at satisfaction with programs and services including registration, grading, financial aid, security, residential life and food services. Survey instruments such as the “Student Satisfaction Inventory” and NuPulse are already in place for this purpose.**
- 2) **How well programs and services meet student needs after the conversion is complete. Survey instruments such as the “Student Satisfaction Inventory” and NuPulse are already in place for this purpose.**

- 3) **Whether the new summer mini-semester experience, both academic and co-curricular, is an intellectually stimulating experience that enhances student satisfaction and loyalty. Survey instruments may need to be designed for this purpose.**
- 4) **Whether there is enhanced academic and co-curricular engagement with the institution because of semester conversion. National Survey of Student Engagement can serve this purpose.**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the results of these surveys be reported on a yearly basis to the Faculty Senate and to the Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee for distribution to concerned Faculty and Administrators.

The floor was yielded to Professor Strauss who thanked the Academic Policy Committee and explained that the intent of the resolution was to help assess the effects of the semester conversion in enhancing the University's retention rate and reputation and in building a stronger community with regard to student attitudes toward the University.

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

Vote: PASSED, 28-0-0.

Adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Flym
Secretary, Faculty Senate