

April 21, 2004

## Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/21/2004

Charles H. Ellis Jr.  
*Northeastern University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Ellis Jr., Charles H., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/21/2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 51.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005006>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE  
FROM: CHARLES H. ELLIS, Jr., SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE  
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2003-2004 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 21 APRIL 2004

---

Present: (Professors) Alper, Alverson, Aroian, Bannister, Bansil, Bursey, Ellis, Hansberry, Howlett, Hunt, Kruger, Lowndes, Morrison, Ondrechen, Peterfreund, Serafim, Shafai, Sherman, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wray  
(Administrators) Abdelal, Finkelstein, Greene, Hill, Meservey, Onan, Soyster, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Barnes, Blank, Brookins, Bruns, Flym, Futrelle, Khaw, Krishnamoorthy, Margotta, Metghalchi  
(Administrators) Weiss

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:57 a.m.

- I. **Minutes.** The minutes of March 31 and April 1 were approved.
- II. **SAC Report.** Professor Lowndes reported the following.
  - A. **Meetings.** SAC met once since last week's Senate meeting.
  - B. **Administrator Evaluation.** The evaluation report on Dean Greene has been released for review in the Senate Office by the Criminal Justice faculty.
  - C. **Background to FAC Report on the Annual Budget Process.** The following endeavors to provide some additional information relevant to the Financial Affairs Committee (FAC) report on the annual budget process.

Last year, the Faculty Senate passed resolutions articulating the need for a greater transparency for the annual University budget process in general, and for improved information about the budget to be presented to the Committee on Funding Priorities (CFP) in particular. The President responded favorably, so that improved detail about the operating budget was given to the CFP during its deliberations this year on the 2005 budget.

The failure this year was a serious mismatch between the budget recommendations of the CFP to the Budget Committee, and the resulting recommendations from the Budget Committee to the President. As a result, the SAC raised serious concerns with the President about the process and outcomes of this year's budget.

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.

Since the FAC had been charged at the beginning of this academic year with making recommendations on how to further improve transparency and faculty involvement in the budget process, it was agreed by the SAC and the President to await the report of the FAC before discussing this further.

Subsequently, the report was received and discussed with the President and Provost. 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, 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 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”.

- D. **Thanks to Senators and Provost.** SAC offers its sincere appreciation to you all for your strong participation and support in the deliberations on the long agenda for the Senate this year. Your willingness to accommodate the extra Senate meetings, and to move forward constructively on some very important matters for the University, have been very much appreciated. Finally, we also want to thank Provost Abdelal for his collegial leadership and support for the Senate business this year—it has been a pleasure to work together.

### III. **Question and Discussion Time**

Professor Herman had transmitted the following question in advance, with the understanding that an answer would appear in these minutes.

When the Senate approved the new UC governance structure and ability to propose degree programs like any other NU College, it did so with two caveats: First, Trustee approval would be needed before any of this could take effect; and Second, a Senate Agenda Committee nominated Governance Committee made up of Tenured Professors and administrators would have to be put into place. To date, neither of these things has occurred. Additionally, the Senate recommended that the Graduate Council consider expedited processing regulations for UC proposals (as in the past—when expedited rules for UC proposed certificates were adopted—such expedited regulations, if proposed by the Graduate Council, would require Senate approval before taking effect). Recently, reports have surfaced that University College has proposed Leadership undergraduate and graduate degree programs to the Graduate Council's Executive Committee and to the UUCC for expedited approval, without passing through any U.C. governance structure (since none yet exists) and without being reviewed by the College of Arts and Sciences or the College of Business (which is required by the regulations currently in effect, since the Trustees have not acted on the Senate proposals). Can you comment on the status of these proposals?

#### IV. **Committee of the Whole: Academic Search Procedures**

Motion. Professor Peterfreund moved to go into a committee of the whole. There was no objection, nor was there objection to the time limit that had been established in the agenda.

[The minutes of a committee of the whole do not become part of the minutes of the Senate meeting and are therefore appended.]

Motion. As time had run out, Professor Vaughn moved that the committee of the whole rise. The motion was seconded.

Vote: PASSED by unanimous voice vote, 29-0-0.

Vice Provost Meservey reminded the body about Dean Greene's earlier suggestion to establish a task force to work over the summer. Professor Lowndes responded that this would be a decision for the outgoing and incoming Agenda Committees and that he expected a committee would work with the President and the Provost on the details.

#### V. **Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee**

Motion. Professor Bannister moved Resolution #1 and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

**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 Collegiate levels to properly fund and support interdisciplinary programs.**

The floor was yielded to Professor Cokely, Chair of the Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee, who thanked the committee for its efforts.

The floor was yielded to Professor Herman, Director of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies, who expressed strong support for the resolution as a tool in recruiting the best and brightest students.

While he said that he champions interdisciplinary activities, Provost Abdelal expressed some reservation about the vagueness of the funding and indicated he would prefer more specific wording to clarify the intent of the resolution.

Dean Stellar suggested that the issues of mechanisms and funding be separated. The lack of money coupled with the incredible growth in the last five years has exacerbated the problem. The College of Arts and Sciences will be studying this over the summer in consultation with the Provost's Office.

In clarification, Professor Cokely explained that the mechanism to be put in place would result in the proper funding.

Motion. Professor Peterfreund moved to amend by substituting the following for the last sentence, after “University and”: “Collegiate levels to inventory all interdisciplinary operations, assess their budgetary needs, and properly fund and support the programs.” The motion was seconded.

Provost Abdelal reported that he was also looking at funding for interdisciplinary graduate and research programs.

Professor Vaughn suggested changing “Collegiate” to “College” and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

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

As amended, Resolution #1 read as follows:

**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.**

Vote on Resolution #1: PASSED, 28-0-0.

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

**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.**

Professor Herman noted that the resources for study abroad have declined over time and urged that revitalization be encouraged.

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

Vote: PASSED, 25-0-0.

Motion. Professor Bannister moved Resolution #3 and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

**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.**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate endorse the principle that teaching an Honors Seminar will be considered part of a faculty member's regular annual teaching load.**

The floor was yielded to John Portz, Director of the Honors Program, who reported that the number of seminars is expected to increase from 6 this year to something in the 12-14 range.

Dean Soyster asked for clarification with regard to an honors seminar in the context of annual teaching load. Professor Cokely responded that the honors seminar is often interdisciplinary in nature and therefore a department might not count it as part of a faculty member's load, which in turn makes it difficult to attract faculty to teach honors seminars.

Dean Greene expressed concern that the small colleges would have difficulty providing faculty to subsidize honors programs across colleges.

Professor Portz explained that at present an honors seminar is funded either with a stipend to the faculty member as an overload beyond the normal teaching load, or as part of the normal teaching load, in which case

it must be negotiated with the department and college, the honors program providing the department and college with stipend funds to replace the faculty member.

Dean Zoloth said that he considered teaching an honors seminar a privilege that would occur only every couple of years and as such be integrated with the faculty member's teaching load.

Professor Ondrechen did not read the resolution to "endorse the principle" as setting a requirement. If a faculty member is asked to teach an honors seminar, it should be part of the load and not an add-on.

Professor Peterfreund noted that to endorse a principle without the resources to implement it would be ironic.

Motion. Dean Greene moved to divide the question by separating the last paragraph from the rest of the resolution, and the motion was seconded.

Vote to divide the question: PASSED, by voice vote.

Professor Peterfreund called the question on the first two parts of the resolution, and there was no objection.

As amended, the resolution read as follows:

**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.**

Vote: PASSED, 22-0-0.

Discussion continued on the third part of the resolution.

Professor Portz explained that, although the resolution spoke only with regard to the principle of teaching an honors seminar, it was nonetheless an important step toward treating honors seminars as part of the teaching responsibility for all faculty.

Motion. Professor Peterfreund moved to delete "endorse the principle that" and add "encourage all day colleges to work toward making" and to delete "will be considered". The motion was seconded.

Provost Abdelal explained that we do not have the necessary resources to do what needs to be done, however desirable. Each department and college must manage its own resources against its obligations, while trying to meet many competing needs.

Dean Zoloth supported the resolution as critical to the future of the University to provide the best faculty to teach our best students in honors seminars.

Dean Soyster did not wish to put the responsibility on the shoulders of individual faculty. In the long term, this is a budget issue. It is up to the college to get the right number of honors students and to commit its faculty to support that program.

Vice Provost Meservey suggested that the Agenda Committee next year charge the Financial Affairs Committee to look into prioritizing important resource-dependent interests to the University as we move into the budget process.

Motion. Professor Lowndes noted that the time had run out for this agenda item and moved to extend the time in order to complete the discussion on these important issues. The motion was seconded.

Vote to remove the time constraint: PASSED by voice vote.

Vote on Professor Peterfreund's amendment: PASSED, 21-4-0.

As amended, the third part of Resolution # 3 read as follows:

**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.**

Vote: PASSED, 27-0-0.

Motion. Professor Bannister moved Resolution #4 and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

**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 students seeking grant funding for graduate education, perhaps through the creation of an Office of National Scholarships.**

Professor Cokely explained that the resolution basically sought support within the Provost's Office to coordinate students' applications seeking major scholarship support for graduate education.

Provost Abdelal registered concern about resolutions that would have significant budgetary implications. He urged that these costs be placed in the context of the function of the Committee on Funding Priorities and the Financial Affairs Committee.

Professor Ellis recalled the concern expressed by the President and the previous Provost about the lack of support for Rhodes, Truman, and Marshall scholarship applicants and urged that the money be found.

Dean Soyster felt that the responsibility should lie within the colleges.

Professor Ondrechen expressed concern that existing structures, such as the Financial Aid Office, are restricted to working with undergraduates and do not help our graduating seniors to obtain fellowships.

Provost Abdelal emphasized that, while he was in favor of supporting those nominated or applying for prestigious scholarships and graduate fellowships, he could not afford to establish another office. He suggested that support be through college and faculty initiatives.

Professor Cokely noted that the committee was not so much recommending the creation of an office but coordination of efforts that would make it easier for graduate students to feel supported in their initiatives. He would not be averse to the Provost's suggestion of a friendly amendment to delete the text after "graduate education".

Professor Onan pointed out the importance of having a method whereby information about these scholarships is available to students and also assistance to the students over a period of months in developing their proposals. She suggested diminishing the focus of the resolution to include "undergraduate students seeking grant funding". This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Peterfreund recommended that the Provost's Office take the lead in putting together a website that would make it possible to get information to prospective applicants. He added that the Provost's Office, working through the Honors Program, has made a start in helping students with their proposals.

Provost Abdelal reported that the Honors Program Director position was to become full-time and the program would be faculty-mentored.

Professor Alverson called the question, and there was no objection.

As amended, Resolution #4 read as follows:

**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.**

Vote: PASSED, 25-1-0.

Motion. In the interest of time, Professor Bannister moved Resolution #6 instead of #5, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

**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 their 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 first week in January. In addition the University should work towards improving the alignment of its budgeting cycle with authorizations to hire.**

Professor Peterfreund suggested substituting "his or her" for "their" in the third paragraph, and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Vaughn asked how the uncertainties about carrying capacity in departments would be managed. Professor Cokely responded that the committee felt that each unit has a clear sense of its capacity to handle majors for freshmen and transfers and, while this may vary marginally depending on sabbaticals, it could be factored into the calculations. Professor Vaughn pointed out that colleges that do not teach freshman courses have a year to catch up.

Professor Peterfreund recommended that Enrollment Management take into consideration that some departments have a difficult time absorbing large numbers of majors, whereas other departments are under-utilized. Provost Abdelal replied that he was in sympathy with the goals articulated in the resolution.

Vice Provost Meservey explained that getting budgetary information out in a timely manner has been difficult. While she agreed with the authorization being given to unit heads by the first week in January, the tradition has been that the budget does not go to the Financial Affairs Committee of the Board until the end of January.

Vice Provost Meservey suggested amending the resolution by substituting "the last" for "the first" week of January, with the understanding that the new academic initiative would facilitate hiring earlier than January. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Lowndes called the question.

Vote on cloture: PASSED by voice vote.

Resolution #6, as amended, read as follows:

**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.

Vote on Resolution #6: PASSED, 26-0-0.

Motion. Professor Bannister moved Resolution #7, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

**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 such recommendations, if any, be submitted to the Faculty Senate no later than March 15, 2005.

Professor Bannister explained that, as several department chairs had reported that transfer students had created a bimodal distribution in certain classes, the resolution called for gathering data in order to determine whether it is true and, if so, to take appropriate steps to correct it.

In Dean Zoloth's view, Enrollment Management has not turned its attention to actively recruiting transfer students in a focused way.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out that data can lie because not all transfers provide SAT scores.

Vice Provost Meservey suggested adding a resolution, to read, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Provost's Office work with the Office of Admissions to increase the recruitment of competitive transfer students, particularly, in under-enrolled majors." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Cokely explained that what the committee was interested in finding out was whether the transfer student cohort in fact results in the bimodal experience in the classroom.

Dean Soyster recalled a study of several years ago, which reported that our transfer students were coming from lower-level institutions. He suggested recruiting more aggressively with higher caliber institutions.

Professor Ellis called the question, and there was no objection.

As amended, Resolution #7 read as follows:

**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.**

Vote: PASSED, 25-0-0.

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

**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.**

Professor Alper asked what it would mean to internationalize the curriculum. Provost Abdelal responded that he had seen examples of core curricula with more multicultural components than ours.

Dean Zoloth reported that he had been working on the core curriculum and suggested that this resolution be bundled with that discussion.

Professor Lowndes called the question, and there was no objection.

Vote on Resolution #5: PASSED, 15-5-1.

**Announcement.** Professor Herman asked Senators to review the Academic Policy Committee Report and send him their comments over the summer. He explained that the principles in the report were there for discussion in order for next year's Academic Policy Committee to know those directions are the ones in which we should move.

Adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Ellis, Jr.  
Secretary

**Report of the Committee of the Whole**  
**21 April 2004**

Professor Lowndes asked Senators to look at the four changes that he had highlighted in his memo of April 12 (4/14/04 Senate Minutes). Item one read as follows:

There would now be two types of committees to fill academic administrator positions: search committees and selection committees. Search committees would be constituted for positions in which the faculty has a primary interest (such as for the positions of Department Chair, College and School Deans, Provost etc). Selection committees would be constituted for positions for which the faculty shares interest to a significant degree with other parts of the Northeastern community (such as for Senior Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Vice President for Information Services, Vice President for Co-operative Education etc). The fundamental difference between the two is that a search committee would have primary responsibility for developing the pool of candidates and recommending a list of finalists, whereas a selection committee would recommend a list of finalists based on a review of a group of candidates, developed usually by a search firm, and presented to it by the appointing authority.

Professor Vaughn suggested a preamble to this section of the Handbook that would indicate consultation with the Agenda Committee, the procedures to be followed, some way to avoid overlong interim positions, and a more complete and current list of "key" administrators in whom faculty have a primary interest.

Dean Greene recommended a task force of administrators and faculty to incorporate the suggestions from Senators over the summer for discussion in the fall.

Dean Greene thought that search firms might be needed by search committees as well as by selection committees. Professor Lowndes responded that the search committees, unlike the selection committees, would not be constrained to consider only candidates provided by the consultants. Dean Greene countered that he would not exclude the use of search firms because some national chair searches would warrant it.

Provost Abdelal pointed out that the role of a selection committee would be more limited than that of a search committee. The selection committee would not even meet until the search firm has produced a list of candidates.

Professor Alper asked for clarification as to whether the selection committee would have the right to seek out candidates. Provost Abdelal replied that this would be the case. Professor Alper expressed concern about the loss of the faculty's right to develop candidates.

Professor Ondrechen noted that faculty perhaps would be more likely to bring in qualified candidates through their networking capabilities.

Professor Ellis pointed out that it should be the appointing authority who provides the list, however it is generated, and this could be done without a search firm. He added that in some cases the committee might know better than any search firm the kinds of people best suited to the position.

Provost Abdelal explained that the language implied that the search committee would provide the list, adding that any search firm would be working with the administration.

Professor Peterfreund was uneasy with the division of function because it seemed to rest on the inaccurate assumption that, while faculty may know what a chair, academic dean, or provost looks like, only the administration knows what a vice president for enrollment management or Coop looks like. If we all have a stake in the well-being and life of the University, we all have to have some sense of what everyone does here.

Professor Wray was not sure that the Coop vice president position should be in the category of selection committee. Since the dean position has been eliminated, the vice president now advocates for the educational role of the unit and its faculty, most of whom are non-tenured.

Provost Abdelal recapitulated that the three points made thus far were 1) whether there should be a distinction between search and selection committees and what such a distinction would mean, 2) if there were such a distinction, what should be covered under it, and 3) whether there should be different types of committees.

Professor Vaughn noted that the enrollment management vice president position did not exist when the last *Faculty Handbook* was published, so it might be a good idea to have selection procedures for the newer positions.

Professor Lowndes noted that the real question was whether to have all committees function as search committees, as opposed to having two types of committee with different constituencies.

Professor Lowndes proposed a straw vote to indicate the Senate's preference for having all committees to be search committees.

Vice Provost Meservey asked whether the vote would mean the positions currently listed in the *Faculty Handbook* would be included. Provost Abdelal responded that this vote would be on the general premise that all positions would follow the search committee process.

Straw vote that all committees be search committees: PASSED by unanimous show of hands, 29-0-0.

Professor Herman pointed out that some new positions should be added to the list of key administrators, such as the Director of School of General Studies, the Director of the Honors Program, and Vice President of University College.

The Senate then turned to a discussion of topic 2, the issue of having slates from which to appoint committee members. It read as follows:

There would now be two types of committees to fill academic administrator positions: search committees and selection committees. Search committees would be constituted for positions in which the faculty has a primary interest (such as for the positions of Department Chair, College and School Deans, Provost etc). Selection committees would be constituted for positions for which the faculty shares interest to a significant degree with other parts of the Northeastern community (such as for Senior Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Vice President for Information Services, Vice President for Co-operative Education etc). The fundamental difference between the two is that a search committee would have primary responsibility for developing the pool of candidates and recommending a list of finalists, whereas a selection committee would recommend a list of finalists based on a review of a group of candidates, developed usually by a search firm, and presented to it by the appointing authority.

Dean Greene thought that having five slates would be cumbersome. Professor Lowndes responded that the notion of slates would allow the chooser to guarantee representation from all the different constituencies that need to be included.

Dean Greene supported the notion of streamlining slates, as in a pool, and he recommended a prefatory statement about including representation across the various concerned groups.

Professor Lowndes reported that some SAC members had had reservations about slates. He conceded that slates would entail more work, but he pointed out that they would also ensure dominant representation by faculty. The alternative would be to retain the current procedure, which is that the administration picks administrators and faculty pick faculty.

Provost Abdelal thought that the concept of having slates was actually less complicated than the language made it seem. He cited the CBA dean search as an example. With consultation between the Provost and the Agenda Committee, that committee was staffed within a week.

Professor Peterfreund viewed the process as akin to empanelling a jury and, therefore, recommended that it allow for at least one challenge of an entire slate.

Professor Onan thought that slates would be unnecessary and potentially divisive and suggested instead having a pool of eight or ten faculty from whom to staff a committee.

Dean Finkelstein noted that the selection process might have unintended consequences and asked whether precedents existed. Provost Abdelal responded that other institutions have such a model.

Professor Vaughn, citing morale, preferred a negotiating procedure to having slates.

Dean Greene thought the notion of a peremptory challenge would be divisive.

Professor Ondrechen proposed taking a straw vote on whether Senators favored slates.

Professor Alper asked what would be the alternative to having slates. Provost Lowndes responded that the alternative would be the current system, adding that the SAC has historically done a careful and competent job.

Straw vote that Senators favor slates: FAILED, 9-18.

The Senate then turned to a discussion of topic 3, selection of the committee chair. It read as follows:

The administrator concerned now would select the chair of the committee. Where elected members are involved, the administrator must select from the elected members unless SAC approves otherwise. Where search committees are entirely appointed, the administrator must select the chair from one of the appointed faculty members. For selection committees, the administrator must select one of the appointed members as the committee chair. Under the existing search procedures, search committee chairs are either elected by and from the committee membership, or are appointed by SAC.

Professor Lowndes pointed out that the new part in this item was that, instead of the committee electing its own chair, the administrator would appoint the chair. While the President was strongly in favor of the change, Professor Lowndes was not convinced it would make much difference.

Dean Soyster favored giving the committee some autonomy.

Professor Vaughn suggested that the dean have the option of selecting the chair or telling the committee to elect its own chair.

Professor Peterfreund noted that nothing would preclude a dean or provost from polling the committee as to who should chair it.

Professor Ondrechen did not view appointment of the chair as significant, but she thought the committee might benefit operationally by selecting its own chair, especially in lower level searches.

Dean Finkelstein wondered what was broken that needed to be fixed. Provost Abdelal responded that the current *Faculty Handbook* seems overly vague and suggested following other models, in which administration and faculty work together.

Professor Bansil emphasized the importance of having a collaborative procedure.

Professor Lowndes proposed taking a straw vote.

Dean Zoloth favored having the administrator appoint the committee chair in higher level searches.

After some discussion on the voting options, it was decided that the first option would be the language in item 3 with consultation included, the second option would be the old *Faculty Handbook* language, and the third option would be for the chair to be appointed by the administrator, in consultation with the committee.

Straw vote: 2 favored option one; 18 favored option two; and 6 favored option three.