

April 14, 2005

## Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/14/2005

Charles H. Ellis Jr.  
*Northeastern University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Ellis Jr., Charles H., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/14/2005" (2005). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 68.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004361>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE  
FROM: CHARLES H. ELLIS, Jr., SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE  
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2004-05 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 14 APRIL 2005

---

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bansil, Blank, Bobcean, De Ritis, Ellis, Glod, Hansberry, Heiman, Kruger, Lowndes, Margotta, Marshall, McKnight, Melachrinoudis, Morrison, Peterfreund, Reynolds, Robinson, Shafai, Sherman, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wiseman, Wray  
(Administrators) Abdelal, Hill, Moore, Onan, Spieler, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bannister, Futrelle, Herman, Krishnamoorthy, Powers-Lee, Schaffer  
(Administrators) Falcon, Finkelstein, Soyster

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 2:59 p.m.

I. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of 23 March and 31 March were not ready for distribution.

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

A. **Meetings.** SAC met once in regular session since the last Senate meeting, and once with Provost Abdelal to discuss emerging issues concerning the sabbatical leave process this year (a report on the outcome of this meeting will be given in the next SAC report).

B. **Graduate Certificates.** The Agenda Committee reviewed proposals for graduate certificates in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies for the following programs, which have been approved by the Graduate Council and the Academic Council for Lifelong Learning.

- Adult and Organizational Learning
- Master Mentor in American Sign Language
- Higher Education Administration
- Actuarial and Financial Mathematics
- Project Management
- Healthcare Informatics

In accordance with the approval process for non-degree and graduate certificate programs for graduate schools and the SPCS, formal Senate action is not necessary for implementation, and they have been sent to President Freeland.

C. **Next Meeting:** Next Wednesday, 20 April, the last meeting of the 2004-05 Senate will be held from 11:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. in 240 Egan (Raytheon).

An organizational meeting of the 2005-06 Senate will take place immediately before that meeting, at 10:00 a.m., to elect next year's SAC. If your term is continuing, please plan to attend both meetings. If you are not on next year's Senate, you need not attend the organizational meeting.

III. **Proposed Master of Architecture Program.** Professor Lowndes moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Master of Architecture degree program in the College of Arts and Sciences as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 January 2005.**

The floor was yielded to Professor Thrush, Chair of the Department of Architecture, who explained that at present prospective students are limited to those who have received the BS in Architecture from NU. The proposal seeks to allow access the Master of Architecture degree program to students who have the BS in Architecture from other institutions and to those with Bachelor of Architecture degrees. The first group would

require two years in residence to complete their degrees. The second group would be able to complete their degree program in one year. The proposal has been cleared by the National Architecture Accreditation Board (NAAB).

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

Vote: PASSED, 28-0-0.

- IV. **Financial Affairs Committee Report.** Professor Kruger, who had chaired the Financial Affairs Committee in the fall semester, moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the membership of the University Budget Committee be expanded by two members of the professoriate chosen by the Senate Agenda Committee.**

Professor Kruger explained that one of the fundamental assumptions of the report was the importance of shared governance in university affairs and the faculty's role in that shared governance. He provided some background on the current budgetary process. In the past two years, all members of the FAC have served on the Committee on Funding Priorities (CFP), the advisory group appointed by the President. In addition, CFP includes senior vice presidents, other vice presidents and administrators, deans, students, and staff. CFP's principal charge is to recommend priorities for the incremental budget. If the prior year's budget were \$480M and the following year's projected budget were something like \$490M, CFP would have authority to make recommendations regarding the \$10M increment. CFP recommendations are then forwarded to the University Budget Committee (UBC), a smaller group co-chaired by the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration. Its other members are the Controller, one vice provost, and the Director of the Office for Institutional Research. The Director of the Budget Office is a non-voting member.

This year's CFP held fourteen meetings. The CFP process culminates in a prioritization exercise whereby CFP votes its priorities to be sent on to UBC. The UBC takes those recommendations, creates the new budget, presents its incremental recommendations to CFP in January, and after possible reconciliation then forwards its final budget recommendation to the President. The President then proposes a budget to the Board of Trustees. This year CFP modeled the priorities for three potential budget increments – \$5M, \$10M, and \$15M.

FAC members welcomed the opportunity to serve on CFP as an important task and a useful learning experience. However, FAC wished to share some concerns with the Senate. First and foremost, there was dissatisfaction with the fact that CFP makes recommendations about only a very small portion of the overall budget, the incremental increase. This restriction of authority hampers the ability to make effective recommendations to the UBC. FAC thought it important to expand the responsibility of CFP, giving it more information on the entire budget and allowing CFP to make recommendations about the overall budget. It was also the sense of FAC that meetings of a group of twenty-six are inefficient making it difficult to have open dialogue about what the priorities should be. Faculty involvement is also limited as they make up only a small portion of CFP membership; no faculty are members of UBC. FAC's principal concern about this year's process is that UBC rearranged some of the high priorities recommended by CFP and that not all of the priority recommendations were sent on to the President by UBC. For example, CFP gave high priorities to graduate students' health insurance and to the market adjustment for faculty, but UBC lowered the priority and yoked the two issues.

The majority of FAC believes CFP should be discontinued in its present form and recommends that the entire budget, not just the incremental increase, be addressed; that the co-chairs remain the same; and that the size of the committee be reduced in order to promote constructive dialogue. Since FAC was not of one mind as to whether CFP should continue, its resolution before the Senate focused on the Budget Committee and its lack of faculty representation.

Professor Peterfreund supported the resolution in principle. He suggested substituting "the Financial Affairs Committee" for "the professoriate" and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor McKnight asked whether, after CFP concludes its discussions, members go into the "back room" to make decisions. Professor Kruger replied that CFP does not have decision-making authority and there is no back

room, but it has been frustrating over the past two years to spend many hours meeting and establishing priorities only to see them later rearranged.

Professor Lowndes reported that the outcomes of this year's budget process had led FAC to request a meeting with President Freeland, which he and Provost Abdelal had attended. He explained that some of CFP's high priority budget items did not wind up on the Budget Committee's list of high priorities, some of CFP's lower priority items were funded instead, and some items not considered by CFP appeared in the incremental budget. While much time was expended over many CFP meetings, the general concern at the end of the exercise was that too much time was spent on presentations and too little on deliberations. The President was both concerned about and interested in the feelings of the Senate and FAC, and about how to change the current system. Professor Lowndes expressed his belief that the President wants the budget process to be improved and made more transparent.

Professor Peterfreund thought that the proposal to add two faculty members to the Budget Committee was a good start, but he feared a stalemate if another administrator were added to counter the faculty representatives. Professor Lowndes urged the Senate to support the resolution. He pointed out that it would be up to the President to make the change and added that non-academic areas do not control the budget process at universities.

Provost Abdelal noted that at the meeting with the President he had suggested a single budget committee with empowered representation, not to exceed fifteen members, rather than the current sequential process.

The floor was yielded to Professor Meador who liked the drift of the discussion toward elimination of the sequential process. A large part of his frustration was that CFP would begin meeting only to find that much of the incremental funding had been committed already.

Professor Morrison was opposed to the resolution. He suggested adding "with appropriate increase in the size of the Budget Committee."

Professor Vaughn pointed out that it is the President who appoints that committee, and the intent was not to tell him how to make up the whole committee.

Dean Stellar stressed the need for a broadly constituted debate, where people might make comments and trade ideas. He feared that a small committee would diminish the debate on the University's priorities. He would prefer a process that would produce broad recommendations. He envisioned a discussion where he might recommend raising tuition in order to expand the professoriate while student members would recommend against. Although he favored the resolution before the Senate, he would add another to address the creation of public debate over the University's priorities, without trying to set specific budget numbers yet also without complete absence of information.

Professor Lowndes explained that the hesitancy of FAC to abandon CFP was partly out of respect for the President, whose committee it is and who would have to determine whether to do away with it. He noted that transparency has been missing in the outcomes. CFP was charged to give a report to the Senate in a timely fashion, which it has not done. It would be useful and would create greater transparency if the new, expanded Budget Committee could do its job earlier. The masterful presentations by Vice President Mucciolo and Provost Abdelal did not give a clear picture of what went on and did not indicate the priorities that came out of nowhere nor those that disappeared. When the Senate sends the report and resolution to President Freeland, he, Vice President Mucciolo and Provost Abdelal might come to agree on streamlining CFP and changing the representation on the Budget Committee, or might agree on changing the whole process. He said that, at the meeting, President Freeland was very receptive to thinking about how we might significantly improve the whole budget process.

Professor Peterfreund thought that CFP probably could be disbanded with little harm. He suggested a simple way to handle the input. Step 1, the Vice President for Finance and Administration issues his report to the Budget Committee. Step 2, the Budget Committee looks at the incremental monies and creates a preliminary menu of allocation options. Step 3, the Budget Committee calls an open faculty meeting and gets a clear idea of

what faculty think. All of this would be done independent of the Senate, which probably should not be involved in that process. He would prefer that the faculty speak for itself.

Professor McKnight suggested voting for the resolution as a way to increase the relevance and seriousness of CFP.

Professor Ellis expressed concern that eliminating CFP would also eliminate student input. He thought the first step should be to get faculty on the Budget Committee, and not to let the Budget Committee become so large that the faculty voice is minimized.

The floor was yielded to SGA President Michael Benson who had served on CFP for the last two years. He spoke in favor of the resolution, adding that the larger issue was evaluation of the entire budget process by all constituents. He recommended getting together over the summer to put together a proposal before the next budget cycle.

Professor Morrison, who had chaired CFP for the last four years, offered an alternative perspective to some of the comments made at this meeting. CFP, in his first two years, came up with lists of priorities with some numbers that hatched in a different way than in the last two years. It was generally agreed the Budget Committee's recommendations were quite consistent with what CFP had recommended. A year ago, CFP adopted a new methodology by which it polled individual members and reported out single-number estimates in a rank ordering of 1-18. The Budget Committee deviated in significant ways from those single-number priorities, which led to the meeting with the President to improve the process that led to the creation of a reconciliation phase that was in place for this round. In this round, the Budget Committee adopted a different approach to prioritization. Everybody still ranked priorities, allocated the hypothetical \$5-\$10-\$15M, and, by general agreement, reported back 65<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> percentile of the recommendations to give the Budget Committee a range of recommendations rather than a single number. When the Budget Committee reported back in January, a subsequent meeting was already scheduled to reconcile what CFP had recommended with what the Budget Committee had recommended. That meeting was not held because Professor Morrison thought the Budget Committee's recommendation was, if not 100% consistent, reasonably consistent with what CFP had recommended.

Professor Sherwood emphasized the importance of transparency in the whole operation and of looking at the whole budget rather than just the incremental increase.

Dean Stellar commended Professor Morrison as Chair of CFP and supported his characterization, but he thought there was a disconnect, which occurred to him when it became clear most of the way through the process that something like 4.6% of the 6% increase in tuition was already taken by things that happened, in some cases, a year ago or more. At that point he began to feel that, having spent thirty hours listening to vice presidents present their plans without having seen the full operating budget, the process had been a gigantic waste of time because much of CFP's discretion was already gone. While he acknowledged the data to be technically correct, he urged a more open presentation of information to all constituencies, followed by a broad-spectrum debate. He supported the resolution with the expectation that another motion would be put forth to launch the process discussed today.

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

The resolution, as amended, read as follows:

**BE IT RESOLVED That the membership of the University Budget Committee be expanded by two members of the Financial Affairs Committee chosen by the Senate Agenda Committee.**

Vote on the resolution as amended: PASSED, 29-0-1.

Professor Kruger, who had been on sabbatical this semester, thanked Professor Wallin, who had assumed the chair and had drafted the report.

- V. **2004-05 Faculty Development Committee Report on Tenure Clock Adjustments.** Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT, as a result of a substantial and sustained child-care responsibilities related to the birth/adoption of a child, or significant responsibilities related to elder, spousal or partner, or dependent care, a faculty member who wishes to take a family responsibility-related leave and/or to request a one-year adjustment of the year in which s/he is considered for tenure in consequence of such family responsibilities may do so. The request for a tenure-clock adjustment must go through the chair/group leader, Dean, and Provost. A family care responsibility leave does not automatically result in a tenure-clock adjustment: such an adjustment must be requested in writing.**

The floor was yielded to Professor Wertheim, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee, who explained that Provost Hall had promulgated details of the maternity leave policy in 2000, which were reaffirmed by Provost Abdelal in 2004. This policy was never acted upon by the Senate, nor is it in the Faculty Handbook. While trying to stay within the basic framework, the FDC suggested expanding the Handbook policy to include the wording in the resolution.

Professor Onan distributed the following as a friendly amendment, which read as follows:

**BE IT RESOLVED That, as a result of substantial and sustained child-care responsibilities related to the birth/adoption of a child, or significant responsibilities related to elder, spousal or partner, or dependent care, a faculty member who wishes to take a family responsibility-related leave under the conditions of the University's Family Leave policy may do so.**

**A faculty member who wishes to request a one-year adjustment in his or her tenure clock based on a family responsibility-related leave may do so. An adjustment of the tenure clock must be approved by the Provost based on a request and justification submitted through the chair/group leader and dean. A family care responsibility leave does not automatically result in a tenure-clock adjustment; such an adjustment must be requested in writing.**

**A request to extend time to tenure consideration shall be made at least one year prior to the date on which a final notification of grant or denial of tenure normally would be made under university policies. A request to extend time to tenure consideration shall be made within six months of the advent of the personal circumstance that is impeding progress to tenure.**

The motion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Peterfreund expressed concern about the arbitrary six months and suggested instead, "within a reasonable period".

Professor Onan suggested "shall normally be made within a reasonable period". This was accepted as a friendly amendment. The motion on the floor then read as follows:

**BE IT RESOLVED That, as a result of substantial and sustained child-care responsibilities related to the birth/adoption of a child, or significant responsibilities related to elder, spousal or partner, or dependent care, a faculty member who wishes to take a family responsibility-related leave under the conditions of the University's Family Leave policy may do so.**

**A faculty member who wishes to request a one-year adjustment in his or her tenure clock based on a family responsibility-related leave may do so. An adjustment of the tenure clock must be approved by the Provost based on a request and justification submitted through the chair/group leader and dean. A family care responsibility leave does not automatically result in a tenure-clock adjustment; such an adjustment must be requested in writing.**

**A request to extend time to tenure consideration shall be made at least one year prior to the date on which a final notification of grant or denial of tenure normally would be made under university**

**policies. A request to extend time to tenure consideration shall normally be made within a reasonable period of the advent of the personal circumstance that is impeding progress to tenure.**

Vice Provost Hill inferred that “may do so” in the first paragraph meant that the request would be at the discretion of the faculty member.

Professor Morrison asked if a faculty member had to request that the tenure clock stop during the leave without pay. Provost Abdelal replied that this was the case.

Dean Spieler expressed a level of confusion. She thought of the Family Maternity Leave Act as setting a floor and not a ceiling for allowing a leave of six months. The tenure clock should be discretionary with regard to the circumstances of the individual, which would be known by the team leader. The University’s policy tracks federal law closely. She favored separating the leave from the tenure clock.

Provost Abdelal noted that the intent of the friendly amendment was to define the conditions for tenure clock adjustment.

Professor Onan wanted to separate the benefits piece from the leave. She would like the benefits piece to be dealt with by the experts on that issue. If the leave would slow the tenure process, what can we do to help the individual and still protect the institution from abuse?

Professor Ellis explained that Provost Hall’s memo dealt with the fact that someone on maternity/parental leave or sick leave might not have time to do scholarship, which was not addressed in the Handbook. Someone else might not want to stop the tenure clock. The Handbook addresses stopping of the tenure clock but does not have language about expectations for scholarship during that time.

Professor Lowndes suggested changing the first sentence in the second paragraph to say, “must do so in writing” instead of “may do so”.

Professor Kruger suggested deleting “may do so” as gratuitous.

Motion. Dean Zoloth moved to postpone consideration until the relevant sections of the Handbook were brought before the body. The motion was seconded.

Vote to postpone: PASSED, 27-2-1.

Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Ellis, Jr.  
Senate Secretary