

October 05, 2005

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 10/05/2005

Stuart S. Peterfreund
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Peterfreund, Stuart S., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 10/05/2005" (2005). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 70.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004282>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: STUART PETERFREUND, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2005-06 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 05 OCTOBER

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bannister, Bobcean, Bruns, De Ritis, Futrelle, Glod, Hall, Hansberry, Herman, Janikian, Krishnamoorthy, Marshall, McKnight, Melachrinoudis, Morrison, Peterfreund, Powers-Lee, Reucroft, Reynolds, Robinson, Ryan, Sanchez, Schaffer, Sherwood, Strauss, Willey, Wiseman
(Administrators) Abdelal, Falcon, Finkelstein, Greene, Moore, Onan, Soyster, Sridhar, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Flym, Kane
(Administrators) None

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:53 a.m.

I. **In Memorium: Charles H. Ellis.** The following was delivered by Professor Gerald H. Herman.

Professor Charlie Ellis was my long time friend and colleague. His qualities, as a superb teacher and mentor to his students and as a marine biologist who died doing what he loved, have been eulogized elsewhere, as have those qualities that made him a truly “Renaissance Man.”

My purpose here today is to comment on Charlie’s indispensable role as “University Citizen,” because, more than any other individual on campus, Charlie exemplified what it means to be a tenured faculty member at a mature University—that is, at a University whose faculty are expected to oversee and (along with others) govern its academic life.

For all of his thirty four years at Northeastern, Charlie was the very model of an engaged faculty member, fully committed to sustaining and enhancing the life of the University at every level and for all its members: as student advisor in his own department, as pre-med advisor for the entire University, as an enthusiastic participant in its co-curricular life, as a participant in the governance of both his department and College, and as a leader in the Faculty Senate. In all these ways and more (as many of his colleagues discovered as they scrambled to fill the gaps left by his untimely passing), Charlie was irreplaceable.

I knew and worked closely with Charlie in many of these activities. In the early 1990’s, when I chaired the Senate’s *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Support Services, Charlie served, in the Office of the Provost, as the University’s “Faculty Service Ombudsperson” and therefore as an *ex officio* member of that Committee. He untangled individual faculty problems with the “NU shuffle,” while the Committee worked on the structural issues uncovered by those cases to make it less likely that faculty in the future would suffer from the same problems. We thus worked closely together and I marveled at his capacities for keeping his “cool” while trying to deal with scarce resources and bureaucratic [il]logic, for finding practical solutions to seemingly intractable problems, for paying attention to the details that would insure that the solutions would be implemented and achieve the desired result, and for doing so in a way that left every-one feeling that they had participated in a positive and useful exercise. He always understood, no matter how seemingly trivial the problem appeared, how important the work was to the faculty involved. He gave it a certain *gravitas*, understanding its role in maintaining faculty productivity, enhancing morale, and sustaining the centrality, within the University, of its Academic missions.

These same qualities—calmness, rationality, practicality, a healthy sense of both the importance of the work and humor about its trials and tribulations, and an enormous capacity for, and cheerful willingness to take on prodigious amounts of, detailed work, all resting on an abiding humanity and a quiet commitment to doing what’s right—marked all of my subsequent interactions with him. They made him his peers’ natural choice to act, over and over again, as Senate Agenda Committee Chair, as Senate Secretary, as Senate Grievance Officer, and, for the last three years, as both Chair and recording secretary of the Senate

Faculty Handbook Review Committee. We always knew that, if Charlie was on the job, it would get done, and done right.

These same qualities were always visible in his decades-long work with me as a senior member of the University's Marshals' Cadre. At every one of the over one hundred graduations and convocations that he helped to organize and lead, Charlie's qualities shone through. He was deeply involved in planning and executing the detailed 'choreography' that enabled these ceremonies, involving thousands of participants, to go off without a hitch. But he never let the need for order interfere with the quality of each student's experience in those events, or, for that matter, in his own experience of joy at witnessing his students' ultimate success at Northeastern.

I started out by saying that my intention here was to remember Charlie Ellis as a "University Citizen," as an engaged faculty member, fully committed to sustaining and enhancing the life of the University. To have devoted so much of himself to this is all the more remarkable, for much of this service was unrewarded and took place at the same time that the perceived criteria for faculty excellence focused more and more narrowly onto scholarship and teaching, diminishing the 'worthiness' of the vital work of faculty participation in governance. Charlie's work forces us to remember that for the University to remain a vibrant academic environment requires hard and sustained work, and that, being faculty members, necessarily involves participation in this broader Community of effort. If that is the lesson we draw from Charlie's example, I'm certain that he'll 'rest in peace.'

- II. **Election of SAC Secretary.** Professor Stuart S. Peterfreund was nominated and elected by show of hands.
- III. **Election of SAC Member.** Professors Wallace W. Sherwood and Susan G. Powers-Lee were nominated and gave brief statements. Professor Powers-Lee was elected.
- IV. **Election of Presidential Search Committee Candidates.** Professor Glod reminded Senators that the balloting was to elect eight nominees for the four faculty positions on the Presidential Search Committee. The Search Committee will include 17 members: nine Trustees (to be announced) with George Chamillard as Chair: four teaching faculty members, elected by referendum; Dean Zoloth, already elected by the Deans Council; a member of the Presidents's cabinet, elected from the Cabinet; a student, chosen by the BOT from among those who applied; an alum, chosen by the Board. The deadline is 30 April 2006 to submit three names. Professor Stephen W. McKnight explained today's election process. After four rounds of balloting the following 8 nominees were elected from 17 prenominees. These will be sent on 6 October 2005 to NU Teaching Faculty for election of the four finalists.

Professor Gilda A. Barabino (Chemical Engineering)
 Professor Barry Bluestone (Sociology and Anthropology)
 Professor Anthony P. De Ritis (Music)
 Professor Carol A. Glod (Nursing)
 Professor Graham Jones (Chemistry and Chemical Biology)
 Professor Robert P. Lowndes (Physics)
 Professor Harlan D. Platt (CBA-Finance & Insurance)
 Professor Michael B. Silevitch (Electrical & Computer Engineering)

- V. **SAC Report.** Professor Glod reported the following:
 - A. Introduction:** Helen Broderick, Executive Assistant. Professor Glod also thanked Ann Marie King for her continued dedication and good work in the Office of the Faculty Senate.
 - B. Meetings.** SAC met eight times in regular session, twice with President Freeland and Provost Abdelal, and twice with President Freeland, Provost Abdelal and the Chair of the 2004-05 Financial Affairs Committee.
 - C. Resolutions.** President Freeland has responded to a number of 2004-05 Senate resolutions.

- #24. 2003-04 Faculty Development Committee Resolution #1: Approved. “This approval does not imply specific budget expansion at the university level of the academic area budget.”
- #25. 2003-04 Faculty Development Committee Resolution #2: Approved. “I understand this to be a recommendation that the Provost develop such a program and support this with that understanding.”
- #29. Bylaws: Not approved by President; not approved by Trustees 7/19/05. (see Appendix A)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the revised Faculty Senate By-Laws as presented in the Revised Draft (1/10/05) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to be submitted to the Teaching Faculty for a ratification vote. (20-0-0)

- #30. SGA Resolution on Student ID Numbers: Informational, 4/27/05: “I commend the SGA for their concern regarding identity and am in agreement with the intent of the resolutions to eliminate Social Security Number, SSN, as the primary student ID at Northeastern. I have asked Bob Weir, Vice President of Information Services, to lead a cross university effort to define the scope of the problem, that is, identify all systems and processes, whether supported by IS or within the colleges/units, where SSN is used as a person ID (for students, faculty, staff, and alumni). Further, I have asked for a recommendation as to how to address the issues raised in the resolution by October, 2005. Any plan will also address the protection of SSNs for systems and processes, such as payroll and financial aid, where storage and use of SSN is required. Once I have received the recommendation a determination will be made as to how the University will proceed in this matter. I have also asked Vice President Weir to prepare a briefing memo for me outlining the controls and protective measures that we currently have in place to protect identities and to make any recommendations about other measures we might undertake on an interim basis to make sure our security systems are as strong as possible pending a more permanent solution to this issue.” The President also sent this response to students.
- #37. 2004-05 Faculty Development Committee – Tuition Waiver for Online Courses: Not approved. “As you know the University offers generous and competitive tuition benefit program for staff and faculty members. We have reviewed the option to add on-line courses. Unfortunately, there will be a real cost to the University if we offer tuition waivers for on-line courses. Given the growing number of such offerings such a change would add substantial costs to the university. This does not seem like an opportune time to expand our tuition benefit program.”
- #38. 2003-04 Faculty Development Committee Resolution #4: “Informational.” “I support the principle of allocating resources for this purpose, but specific budget recommendations of this type are an administrative responsibility. I also doubt the wisdom of this kind of formulaic support of faculty.”
- #39. Direct Entry MS in Respiratory Therapy: Approved.
- #40. Master in Professional Writing and Design: Approved.
- #41. Graduate Entry PharmD: Approved.
- #42. Professional Masters in Marine Biology: Approved.
- #43. Library Policies and Operations Committee: Approved. “I strongly share the impulse to enhance library resources. Specific budget allocations must be part of the university budget process.”
- #45. Master of Architecture: “This approval does not imply commitment of any additional resources.”
- #46. Financial Affairs Committee – Expansion of University Budget Committee: Not approved. “After extensive discussions with those involved in the budget process, the President and Provost have worked closely with SAC to make our budget development process more efficient and to improve the quality of input by the campus community. I have attached a copy of the new process [below].”

1. The work of crafting the university’s operating budget is a responsibility of the university administration. The President has assigned primary responsibility for this task jointly to the Sr Vice President for Administration and Finance (Sr. VP A&F) and the Provost, who will work closely with the President at every stage of the budget development process.

2. It is a responsibility of the president, at the beginning of each budget development cycle to meet with the Provost and Sr VP A&F regarding priorities, issues and concerns that will influence the framing of the upcoming operating budget and to provide whatever guidance and parameters for the crafting of the budget the president determines to be relevant.

3. The Sr VP A&F and Provost shall receive and review operating budget requests from the various operating divisions of the university and shall establish a process and timetable for the submission of these requests.

4. To assist the Provost and Sr. VP A&F in developing the operating budget, to assure input into the budget development process by all major university constituencies, and to promote broad understanding of the universities financial situation, the Sr. VP and Provost will work with a Fiscal Advisory Committee (FAC) in developing the budget. The Provost and Sr VP A&F will co-chair this committee.

5. The role of the Fiscal Advisory Committee is to articulate on behalf of the university community the priorities that, in their view, should guide the drafting of the actual operating budget and to advise the Sr. VP and the Provost regarding the extent to which the committee feels both the draft and final budgets are consistent with the committee's views. To this end, the Provost and Sr VP A&F will convene the FAC at each stage of the budget development process, beginning with an initial discussion of basic goals and priorities that should guide the development of the budget, through various stages of drafting, to a review of the final draft prior to its submission to the president. In participating in the work of this committee, individuals, while drawn from various constituencies, are charged to think in terms of the well being of the entire university in formulating their views and recommendations.

6. It is a responsibility of the Sr VP A&F and the Provost to provide information to the FAC that enables the committee both to understand the university's financial circumstances in any given fiscal year in so far as these are germane to the drafting of the operating budget and to consider and discuss in a meaningful way the choices and priorities before the university in drafting of the operating budget. To this end it may be useful for the FAC to hear presentations from university leaders as to perceived needs for financial support in their areas of responsibility; these presentations should not be in the form of budget requests but rather in the form of policy-oriented discussions. As part of these presentations, the FAC should hear from the Vice President for Human Resources regarding issues of compensation and from the Director of Research and Planning, on issues related to the University's long range plans. Members of the FAC are invited to request information or presentations that, in their view, would be helpful to them in understanding the shape of the budget and the needs of various functions and dimensions of the university.

7. The membership of the FAC shall include thirteen members as follows:

- Sr VP A&F co-chair
- Provost co-chair
- 4 Faculty chosen as follows
 - Chair of the SAC
 - Chair of Financial Affairs Comm.
 - 2 other faculty appointed by the SAC in consultation with the Provost
- Sr VP for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs
- Sr VP for Advancement
- 2 Deans selected by Dean's council
- 1 Staff Rep Selected by Staff Council
- Pres of SGA
- Pres of GPSA

The role of the co-chairs is to preside over and organize the discussions of the Committee. The co-chairs will vote only when it is necessary to effect the outcome of the committee's deliberations.

Also, two non voting staff members, one designated by each of the co-chairs, to support the work of the FAC. For 2005-06 these will be:

- Budget Director
- Director Academic-Fiscal Affairs

8. In the spring of 2006, following preparation of the 2007 budget, the Sr. VP A&F and Provost shall convene the SAC to discuss major issues and concerns regarding university-wide patterns of resource allocation that could not be appropriately or adequately addressed during the actual drafting of the FY07 budget. This process is intended to provide members of the FAC and the constituencies they represent with an opportunity to engage the administration in a dialogue about the deployment of the university's fiscal resources that is difficult to have under the pressure of preparing an annual operating budget. This discussion is intended to provide background and context for the drafting of the FY08 budget in the fall of 2006. A determination will be made at the end of the spring as to whether this type of discussion would be useful on an annual basis as part of a regular budget cycle.

9. At the end of the spring of 2006 the committee will review the work of the year and offer its evaluation of the new structure and processes established by this document.

#48. BS in Information Technology: Approved.

#49. BS in Human Services: Approved.

#50. BS in Public Affairs: Approved.

#51. M.Ed. Transfer: Approved

#52. Master of Interpretive Pedagogy: Approved.

#53. Master of Sports Leadership: Approved.

#54. Master of Professional Studies in Digital Media: Approved.

#55. Clinical Doctoral Degree in Physical Therapy: Approved. "This approval does not involve commitment to any additional resources."

#61. UUCC – Athletic Training Degree Name Change: Approved.

#62. UUCC – Suspension of Respiratory Therapy Undergraduate Admission: Approved.

#63. UUCC – Suspension of Exercise Physiology Undergraduate Admission: Approved.

#64. UUCC – Elimination of BA in Music Lit and Performance: Approved.

#65. UUCC – Music Degree Name Change: Approved.

#66. UUCC – Geology-Earth Science Name Change: Approved.

#67. Suspension of MS in Cardiovascular Perfusion: Approved.

#68. UUCC – Suspension of MedLabScience Freshman Admissions: Approved.

D. Parliamentarian. Professor Herman will serve as Parliamentarian.

E. Presidential Search. Ballots based on the results of today's election will be sent on 10/6 to Teaching Faculty, and are due back on 10/14.

F. Speech Language Pathology and Audiology Chair Search Committee. Provost Abdelal has asked the Agenda Committee to initiate an external chair search for the Department of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology. Staffing is in progress.

G. Senate Standing Committees. SAC is in the process of staffing and charging the Standing Committees on Academic Policy, Enrollment and Admissions Policy, and Faculty Development. The Financial Affairs Committee has been staffed and charged as follows:

Members:

Professor Louis J. Kruger, Chair
 Professor Ganesh Krishnamoorthy
 Professor Emanuel J. Mason
 Professor Phyllis R. Strauss
 Professor Yiannis A. Levendis
 SAC Liaison: Professor Glod

Charge:

The Senate Agenda Committee respectfully requests that the Financial Affairs Committee prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following three-part charge:

1. Based on current information and any other analyses that it may wish to undertake, the Committee is asked to make recommendations on appropriate merit raises. In particular, working collaboratively with the Provost, the Committee is asked to review and recommend adjustments in the equity process. The FAC should meet with the Provost to agree on appropriate parameters for updating matchmate studies. The Committee should present its recommendations on these matters to the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee by 25 October 2005, for Senate consideration on 2 November.
2. This year the Chair of the Financial Affairs Committee will serve on the newly constituted University Fiscal Advisory Committee of the President. The Chair, in consultation with members of the Financial Affairs Committee, should consider all appropriate fiscal issues as they relate to the well-being and success of the University. The Committee should report back on the progress of the University Fiscal Advisory Committee in a timely and appropriate manner. Along with the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee, the Financial Affairs Committee should carefully consider and report back to the Senate by no later than 1 March 2006 any suggestions for further improving the annual budget process.
3. Make recommendations and contribute to the decision making concerning investments in the basic colleges, new buildings and facilities, and in particular, in the development of the University's master plan, along with major issues and concerns regarding University-wide patterns of resource allocation.
4. Other priorities may arise, to be determined by SAC.

H. 2004-2005 Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee Report (Chair, R. Rasala)

I. 2004-2005 Information Systems Policy Committee Report (Chair, A. Bansil)

J. Next Meeting: Wednesday, 19 October, in 450 DG. President Freeland will attend.

VI. **Provost's Report.** Provost Abdelal reported the following:

[In response to Professor Glod's report of the Faculty Senate Bylaws:] The new budget process and the fiscal advisory committee constituted as described [in the SAC report] represent a significant improvement in the budget process. The Provost looks forward to working with all members of the committee on this process which is about to begin.

In FY05 there were three specific areas of budgetary concern. The first, maintenance of our trajectory in terms of retention and graduate rates, was accomplished and, in fact, improved slightly. The second was increased net graduate revenues. The Provost was pleased to report that net graduate revenue increased by 14% which surpassed the goal of 8½% due to more efficient distribution of aid and scholarships and in securing more enrollments. It is important to know that we can generate additional revenue by investing in the graduate program. One challenge of the budget is that each year we have focused on obtaining new revenue from enrollments and tuition at the undergraduate level. This is the first year to see significant improvement in net graduate revenue which is worth emphasizing as we look to sources of revenue to enhance our capability of investing in academic programs.

In the third area of concern, that of research, the Provost was pleased to report that outside funding increased from \$30m to \$46m, a 15% increase that does not include gifts from foundations and corporations (which improved by somewhat less than 15%). Funding is an important indicator of our national standing as a research university along with scholarly productivity. It is these numbers that are referenced when standings of research universities are compared.

These three indicators – retention, graduate revenue and outside funding – provide NU with a solid position on which to build in order to continue investment in the academic plan. Performance is strong which allows optimism about what can be done this year and, building on that, into the future. The Provost stated that this was his primary report at this meeting.

The Provost then stated that the major issue that caused difficulty for the President when reviewing the Bylaw changes were a lot of specific comments regarding representation on the budget committee. It is the Provost's opinion that by arriving at this new budget process and new constitution of the Fiscal Advisory Committee, one of the major points of difference was resolved. Obviously the issue of the Handbook and Bylaws needs further discussion. Provost Abdelal expressed appreciation for the discussions and work thus far.

Professor Herman motioned to reverse the order of the remaining two agenda items. The motion was approved.

V. **Name Change – Department of Architecture**

Professor De Ritis moved Resolution #1 and it was seconded. The Resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the name change of the Department of Architecture to the School of Architecture as approved by the College Council on 15 October 2003.

Professor Thrush explained that the name change is primarily for satisfaction of a directive by the accreditation board several years ago. As well, architecture is a professional program competing with many schools and this change will assist in marketing and in attracting students. Professor Marshall asked if this change would provoke any budget changes to which both Professor Thrush and Provost Abdelal replied in the negative.

There being no further discussion The Senate turned to a vote.

Vote: PASSED, 30-0-0

VI. **Question and Discussion Time.** Professor Alper asked if The University would be instituting the new IRS guidelines that allow employers to extend the time for submitting bills to their Flexible Spending Accounts by two months. Provost Abdelal will look into this.

Professor Phyllis Strauss queried whether The University has developed a plan in regards to the possibility of a flu pandemic such as has been written about in the newspapers. Provost Abdelal replied that he is not aware of what initiatives might be undertaken by NU but will look into it.

Professor Marshall asked about outstanding resolutions and whether there is a time limit for response from the President's office. Professor Glod replied that there are about 9 outstanding resolutions from ISPC and the Faculty Handbook resolutions have not been acted upon yet. She indicated that there is no clear rule on the issue of timeliness. Provost Abdelal offered that the President raised a number of questions about several resolutions that he new to be outstanding and had asked for clarification from several colleges. One has recently reported back and one has not. As regards a time limitation, as long as we have movement on these proposals it is progress. It is reasonable to allow time to review the resolutions and to ask colleges and departments for clarification.

Professor Marshall asked if there is any public information (such as a printed list) about when the BOT meets during the year. The Provost deferred to Kay Onan who replied that the Board meets every month either as the full Board or as the Executive Committee, usually alternating. The Academic Affairs Committee, which reviews most Faculty Senate issues, meets without a regular schedule. The Provost agreed and added that if a quorum doesn't materialize, the meeting is rescheduled. It is a difficult scheduling process. Deanna Jantzen (Dir. BOT) is the best source of information about these meetings.

Adjourned at 1:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart Peterfreund
Secretary

Appendix A

Memo of 7/18/05 from President Freeland to Board of Trustees Executive Committee:

The attached resolution asks the Board of Trustees to not approve a set of changes to the bylaws of the Faculty Senate that were recently approved by the Senate and endorsed by a referendum of the full faculty. Unless the Board takes this action these bylaw changes will automatically take effect at the end of July. I am requesting this action in order to provide me and the senior administrative leadership time to consult with the Senate regarding the proposed changes as well as other recommended changes in the faculty handbook and to bring forward to the board a comprehensive set of faculty handbook changes that have been developed through a consultative process.

This recommended action is made necessary by the following circumstance. On April 28 I received from the Faculty Senate a set of Senate-approved amendments to the Senate bylaws that emerged from a comprehensive effort to revise the faculty handbook that has been under way for over two years. As I have mentioned, the bylaw amendments—which represent a subset of the proposed handbook revisions—have been approved by a referendum of the full faculty as required by the bylaws. Under a related bylaw provision, the Senate-and-referendum-approved changes automatically take effect 90 days after their transmission to the President unless specifically disapproved by the Board. The 90 day period ends on July 28.

I have had many discussions with the Senate Agenda Committee (effectively the executive committee of the Senate) regarding issues related to handbook revision over the last two years. The general understanding on both sides--mine and the agenda committee's--has been that once the Senate had adopted a complete set of handbook revisions the campus administration and the SAC would review them together in order to determine which were acceptable to the administration and where modifications might be needed. Many of us--me included--were surprised when we realized, unfortunately quite recently, that the bylaw portion of the proposed handbook revisions was subject to the 90-day limitation for consideration. Amendments to other parts of the handbook involve no such limitation.

The effect of the Board's not approving the Senate-recommended bylaw changes will be to provide an opportunity for the campus administration and the Senate to proceed with the process of consultation regarding all proposed handbook changes that we have anticipated all along. It will also have the effect of preventing the automatic approval of a few specific bylaw changes that appear to me on initial review to be problematic. The requested action will not, however, preclude subsequent approval by the Board of many of the recommended bylaw changes; it only prevents their automatic implementation by virtue of the 90-day rule.

The Provost and I have met with the Senate Agenda Committee to discuss this matter, and I have indicated to them my intention to take the course of action I am now recommending to the board. The SAC has authorized me to include the following statement in my cover memo to you: "The SAC regrets that procedural mandates require action within 90 days from transmittal; however, the SAC looks forward to working with the Provost and the President on resolving issues raised by the revision.

I am therefore asking the Board to approve the attached resolution.

"To not approve the revised Faculty Senate By-Laws adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 2005 (Resolution No. 0405-29) and ratified by the teaching faculty on April 6, 2005."