

February 08, 2006

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 02/08/2006

Stuart S. Peterfreund
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Peterfreund, Stuart S., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 02/08/2006" (2006). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 77.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004142>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: STUART S. PETERFREUND, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2005-06 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 8 FEBRUARY

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

Absent: (Professors) Bobcean, Kane, Ramirez, Schaffer
(Administrators) Moore

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:56 a.m.

- I. **Approval of the minutes.** The minutes of the 1/25/06 meeting were accepted as amended.
- II. **SAC report.** Professor Glod reported the following:
 - A. Meetings. SAC met two times in regular session.
 - B. Committees. After meeting with President Freeland, NU administration has agreed to faculty representation on the University master planning committee and its subcommittees as follows:

Master Plan Committee, Professor Carol Glod
Plant Modernization & Parking Committee, Professor Steven Morrison
Teaching Labs, Professor Susan Powers-Lee
Classrooms, Professor Robert Lowndes
Residences, Student Life, Professor Karin Lifter
IT, Professor Eric Miller
Research, Professor Stephen McKnight
Arts/Cultural Performance Center, Professor Kali Nikitas
 - C. SAC reviewed, based on discussions held at the last Senate meeting, the charge that was given to the Senate Academic Policy Committee about the potential for inconsistencies around grading appeals procedures, not only within the three student handbooks, but also the faculty handbook, operations manual, and other relevant documents. Professor Herman, chair of APC, indicated that all documents had been reviewed as charged and the review had resulted in the resolution passed last week.
 - D. **The next Senate meeting is Wednesday, 22 February at 450 DG.**

Professor Strauss asked the Provost for an update concerning an earlier question she'd asked about NU's preparedness to deal with an epidemic.

Provost Abdelal opened the floor to questions concerning the SAC report.

Professor Futrelle asked what authority charges the Master Planning Committee and its subcommittees to which Professor Glod replied that no charges had been given to the committees as yet. Professor Futrelle pointed out that some student housing is not on the

master plan being projected out ten years. Nor was it on the last ten-year master plan. Since there was a deadline to submit proposed revisions to the present plan, he wondered where it stands.

Provost Abdelal indicated that NU is at the end of that process. The amendments pertaining to residence halls have been presented to the City per a memorandum of agreement (MOU); there are no other amendments to that plan. The focus now shifts to the next master plan.

Doctor Onan confirmed that the deadline for amendments to the old master plan is April.

III. **Provost Report.** In answering Professor Strauss's question, the Provost said that Jean Fleischman, executive assistant to the President, has been working on coordinating NU's responses to emergencies. The Provost will send the latest report to Professor Strauss.

Dr. Onan added that Ms. Fleishman is working on an evacuation plan with a variety of scenarios. Some offices may be asked to work with her. Ms. Fleishman is also more specifically looking at responses to pandemics and has attended several meetings in the area.

The Provost went on to respond to two questions raised by Professor Hall at the last meeting. The first was whether there was likelihood of a longer range budget frame so when it is time to offer stipends to graduate students the budget is known. Unless the Colleges hear differently, whatever allocation is made to each college in terms of number and amount of stipends the previous year will continue. In terms of raises, stipends would be the same as for faculty and staff and those amounts will be discussed at the budget presentation at the next meeting. If more assistantships are being requested, this is a different issue.

Professor Hall's second question was whether the University has done as much as possible to enhance energy savings over the long term. There is a conservation protocol which includes turning lights off and things of that nature. The challenge is our actual consumption which has increased, most likely because of increased utilization of academic facilities as well as student life. It may be an issue to discuss following the budget presentation at the next Senate meeting, if time permits. The Provost opened the floor to questions.

Professor Alper asked if there is a parking committee and, if so, does it have faculty representation. He specifically referred to a change in parking regulations at Renaissance Garage. Professor Morrison indicated that there is an ad hoc committee that deals primarily with rates. Professor Morrison sits on the committee but recalled no discussion of a change at Renaissance Garage.

Professor Alper asked if the Senate Agenda Committee might pursue faculty representation on this committee and Professor Glod agreed to look into it. The Provost agreed to follow up on the exact change at Renaissance Garage.

Professor Alper continued that he'd heard more talk about adding a transcript page for coop and wondered if SAC and the Senate will have the opportunity to review and debate this prior to implementation. Provost Abdelal assured the Senate that the issue would come to the Senate before being implemented.

The Senate further discussed parking and agreed that the issue involves process and the apparent lack of notification concerning changes. The Provost agreed and moved to the next agenda item.

IV. New School Academic Advisory Committee proposal for new School of Social Sciences, Urban Affairs, and Public Policy to be housed within the College of Arts and Sciences. (Vote by affiliated CAS department faculty: 59-2-5; vote by CAS College Council: 20-1-3).

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the establishment of the proposed School of Social Sciences, Urban Affairs, and Public Policy as approved by the College of Arts and Sciences College Council and agreed to by its associate departments.

Professor McKnight raised a point of order as to whether there was, at the last meeting, a vote to close debate on the resolution or on the amendment. He pointed out that the minutes read that debate on the resolution was closed and, if this was not the intent, the minutes needed to be changed. Professor Strauss indicated that only the amendment was voted upon but Professor Peterfreund, who proposed the original motion to close debate, said that he intended to close debate on the question. Professor Herman, Senate Parliamentarian, recalled the motion to close as related to the amendment. It was therefore agreed that the minutes of the 25 January meeting should be amended to reflect that the motion to close was to close debate on the amendment.

The Provost then brought the original motion back to the floor and yielded the floor to Dean Stellar. Dean Stellar asked Professors Bosso, past chair of Political Science; Koenig, chair of Sociology and Anthropology; and Portz, current chair of Political Science, to address the issue of support within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Bosso said that many faculty members participated in an extensive discussion in anticipation of many areas of concern from both CAS departments and CAS as a whole. Speaking broadly, the impetus behind the proposal was recognition that CAS's comparative advantage in the social sciences, especially at the graduate level, is increasingly being dictated by NU's competition with institutions that have a school of public policy. CAS is constantly losing good applicants, especially at the master's level, to public policy schools. Various models have become the norm among top tier universities, with whom we compete for those graduate students. The synergies created by this model are more attractive than separate departments. [The proposed School] is a rational response to a market dilemma, which is the need to raise our competitive advantage at the graduate level where we have not kept up. The proposed School can focus efforts to obtain funding for policy-based programs and professional programs, and provide a market advantage. The only other real policy school in the area is the Kennedy School so this would be a major statement at the graduate and research levels. This effort is a common one by people in the social sciences in reaction to market pressures; to raise the competitive advantage of the University in the social sciences, policy areas and professional programs; and to give value added that can be used in recruitment, fundraising, research development and ways in which we cannot imagine yet.

As to the question on why to keep it within CAS: separating it is wrong for NU. Our view is that a strong policy school within CAS is good for the College and for NU as a whole. While a separate school would be an asset in terms of fundraising and in attracting graduate students, the impact on core departments would be tremendous. The key is that this is the right thing to do at this moment in time.

Professor Koenig said that the social science departments have been discussing this for 2-1/2 years and it's the result of a long series of compromises. This proposal is seen as making the pie larger, not taking away from anyone else, but making a statement that NU is in the game. Professor Portz concurred, adding that Political Science also had discussions for the last couple of years and voted unanimously in favor of the proposal. There are many advantages and synergies across departments that could be developed in a variety of ways.

Dean Stellar continued that the CAS regards this School as a continuation of the academic investment plan in which we said that we would do nanotech, biotech, sensing and imaging, and urban policy.

Professor Reucroft granted that there are some departments that support the proposal, but wanted to know the percentage of faculty as his own informal quizzing indicates that support in CAS is less than 50%. He proposed an open meeting in the CAS to debate and vote the proposal. He also asked to see minutes of the College Council meeting as they have never been distributed. And thirdly, Professor Reucroft asked to see a budget. He indicated that a budget had been provided at a meeting of chairs recently which he in turn was given by his chair. He proposed to distribute that budget to the Senate. After some discussion, the Senate agreed to distribution of the budget.

Dean Stellar asked Professor Herman to address Professor Reucroft's comments regarding process and said that he would respond to the budget.

Professor Herman explained that the CAS Constitution empowers the College Council to act on behalf of faculty. The Council met in November for full discussion; there are 37 members of the College Council; a quorum is 19. 24 members attended, voted on the proposal and approved it by a vote of 20-1-3. The proposal was distributed a week prior to the meeting. Professor Herman explained that the College Constitution vests the responsibility of transacting business in the College Council because it is all but impossible to get the full faculty to attend meetings. This arrangement has been in effect since 1982. This question of having a College meeting has never been brought up before although the possibility is provided for in the Constitution. The Council passes many resolutions throughout the year and this proposal was treated exactly like any other. Professor Herman explained that, due to staff turnover, the minutes are missing. He added that, in the future, both agendas and minutes will go to chairs and as soon as an email list of all faculty members is available, everyone will get everything. He reminded the Senate that College Council members are elected by their departments and suggested that saying one doesn't like the outcome so let's change the process is inappropriate.

Regarding budget, Dean Stellar explained that there was a second set of operational deliberations involving a development committee, which was asked to look at the feasibility of external fundraising. This budget was not distributed because it is not a budget for approval. It was formed out of a conversation with Professor Bluestone and Jim Sarazen, director of financial affairs in the CAS Dean's office. The Dean yielded the floor to Professor Bluestone to explain why the document exists and repeated that it is not a budget for the proposed School.

Professor Bluestone explained that, as the committee was developing a full scale proposal, the question was raised about what it might cost, particularly since the committee was committed from day one to the proposition that all resources would come from outside sources. Professor Bluestone was charged with developing, with Dean Stellar and Jim Sarazen, a "gold-plated" budget for the school ten years from now. After several iterations, this dream budget was produced. It proposes garnering enough outside resources to support not only the School but other units at the University. Professor Bluestone said that the budget is based on endowment income. He added that lastly, and most importantly, some activities are already going on in existing centers—the Center for Labor Market Studies, the Center for Urban and Regional Policy—which bring in millions each year and will be part of the school. So the final operating budget of \$5 million, which represents 1% of NU's budget, will represent and be generated by the interest earned from an endowment of \$118 million raised through external funding sources.

Professor Strauss stressed the importance of strong support from the college. She claimed that there are serious flaws in the process by which the proposal got to the floor of the Senate, and argued that the proposal would fare better if it received strong support from the College before coming to the Senate. The Professor read an email from Dean Stellar in which the subject of whether this was discussed elsewhere throughout the College: "I distributed the proposal once to the College of Chairs in November, the Council of Chairs, through electronic format, we had it on the agenda, but I let the agenda slip so we did not discuss it." Professor Strauss expressed her conclusion that the proposal has not been vetted properly.

In addressing the budget issue, the proposal requires that the University raise \$118 million in order to provide endowment interest at 4.5%. NU has not done this easily in the past. She cited the 1991-97 capital campaign and said that all this does not mean it couldn't be done. However, attempting to start a new school with insufficient funds will weaken existing departments while failing to build a truly first-class interdisciplinary public policy-oriented entity on campus. Professor Strauss proposed remanding the proposal back to the College to work all aspects through in a consistent way. She reiterated that she thinks the idea is fabulous.

Professor Janikian expressed concern about what appears to be a lack of trust among some members of the Senate toward some of the faculty who said they have passed the proposal unanimously in their departments. He proposed that the Senate may be ready to vote.

Dean Soyster expressed concern that the budget document had become public and suggested the need to be smarter about how documents are distributed.

Professor Powers-Lee added that it has become clear that not enough attention is paid to College Council. The departments elected representatives who voted for what they thought was a good fit for the College and University with potential for a better reputation. Representatives from Biology did not consult the entire Biology faculty because they did not feel it warranted that. So the process worked in spite of everything. We've learned that we want to get agendas and want to know more, but we did choose this sort of governance.

Professor Marshall said that his department [Communication Studies] is on the cusp of the arts and the social sciences and have faculty that are aware of and impacted by the proposal. Professor Marshall sees this as creating a multiplier effect that will have positive implications for his department as opposed to drawing away from it. The department was aware of this proposal and thought of it as a multiplier effect with powerful possibilities that should be acted upon. He does not believe the objections are real enough to backtrack on the issue.

Professors Nathanson and De Ritis added that their departments [Philosophy & Religion and Music] were aware of the proposal and excited about the possibilities it presents for their departments. Professor De Ritis said that both the Music and Theater departments' reactions are positive.

Professor Peterfreund added that, while the issue of internal funding was discussed at the last meeting, the response of funds "in kind" is disingenuous as "in kind" cannot create super-structure. He suggested that if a Senator is not ready to vote, they should have the courage to propose a motion to postpone consideration. Otherwise, the question should be voted upon.

Dean Zoloth said that any expansion in the public policy area is important to Bouvé in terms of collaborative research and in attracting faculty into Bouvé's own initiatives. He underscored the multiplying effect of the proposal. Dean Greene said that the proposal is very clearly connected to a three to five year process within the University which stresses interdisciplinary

approaches across the colleges and within departments. In order to have a credible and competitive proposal there must be interdisciplinary activity and large scale projects. It must have the capacity, like the Maxwell School, to leverage sociologists, economists, political scientists and others. He said that it is perfectly appropriate to come up with a “blue sky budget” to get the discussion going. It does not in any way reflect what is going to happen.

Professor Brookins said that if it was to be modeled on the Rappaport Center at KSG, as was printed in the Boston Globe, he is against it. The Rappaport Center practices advocacy as research and it is a dangerous model.

Motion: Professor Strauss motioned to commit the proposal to the College and the faculty of Arts & Sciences and it was seconded.

Vote: Defeated, 5-23-5.

Motion: Professor Herman motioned to vote the question and it was seconded. There being no objection, the resolution was brought to vote.

Vote: Approved, 28-3-4.

V. Executive Doctorate in Law and Policy. Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Executive Doctorate in Law and Policy in the School of Professional and Continuing Students (SPCS) as approved by the Graduate Council on 11 January 2006. (6-2-0)

The floor was yielded to Joan Fitzgerald, acting director, Law Policy and Society Program (LPS), who indicated that the proposal has been worked on for several years. The idea is to create a program in Law and Policy that will be offered on the executive format. SPCS is hoping to establish separation between the LPS program, which is a traditional PhD program to encourage more full time students wanting to go into tenure track academic positions, and focus the executive doctorate more on mid-career professionals who are looking for a doctorate to pursue career goals. It's a two-year program with the dissertation process beginning immediately. It will meet two weeks in summer followed by monthly weekend meetings.

Vice President Hopey added that it is a model based on one at the University of Pennsylvania which has more than 280 students. The model is being adapted by Seton Hall, Vanderbilt, Harvard KSG and others. The program would provide older business professionals the opportunity to get an advanced degree. A lot of very talented people are lost because we don't offer this type of opportunity. It is not a PhD program; it is not designed for pure researchers or academics; but it is for people who want to move into advocacy roles in government or people in business moving into the non-profit sector. It is not a traditional PhD program, but it is a new sort of doctoral program that is creating a trend across the country.

As to why SPCS: Professor Fitzgerald sees some of the revenue from this new doctoral program going back to fund full-time PhD students in LPS. Second, SPCS has the infrastructure to provide this type of program. It's an LPS program but SPCS provides the delivery. It may not be a program of which SPCS has long-term ownership.

Professor Peterfreund added that one way to look at it is catching up with the rest of the world. In Europe there have been far more doctorates produced that can be used in the university system and many go on to professional fields. Some US PhDs who do not find jobs in academics change careers but this degree has the advantage of taking people who are already engaged in some field of endeavor and giving them the doctorate to be active consumers of research for the purpose of making governance, policy and corporate strategic decisions. It is a way of equipping the leadership that comes to us to be active on a global scale.

Professor McKnight commented that the schedule seems a little light for a PhD. Dean Hopey responded that SPCS has had top faculty working on it and it will be reviewed after two years. It's a pilot. At Penn, Dean Hopey experienced the same questions. The experience was radical there as well. There, the quality is very good: there are students coming in with 20 years of experience and they're winning awards. It will attract a very high quality professional who didn't get a PhD earlier in life because they went out to work. Applicants will have a masters or a JD.

Professor Alper said his reaction is that it is similar to grade inflation, only it is degree inflation. Pointing to a passage on page two of the proposal, which reads, "usual barriers will be lowered", he expressed concern about the degrees we're offering under SPCS; about whether NU is comfortable with the idea of degree inflation; and that there will be no way to differentiate between these doctorates and any others. Finally, he asked if a budget is not generally submitted for a new degree program. To the last issue, the Provost responded that budgets are not submitted for SPCS programs as they operate on a self-contained basis.

Professor Alper then asked what the admissions standards were as they are not defined in the proposal.

Provost Abdelal said that, due to the time, the Senate will not be able to act on this proposal. He requested that copies of the budget distributed earlier be returned to Professor Reucroft.

Adjourned: 1:25pm

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart S. Peterfreund, Secretary
Faculty Senate