

March 01, 2006

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 03/01/2006

Stuart S. Peterfreund
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Peterfreund, Stuart S., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 03/01/2006" (2006). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 79.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004166>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: STUART S. PETERFREUND, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
RE: MINUTES, 2005-06 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 1 March

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bobcean, Bannister, Bruns, De Ritis, Futrelle, Glod, Hansberry, Herman, Janikian, Kane, Krishnamoorthy, Marshall, McKnight, Morrison, Peterfreund, Powers-Lee, Reucroft, Reynolds, Robinson, Ryan, Sanchez, Willey
(Administrators) Abdelal, Falcon, Onan, Sridhar, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Hall, Melachrinoudis, Ramirez, Schaffer, Sherwood, Strauss, Wiseman
(Administrators) Finkelstein, Greene, Moore, Soyster

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

I. Approval of the minutes. Since the minutes were not received by Senate members until February 28, discussion and approval are postponed to the next Senate meeting.

II. SAC report. Professor Glod reported that the SAC met once in regular session. She also reminded the Senate that there are four Senate meetings remaining after today's, and asked that Senate committees should take note of the limited time remaining.

III. Provost's report. Provost Abdelal reported that research expenditures, which are reported to the National Science Foundation, are approximately \$70 million for FY05. This amount is significantly higher than the amount reported for the previous year (FY04) for a number of reasons. Federal funding increased by about 15%, from \$40 to \$46 million. All data on research expenditures has now been gathered, so that the Controller's Office, which does the reporting, is able to report accurately the total that has been spent on research funded by federal grants, corporations and gifts in support of research, as well as internal support of research. The \$70 million in research spending will advance NU in the national rankings for research as much as 30 positions, or from around 160 to 130, assuming everyone else remains somewhat static. NU is also at around 130 in terms of federal funding. The Provost noted that Vice Provost Sridhar had led the effort with Finance to see that all research expenditures are accounted for. He then concluded by noting that the Provost's Office continues to be busy with salaries and merit raises, tenure and promotion, sabbatical and leaves of absences, and hiring.

As there were no questions for Professor Glod or Provost Abdelal, the Senate turned to the discussion of the proposed Executive Doctorate in Law and Policy, originally moved and seconded at the meeting of 8 February.

IV. Executive Doctorate in Law and Policy.

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)

Professor Fitzgerald, Director of the LPS Program and one of the proposers of the Executive Doctorate, provided context by pointing out that the present LPS program has been predominantly a part-time Ph.D. program. Various evaluations performed in preparation for an external review established that it is very difficult for full-time working professionals to go through a Ph.D. program. Therefore, Ms. Fitzgerald stated that she has been focusing the program on full-time students, and that that this year, three-quarters of the students will be full time. There is a distinction between the LPS Ph.D. program, which prepares students for

academic and research positions, and the proposed Executive Doctorate program, which targets professionals in the policy arena who want to be able to use current research to develop a systematic and academic understanding of what they are doing in public policy. Applicants to the program would have a master's degree, an MBA or a JD when they walk in the door. Their research would result not in a dissertation, but in a substantial scholarly paper that examines the work they are doing in a broad academic context.

SPCS Associate Dean Todd Leach added that a faculty admissions committee will select applicants. He noted also that there will not be conditional accepts, i.e. there will be no students coming to try out a course before deciding if they like the program. Applicants will need to meet the admissions criteria fully in order to gain admission.

A motion to reduce by amendment the admissions requirement of ten years' field experience to five years' was made by Dean Zoloth and seconded.

Vote to change the admissions requirement from ten years' field experience to five, PASSED: 22-0-3.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out that the stakeholders in this program have more to lose by getting a back-door degree that doesn't equip them to do what they want to do than does the University. They are highly visible people and, if the program were investigated and found wanting, it would be an embarrassment to them. He noted that the program has been designed with care and rigor so that graduates will, a) be equipped for their positions, and b) will receive value for value given.

Professor Peterfreund continued by noting that the program is a hybrid of two valuable strains in higher education: one is NU's commitment to the world of the practical and the applied; and the second is to the notion of education as an ongoing component of professional life. He noted that SPCS got out of the business of selling degrees when Vice President Hopey arrived. The University's skepticism is understandable, and the need for scrutiny is paramount, but Peterfreund expressed his belief that the program will do well both for the University and for the professional people who need this kind of program.

Professor Alper noted that he is not a supporter of this program and pointed out several inconsistencies. P.10 lists several courses on data and statistical analysis which do not sound like the basis of a thesis-based program, but rather of a data-based program. P.13 states that the last two quarters of the program are data-analysis oriented. He also noted several inconsistencies as to the program's chronology—specifically, inconsistencies as to when the dissertation is supposed to be written. He expressed his opinion that the proposal is poorly constructed and it is inappropriate for the Senate to approve it.

Professor Fitzgerald responded that courses in data analysis are not inconsistent with study at the doctoral level, and that any doctoral-level program will offer research tools to its students. Students should be consumers of research and able to understand when a methodology is appropriate and when it is not. She explained, too, that inconsistencies on the number of quarters are likely due to the many changes made in the proposal, which was drafted by several hands. Corrections for the sake of consistency will be made. The dissertation topics will be approved early in the program and the students will defend their work in the last quarter.

Professor De Ritis noted that there are two types of doctorates in music composition—a D.M.A. (Doctorate of Musical Arts) for the performer and the Ph.D. for the research-active scholar. The

latter is a much longer program. De Ritis made his observation for the purpose of providing a context for the Executive Doctorate, which he sees as being more like the D.M.A. than the Ph.D.

Dean Zoloth noted similar analogues in the health professions, both in practice-based doctoral programs such as the Executive Doctorate in Public Health at John Hopkins, and in the clinical doctorate in NU's School of Pharmacy. The School of Nursing will be proposing a clinical-practice-based doctorate as well.

Dean Stellar added that, because of the understanding between SPCS and CAS, he is hoping that the Executive Doctorate will generate revenue, which the CAS is committed to using to strengthen current Ph.D. programs, so that the educational reputation of NU will rise. This is a secondary but powerful potential benefit to the program.

Professor Peterfreund offered insight into the seven versus nine quarters discrepancy. Students will be in the program for two years of course work and will defend in the soonest convenient quarter after the completion of those two years, preferably the quarter immediately following. In one iteration, the assumption was that students would be enrolled three quarters per year; in the other, four quarters per year. He concluded that the inconsistencies are easily resolved.

Dr. Onan wondered if it would be worth considering changing the term "dissertation" to "a scholarly paper" as everyone agrees that it is not a dissertation. She also asked if anyone outside of this room know what D.L.P. means.

Professor Fitzgerald responded that there is not another Executive Doctorate of Law and Policy (D.L.P.) program. It is unique in its perspective on public policy and litigation and having 'law' in the title will draw a law audience.

Professor Peterfreund accepted the term "doctoral project" as a friendly amendment. He expressed the belief that it is time for NU to lead and not worry about who we may be following. At this time in NU's institutional history, it is time not to look at what others are doing, but to let others look at what we are doing.

Professor Sanchez asked if, taking a step back, NU has a much broader strategic plan as to how it will increase the number of degrees. He asked if it is an infinite process. The Provost responded that there is always concern when adding Ph.D. programs because each one is expected to represent a significant commitment of resources, and most are ranked by the national research council. So each additional program must be carefully considered. However, when looking at clinical doctorates, executive doctorates, or masters programs, the issue is our capacity to do it and—since they are expected to be revenue producing—their capacity to cover costs and contribute revenue. There is no constraint as to how many of these programs can be added as long as the capacity and expertise to execute them is there.

Motion to close debate was seconded. There was no objection.

Vote to approve the SPCS program Executive Doctorate in Law and Policy, PASSED: 18-2-3

IV. Master of Science in Global Studies. Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution, and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Master of Science in Global Studies and International Affairs in the School of Professional and

Continuing Studies (SPCS) as approved by the Graduate Council on 11 January 2006. (8-0-0)

The floor was yielded to Dean Leach who said that this program was developed with Professor Denis Sullivan and is for working adult professionals in increasingly global organizations that lack the perspective and specific background in managing and leading within a global environment. The program has a unique built-in component for gaining international experience, with faculty supervision, in other countries. The difference between this degree and an international relations or international affairs program is that it is not a political science degree per se. It is a program to enable a broader global perspective.

Dr. Onan said that, while she understands the global studies aspect of the program, she does not see as much of the international affairs side. Dr. Leach responded that a number of titles were tested and this is the one that made clear the program's intent and therefore resonated best of all with the program's prospective audience. He added his opinion that there was enough coursework in each area to justify this designation.

Professor De Ritis offered his support of the work Professor Sullivan does with students in terms of international affairs by his direct involvement in the day-to-day experience of these students during their overseas experience.

In response to Professor Robinson's question about what students would do with the degree, Dean Leach explained that it is designed to prepare working professionals to advance in their fields and to gain an understanding of cultural differences in the workplace. Professor Peterfreund added that the program is focused on providing NGO professionals the global experience and training that they may not have had previously but who find themselves in an increasingly global workplace. It is a program serving both the private and public sector.

Motion to close debate was seconded. There was no objection.

Vote to approve the SPCS program Master of Science in Global Studies, PASSED: 20-0-3

VI. Master of Professional Studies in Geographic Information Technology. Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution, and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Master of Professional Studies in Geographic Information Technology in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies (SPCS) as approved by the Graduate Council on 11 January 2006. (8-0-0)

The floor was yielded to Dr. Todd Fritch, Academic Specialist, Earth & Environmental Sciences, who explained that the program serves two purposes: it is a natural progression of the successful graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems, a very interdisciplinary program whose graduates wish to continue on in their studies. Second, GIS has become a widely applied tool for spatial data management and analysis and this program would attract those wanting the graduate degree as well as those who already have the certificate and want more. There is no similar degree in the Boston area and being the first institution to lead this effort is something we're positioned to do effectively.

Professor Willey asked whether this program would use Google Earth or whether it is more broad-based. Mr. Leach replied that both apply. The knowledge can be used for spatial data mapping and analysis or as purely a database management tool. The intent is to give students

the fundamental baseline of understanding from all perspectives and then choose where they want to go with it.

Professor Willey then asked whether the program could be done online or if students must come to campus. Mr. Leach responded that some other institutions have completely online-based programs and it is being considered. There are components that could be done well online, but informal evaluations of current students indicate that they want classroom experience in areas such as cartography and effective mapping in which visual communication tools are relevant.

Professor Herman added that GIS is useful across a wide range of disciplines. The technique was developed in the 1840's to map cholera outbreaks in England. It is used anywhere where data must be seen from the spatial point of view in order to yield insights. It is geography in the broadest possible sense because it's really data mapping.

Motion to close debate was seconded. There was no objection.

Vote to approve the Masters of Professional Studies in Geographic Information Technology, PASSED: 20-0-2

VII. *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee Resolution IV.G.5. (Faculty Utilizing Students in Research or Consulting Activities in Return for Academic Credit or Payment). Professor Herman moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve Section IV.G.5 (Faculty Utilizing Students in Research or Consulting Activities in Return for Academic Credit or Payment) from the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Herman explained that this resolution is from a section of the 2005-06 undergraduate student handbook. The policy has been in effect for the last 20 years and its basic assumption is that student work belongs to students. It has always been, and continues to be, University policy. It concerned the Handbook Committee that, with more undergraduate students encouraged to become involved in research, faculty realize their obligation to communicate to students that their work could be incorporated into larger projects and that students give permission, similar to what is done when hiring a research assistant. This language from the student handbook will be put into the outside professional activities section of university policies. If the work is given as a grade requirement and they refuse to give permission, faculty must find other work for them. Professor Herman reminded the Senate that, in his position in the office of University Council, he has adjudicated these problems for the past twenty years. Fewer such problems would occur if faculty members inform students up front of this policy so that students can decide beforehand whether to participate. Insertion into the Faculty Handbook will serve as a reminder to faculty to take that extra step—to get a release so there is no question afterward.

Professor McKnight proposed a friendly amendment to remove the first five words and Professor Herman agreed.

Motion to postpone the issue was then proposed by Professor McKnight and was seconded.

Professor McKnight explained that his motion was made because there are many things that affect the way the business of research is performed. He would like to see plans for how this requirement will be implemented. There are issues that are not clear relating to when a release

should be required. Another issue is the sentence stating “If a student is unwilling to execute such a release or assignment in a course necessary for the fulfillment of major, minor, or concentration requirements, the faculty member may not penalize the student in any way, and must provide the student with alternative non-faculty project-related work of similar educational value to fulfill the course requirement.” Professor McKnight stated that, in the case of a graduate thesis, most faculty members would not agree that they have a responsibility to provide students with another project.

Professor McKnight specified that the policy be reviewed by the last Senate meeting of this academic year.

Professor Herman reminded the Senate that these are regulations already in use now. The Provost responded that the Provost’s office was not aware of this policy as it had obviously been written elsewhere and not come before the Faculty Senate. The Provost noted the distinction between a policy that comes before the Faculty Senate and this policy, which may be written in the student handbook but was not voted upon by the Senate.

As a point of order, Professor Peterfreund reminded the Senate that the current debate concerns the motion to postpone only and that the merits of the policy are for another debate.

Professor Glod, on the motion to postpone, reminded the Senate that the proposal was reviewed by SAC and has been listed on the last three Senate agendas. SAC contacted Professor Graham Jones, chair of RPOC, who said that committee would be happy to review the policy. Given concerns about ambiguity and other university practices, Professor Glod urged the Senate to postpone.

Vote to postpone the *Ad hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee Resolution IV.G.5 for further scrutiny to no later than the last meeting of the Senate this academic year, PASSED: 22-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 1:19 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart S. Peterfreund, Secretary
Faculty Senate