

April 26, 2006

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/26/2006

Stuart S. Peterfreund
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Peterfreund, Stuart S., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 04/26/2006" (2006). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 82.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004191>

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, 26 APRIL

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

Absent: (Professors) Bobcean, Krishnamoorthy, Ramirez, Ryan, Schaffer, Willey, Wiseman
(Administrators) Greene, Moore, Soyster

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:11 AM.

I. Approval of the minutes. Minutes of the 4/12 meeting were deferred.

II. SAC Report.

A. Professor Glod reported that SAC met twice in regular session.

B. President Freeland has responded to resolution #13 on the Faculty Center as follows: "For information only. No approval required. I intend to create a working group, with faculty participation, to review this matter and recommend the best course of action. In principle, I am supportive of maintaining a dining facility on campus like the faculty center."

Professor Glod reported that she had met with Senior Vice President Mucciolo to discuss several options for a faculty center including reopening the Kerr space in September. The Vice President suggested that to do so could raise the price of meals to approximately \$40. Renovation/expansion of the basement at Churchill will entail substantial cost. Another possibility is inclusion of a faculty center in the new Alumni Center space at Columbus Avenue. Faculty should send their comments to Professor Glod.

C. Procedures for SPCS certificate programs do not require Senate approval but must be announced at the Senate. The following SPCS certificate programs have been forwarded to President Freeland:

Graduate Certificate in Global Studies and International Affairs
Graduate Certificate in Digital Media
Graduate Certificate in Digital Photography
Graduate Certificate in Game Design
Graduate Certificate in Digital Video
Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design: Educational Multimedia
Graduate Certificate in Public Relations
Graduate Certificate in Information Security Management
Graduate Certificate in Mainframe Technologies and Programming
Graduate Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

D. The results of today's 2006-07 Senate Organizational Meeting SAC elections are as follows: Professor Carol Glod, SAC Chair; Professor Stuart S. Peterfreund, Secretary to the Senate; Professors Susan Powers-Lee and Stephen McKnight are reelected; Professors James Fox and Tracy Robinson are newly elected. Professor Powers-Lee is Vice Chair of SAC.

E. Professor Glod extended thanks to all for their work on the 2005-06 Faculty Senate.

III. Provost Abdelal thanked SAC and the Senators for their work throughout the year, offering praise for the collaborative nature of the endeavor. The Provost also expressed his preference for a Faculty Center associated with the Alumni Center space. The floor was opened to questions.

IV. Questions.

Professor Alper asked the Provost whether he was aware that some classes were split into two rooms for exams. Discussion ensued. Vice Provost Hill stated that he had been made aware of the possibility by the Registrar during the fall and had heard back from the associate deans that splitting classes into two examination rooms would be manageable at the college level. Professor Peterfreund suggested that if classes are split for exams, the Registrar's office should provide proctors. Professor Herman pointed out that the classroom issue has been discussed ceaselessly and must be solved by improving NU's classroom plan, which is part of the upcoming Senate Calendar Committee Report. The Provost then closed the issue by offering that, should this need to be done in the future, it should be systematic and central so that individual faculty members needn't be concerned with logistics.

V. 2005-06 Special Senate Committee for Academic Policy Report: General Education at Northeastern University, Final Report and Recommendations, April 3, 2006. Professor Herman moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the 2006-07 Senate Agenda Committee appoint a University-wide General Education Implementation Committee, as described in the 2005-06 APC Report, to oversee the development and implementation of the curricula to satisfy this requirement.

This is a continuation of the APC Report and Recommendations from the 12 April Senate meeting and is the implementation step. Professor Herman explained that there would be considerable overlap between the present curriculum and implementation of the General Education requirements. The Implementation Committee would eventually turn into a version of the current UCC to deal with ongoing issues. This resolution is the first step in that process.

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

VOTE to approve APC Resolution #2: PASSED 26-0-0

VI. APC Resolutions #3. Professor Herman moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the General Education requirements thus developed be implemented beginning with the freshman class entering in September 2008.

Professor Marshall suggested that this be a determination by the General Education Implementation Committee based on whether finances and resources are realized. He suggested flexibility be applied.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out that flexibility is implicit, and that if the Implementation Committee indicates that implementation cannot happen by the published deadline, it will be deferred. Discussion took place regarding the necessity of a timeline at all and the upcoming NEASC accreditation exercise. The Provost explained that the university-wide self-study needs to take place during the upcoming academic year and the visit will take place the following year, or 2007-08. Professor Herman accepted a friendly amendment to rephrase the resolution.

The amended resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the General Education requirements will be developed with the goal of implementing them beginning with the freshman class entering in 2008.

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

VOTE to approve APC Resolution #3 as amended: PASSED 27-0-0.

VII. UCC Resolution regarding Double Degrees (UCC vote: 11-0-1 on 5 May 2005). Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the UUC's recommendation to permit students to complete a double major in two colleges without being required to complete an extra 30 semester hours.

The mover yielded the floor to Vice Provost Hill, who explained that the resolution proposes to remove legislation making it a requirement for students pursuing two diplomas in separate colleges to complete 30 extra semester hours. The discussion clarified the requirement that the student must fulfill all requirements for each degree in each college to receive two diplomas, except in a case where there is a pre-existing agreement between two colleges for a particular double-degree program. The Provost pointed out the advantage of more interdisciplinary study. Professor Glod offered a friendly amendment to clarify the language to include "a double degree or second baccalaureate". That amendment was accepted.

Professor Herman further clarified the fact that dual majors exist between departments within a single collegiate structure with the notion of a capstone that relates the two disciplines. A double major in a single college is simply two full majors. This is a third species where students work across college boundaries where collegiate requirements are different and where the programs are not related. Professor McKnight noted that there is currently an integrated dual major between Physics and Bioengineering. The distinction between the programs covered by the proposal on the floor and a program such as the one described by Professor McKnight is that, in his example, the requirements have been set between the two colleges.

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

The amended resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the UUC's recommendation to permit students to complete a double degree or second baccalaureate in two colleges without being required to complete an extra 30 semester hours.

VOTE to approve UUC resolution: PASSED, 28-0-1

VIII. Motion to recommit *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) for review by the 2006-07 *Ad Hoc* Handbook Review Committee).

Professor McKnight noted that as a parliamentary point of order, the original resolution must be brought back to the floor in order for it to be recommitted. Therefore, Professor McKnight moved the following resolution (from 1 March), 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 leftover business from the revised Faculty Handbook. He passed out to the Senate the current copyright policy with respect to students and the current patent policy with respect to students, noting that both had been approved by the Faculty Senate. He noted, too, that the notion of students being provided with alternative assignments if they refuse to release their work is the only statement that is not the result of Senate legislation but is a provostial directive. This resolution is an amalgamation of language from various sources with the intent of informing faculty. Except when substantial university resources are involved, students have the same rights to their work as faculty. Professor Herman noted that he'd been working on release forms this term.

Professor McKnight moved to recommit the resolution to the new ad hoc handbook review committee for further discussion and that motion was seconded. He went on to urge, based on the materials that Professor Herman had passed out, that further examination is necessary so that language can be tightened to reflect consistency. Professor McKnight expressed concern as well over the language specifying that faculty must provide a substitute project. He noted that MIT graduate students are required to sign a release upon

enrollment that anything they invent as a graduate student belongs to the Institution. NU does not require this.

Vice Provost Sridhar noted that deliberations should include DSPA, that the resulting policy must work for both graduate and undergraduate students, and that model releases must be made available to the Colleges and to Sponsored Programs.

Professor Peterfreund supported a motion to recommit. Negotiated understandings regarding students' research must be finely nuanced in order to prevent gross misunderstandings.

Discussion took place on the nature of the new ad hoc committee to review student handbooks for consistency with the Faculty Handbook. Professor Herman noted that he had been asked to chair this committee and his understanding is that the committee is to review student handbooks not existing legislation that has already been approved by the Senate. He pointed out that MIT graduate students are required to sign agreements upon enrollment so that the issue does not arise. There is nothing in existing legislation, including the Faculty Handbook, to prevent a College from making signing such an agreement a condition of admission.

Provost Abdelal noted that changing what has been previously approved by the Faculty Senate is a process independent of the issue of what is contained in student handbooks. He reiterated a point that he made at the 1 March meeting: Admissions, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Affairs stand ready to assist in reviewing student handbooks.

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

VOTE on the motion to recommit the resolution for further examination: PASSED, 27-2-2

IX. Proposed Programs in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies (SPCS). Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BS in Finance and Accounting Management:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Bachelor of Science in Finance and Accounting in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on April 6, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Associate Dean Leach who explained that SPCS has been reviewing strategies to deal with accreditation issues noted by AACSB. Both this program and the next on the agenda seek to change the SPCS curriculum in the business area to focus more specifically on its mission and audience, which is different from that of CBA. There is an effort to frontload the business content in a 2+2 model thereby reducing the coverage issues for CBA.

Dr. Onan stated for the record that it would be wise to discontinue the current SPCS programs being replaced by this and the next program on the agenda. Professor Peterfreund responded that they are being phased out by giving the current students a time limit to complete their degrees. If they go beyond that limit they must move into one of these two programs, assuming they receive approval.

Professor Herman observed that SPCS is in competition with BU's adult and continuing education programs. BU was able to procure an exemption from the AACSB's policy that 60% of the program must be taught by full-time business school faculty—an exemption that NU was not granted. Associate Dean Leach added that the 2+2 model complies with AACSB guidelines.

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

VOTE to approve the SPCS BS in Finance and Accounting Management, PASSED: 30-0-0

Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BS in Management:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Bachelor of Science in Management in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on April 6, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Associate Dean Leach who explained that this program was developed with the same goals in mind as those of the BS in Finance and Accounting Management.

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

VOTE to approve the SPCS program BS in Management, PASSED: 26-0-0

Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

MS in Applied Nutrition:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Masters of Science in Applied Nutrition in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on April 6, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Ms. Lea Johnson of the Bouvé Institute, who explained that it is a continuing education degree in keeping with the APA guidelines rather than a clinical degree. Professor Hall asked about demand for such a degree and Professor Peterfreund responded that there is a demonstrated need in the areas of private vendors working with HMOs in providing dietary management and consulting services.

In response to questions from Professor Robinson regarding the type of work and market for such a program, Ms. Johnson responded that it targets registered dietitians who want advanced degrees and other healthcare professionals with the nutrition degree as well as those in physical therapy or nursing who had little training in nutrition but find the need to integrate the subject into their professions. In addition, students at Bouvé have asked for more than the two courses presently offered. The expectation is that the program will eventually grow to 60-75 students.

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

VOTE to approve the SPCS program MS in Applied Nutrition, PASSED: 29-0-0.

Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

MS in Respiratory Care Leadership:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Masters of Science in Respiratory Care Leadership in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on April 6, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Dean Hopey who explained that there is high demand from people who do not have a bachelor's degree in this area which was realized with last year's first direct-entry program in respiratory therapy. Mr. Scott Stanley, Associate Clinical Specialist at Cardiopulmonary Sciences, added that this program fits a need for additional course offerings in SPCS and provides a pragmatic approach to combining research with specialty courses to develop further credentials for respiratory care. This is the first master's degree in the field of respiratory care.

Professor Hall asked if there is an African content in the proposed course subset labeled *global awareness* and, if not, is it anticipated that there will be. Dean Hopey responded that the courses focus on the larger markets initially but Africa and/or Australia are being reviewed and further globalization is anticipated in the next 18 months.

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

VOTE to approve the SPCS program MS in Respiratory Care Leadership, PASSED: 27-1-1.

Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

MS in Human Services

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Master of Science in Human Services in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on April 18, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Associate Dean Leach who said that this area of human services shows a large demand. This non-clinical master's adds professionalism to the field and allows mobility to those in human services organizations. It also provides working professionals the ability to gain the master's on a part-time basis.

Professor Alper wondered why, given the impact of the economic environment on the social environment, no economics-related course or courses are offered in this program. Associate Dean Leach answered that the courses respond to the needs of those working in the profession although the economic aspect makes sense, perhaps as an elective. Ms. Natalia Stone of the Human Services Department noted that their undergraduate program does not require economics although students can take it within their specialization.

Associate Dean Leach continued that the program is geared toward those people who are taking on administrative responsibilities as the curriculum focuses on leadership. The title, however, was kept broad because of other areas, such as criminal justice, that could eventually fall within a wide human services umbrella.

Professor Hall noted that he had had a less-than-receptive response to his proposal to cross-list some of these new courses with classes in African American studies that seemed to be based on who would get the credit hours. Professor Robinson asked if students would gain competencies in specific areas—gender issues, social justice advocacy—through other departments as it appears as though not all courses are listed. Dean Hopey responded that the program is in line with the philosophy of SPCS programs built on a “professional feeder model” whereby students can build their electives around their area of interest. It allows flexibility and provides the platform on which to build.

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

VOTE to approve the SPCS program MS in Human Services, PASSED: 27-1-0.

X. Ph.D in Nursing. Professor Glod moved the following motion and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Ph.D. in Nursing as approved by the Graduate Council on April 18, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Professor Howard and Dean Hoffart from the School of Nursing. They explained that this degree emphasizes clinical research and is a logical expansion step for the School to both add to the aspirations of the University and help resolve the critical shortage of nursing faculty which now exists nation-wide. Results will be enhanced recruitment and retention of faculty, additional University resources, graduation of highly skilled scholars able to work as teachers and researchers in academic institutions and medical centers, and research opportunities that will increase the caliber of undergraduate administrators.

Dean Zoloth added that the program is consistent with the direction of the Bouvé College of Health Sciences in terms of providing high quality doctoral programs in specialized professional areas and it has the full support of the College departments and faculty.

Professor Glod added that past faculty have resigned in frustration of not having a Ph.D. program and that recruiting young faculty is difficult for the same reason as the current program lacks enough senior faculty members to mentor them. So the program serves to complement the faculty and moves the department toward more research.

Professor Powers-Lee noted that norms for a dissertation committee in the field of science require one member from outside the department and sometimes from outside the institution and wondered if those norms were different for Nursing.

Dean Hoffart offered that the norms were probably similar in nursing and that the issue would be addressed to be more explicit.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out a discrepancy between the proposal, which states that it is a dynamic and research-focused doctoral program, and the grant-seeking success of current faculty, and he requested that Dean Zoloth go on record to state the Bouvé College's commitment to hiring additional research-active faculty under the auspices of the Academic Investment Plan. Dean Zoloth stated that a senior hire is allocated by the Provost through the plan. In addition, Bouvé has plans to allocate internal hires at the senior level for additional faculty. Bouvé also plans to attract future faculty who are highly research-active and are on the cusp of submitting federal funding. He expressed confidence that approval of this program will permit the College to attract quality senior and junior faculty.

Provost Abdelal agreed that the School of Nursing had been identified in the Academic Investment Plan to strengthen faculty ranks and is projected to add positions. There is great need nationally for nursing graduates and for doctoral faculty. Graduates of this program will readily find faculty positions throughout the country.

Dean Hoffart agreed adding that the American Association of Colleges of Nursing is expending great effort to address the nursing faculty shortage. The shortage may intensify as current faculty retires. The shortage of nurses cannot be solved without nursing faculty. This program is part of the solution.

Professor Alper noted that the proposal offers no indication of guidelines for an analytical component of the GRE and asked the reason for that omission. Dean Hoffart agreed that it could be added although the requirements are traditional for nursing.

Dr. Onan noted the difficulty of research in nursing given HIPAA, a dearth of research subjects, releases etc., and expressed concern that the program time-frame was too short to gather and analyze data and write a doctoral level dissertation.

Dean Hoffart indicated that the program is a one-year minimum but agreed that it is challenging within that time-frame. She noted that those who worked on the proposal envisioned several things: they anticipate that the urban focus of the program will enable data selection primarily from community care settings as well as the acute care venue. Nursing's clinical programs already have access to a wide variety of community settings. In addition, nursing research works best when students work on a funded project with a faculty member where they use already selected data and supplement with additional data that they select but where access to the institutions has already been achieved by the PI. This is typically where the strongest doctoral programs in nursing are developing their models.

Dr. Onan asked, then, if some of the research would be policy-based to which Dean Hoffart replied it would not by her understanding of policy research. While the research could potentially influence policy, it is focused on collecting data from patients about their health and health care. She also confirmed the continued need for IRB and HIPAA. And in response to a final question, Dean Hoffart said that NU's School of Nursing is ranked 75th.

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

VOTE to approve the Ph.D. in Nursing, PASSED: 29-0-0.

XI. MS in Health Informatics. Professor Futrelle moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed MS in Health Informatics as approved by the Graduate Council on April 18, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Dean Finkelstein who said that the program responds to a critical shortage of health informatics professionals throughout the nation. Its objective is to train broadly educated individuals to enhance the outcome and delivery of health care. The program combines the strengths of Bouvé and CCIS and is an opportunity to build a program of national distinction.

Dean Zoloth added that there is a growing need to bring information systems into the healthcare field with efforts being made from the local to the national levels to modernize. There is not a similar program in New England.

Several faculty members applauded the interdisciplinary effort of the program.

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

VOTE to approve the MS in Health Informatics, PASSED: 25-0-0.

XII. MS in Applied Mathematics. Professor Morrison moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed MS in Applied Mathematics as approved by the Graduate Council on April 18, 2006.

The floor was yielded to Professor McOwen, Chair of the Department of Mathematics who stated the reasons for consideration of the program to be 1) to attempt to increase graduate enrollments and 2) to generate revenue. Students could enter the program without a BS in mathematics and without taking a mathematics GRE. The program is a bit more flexible with the possibility of taking two courses outside the department and the required courses will be fewer than for the current, full-time pure mathematics degree. It is a part-time degree that does not lead to the Ph.D.

Professor Peterfreund expressed concern that no market survey was carried out to determine the employment viability of students with this degree. It is not self-evident, thus the proposal is premature. In addition, to combine doctoral students with graduate students of lesser capability means having to teach to a broad range of abilities, a circumstance which is pedagogically unwise.

Professor Strauss explained that applied math is a different discipline than pure math and, while some basic pure math courses are presumably included, there will be a wider variety of courses these students can take as second-tiered graduate courses, including courses in economics, advanced physics, and advanced engineering. Also, students in this program would not be looking for a job afterwards as they would enroll to advance their careers in an already-related industry. Professor Strauss did inquire about who would be recruited for the program.

Professor McOwen, responding to Professor Peterfreund's observations, said that while no market analysis had been done, there were several indicators of demand. There is always expressed interest in the full-time graduate program in applied math from people without an applied math degree who could take this proposed part-time program; there are inquiries from people without any math degree but who work in an industry requiring work in the math area who could qualify for this proposed program. Targeted advertising is expected to generate substantial interest. In response to the issue of students varying capabilities in the same course, Professor McOwen acknowledged that it could be a concern.

It was pointed out that the proposed program requirements are very close to the core program. There was concern expressed about the ability of the students in the proposed program to keep up, given the lower entrance requirements and the lesser number of regular graduate math courses they would take. Professor McOwen responded that students in the proposed program would have choices that regular, full-time graduate students do not have—for instance, they could avoid an algebra course and take an analysis course. He also said that the Department is attempting to keep initial expenses low by adding only one new

course created especially for the program. Professor Herman pointed out that the program provides a way for people to enroll who have had math in college or come from different backgrounds but are using applied skills.

Motion was made to close discussion. As there was objection, a vote ensued.

VOTE to end debate on the MS in Applied Math, FAILED: 16-9-0. Debate remained open.

Professor Futrelle noted that this seemed a narrow view of 'applied math' and hoped that the Department would develop further courses that would be of interest to their own majors as well. There should be direction for the future. Professor McOwen responded that a new course in computer vision is being created at the undergraduate level using one of the Department's applied mathematicians so the Department is making use of their expertise and looking forward. He added that this proposed program is an initial platform.

Dr. Onan agreed. The proposed program is not an endpoint. When a department is asked to produce revenue, clientele must be developed before a substantial number of new courses can be developed. Given the constraints of the system, a new proposal must be developed slowly and in a disciplined fashion. She said that she sees this as a very good first step.

Dean Finkelstein said that part of his reticence is that 'applied math' has a specific meaning and focus in the marketplace and thinking of this program as mathematics applied to a multitude of disciplines is not how it would be perceived by professionals in the discipline. There is an opportunity to shape this program to a defined market which can be tested and determined in advance. The Dean applauded the efforts of the Mathematics Department but wondered if the proposed program could use more work. He offered to assist.

Professor Strauss noted that many fields are narrowly construed which is unfortunate as students go out and do any number of varied things. This program is an attempt to address the issue of students coming from various backgrounds. It is appropriate to call it 'applied math' because it enables students to obtain more math to be used in applied fashions but is not the thought concept of pure math.

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

VOTE to approve the MS in Applied Mathematics, PASSED: 21-0-7.

XIII. 2005-06 Special *Ad Hoc* Research Policy Oversight Committee (RPOC) Report. Professor McKnight moved the following resolutions (to be voted upon together as they are closely related) and they were seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That, in response to the report of the Research Policy Oversight Committee on the timeliness and responsiveness of University legal procedures, particularly those related to research, it is the sense of the Faculty Senate that both the Vice Provost for Research and the University Counsel Office report annually to the Research Policy Oversight Committee of the Faculty Senate on the documented response time for contract approval in their respective areas.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That it is the sense of the Senate that the Vice Provost for Research and the Vice President and University Counsel report to the Research Policy Oversight Committee by September 15, 2006, on the feasibility of 1) establishing a faculty council or using other university offices to assist in risk assessment, 2) delegating specific legal services and/or contract signature authority to other appropriate University offices, and 3) implementing other "best practices" from national research universities to streamline the process of handling research contracts.

The floor was yielded to Professor Jones, Chair of the Senate Committee on Research Policy Oversight, who explained that the resolutions are a result of concerns, particularly by those with large multi-year federal grants, regarding delays in the legal approval procedure and the University's risk adverse nature where

procedures seem counterproductive. In addition, there appears to be a lack of accountability. The Provost's office has spearheaded one remedy of hiring additional legal counsel which has greatly accelerated the process and now more needs to be done. The Committee recommends that general counsel produce an annual report to address issues of accountability and that University Counsel seek advice from campus experts in an attempt to find solutions rather than giving negative responses.

Professor Morrison noted that Economics Department faculty members had recently experienced long delays in getting what is a standard contract through the NU system.

Professor Herman agreed that the resolutions are entirely appropriate. He pointed out that some problems exist because of bureaucratic delays which University Counsel is working on. Others exist because of attitudes embedded in the Board of Trustees concerning risk, and these will be harder to change.

Dean Soyster suggested that the resolutions would be more effective if they contained specific requests that the Senate would like to see happen. He cited a recent example in Engineering where NU unreasonably suggested the State of California change a 10-page standard form that involved at least 15 other Universities. The Dean therefore suggests specific benchmarks so that we're not back here next year with the same issues.

Professor Peterfreund offered that making this a standing Senate Committee would solve that issue. He also suggested a friendly amendment to subhead three of the second resolution to read "...implement best practices of other national research universities." The friendly amendment was accepted by Professor McKnight.

Vice Provost for Research Sridhar explained that part of the legal review process regarding tech transfer had been moved into the Provost's office. He supports an annual report from the Vice Provost for Research as well as faculty input into the process as attorneys look at only legal aspects and risk.

Provost Abdelal added that risk is sometimes seen as an 'all or nothing' proposition where, in fact, everything has some risk involved. He noted, for clarification purposes, that the attorney in the Provost's office works under the supervision of NU's legal counsel. Progress has been made as well with the addition of a full-time attorney who specializes in contracts. Finally, the Provost agreed that friendly accountability is a good idea.

Professor Herman reminded the Senate that the University deals with a variety of complicated regulations—institutional, federal, etc—that may not be apparent to the person at the receiving end of the contract. He reminded the Senate too that there is a Risk Manager at NU who is responsible to advise the Board of Trustees to think in more flexible terms about money for contracts. At the same time, a collaborative effort will better inform faculty members about the risks.

Discussion took place on whether an annual report was "after the fact" and a tracking process might produce better information. It was suggested that a contract manager may be needed.

Professor McKnight pointed out that the entire process has been a success story of faculty governance as issues have been addressed through the RPOC and solutions established. As to whether there should be a list of benchmarks, the Senate should not itemize but delegate to the RPOC to look at best practices of other universities to improve our own process. He encouraged the Senate to move forward.

Professor Jones agreed that these resolutions offer a good beginning. He noted that still missing is service level agreements to provide accountability. What are the benchmarks at other universities for these? He noted that many of these processes at other institutions are not governed by general counsel but by a specialist. He reiterated, however, that this was a good start.

Provost Abdelal applauded the diplomatic approach to alerting President Freeland to the issues.

As amended, the resolutions read:

BE IT RESOLVED That, in response to the report of the Research Policy Oversight Committee on the timeliness and responsiveness of University legal procedures,

particularly those related to research, it is the sense of the Faculty Senate that both the Vice Provost for Research and the University Counsel Office report annually to the Research Policy Oversight Committee of the Faculty Senate on the documented response time for contract approval in their respective areas.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That it is the sense of the Senate that the Vice Provost for Research and the Vice President and University Counsel report to the Research Policy Oversight Committee by September 15, 2006, on the feasibility of 1) establishing a faculty council or using other university offices to assist in risk assessment, 2) delegating specific legal services and/or contract signature authority to other appropriate University offices, and 3) implementing "best practices" of other national research universities to streamline the process of handling research contracts.

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

VOTE to accept the 2005-06 Special *Ad Hoc* Research Policy Oversight Committee (RPOC) resolutions as amended, PASSED: 28-0-0.

IXX. Bouvé College of Health Sciences' proposal to update titles. Professor Reynolds moved the following resolutions and they were seconded.

WHEREAS, the current titling of Northeastern University's non-tenure track clinical faculty in the health professions is inconsistent with national norms; and

WHEREAS, the current titles disadvantage these faculty and the Bouvé College of Health Sciences; and

WHEREAS, faculty from the Bouvé College of Health Sciences voted (77-1-0) in favor of requesting clinical faculty titles that are consistent with national norms within their disciplines; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the titles assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor and clinical professor be applied to current and newly hired faculty who hold doctoral degrees. A new designation, clinical instructor, would be available for appointment of entry-level clinicians without doctoral degrees in their disciplines. Non-salaried clinical faculty who currently carry the titles of clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor and clinical professor shall be appointed with rank-appropriate *adjunct* clinical titles (i.e., adjunct clinical instructor, adjunct clinical assistant professor, adjunct clinical associate professor and adjunct clinical professor, respectively) to distinguish the nature of their positions from that of the newly created clinical faculty titles proposed herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the clinical and adjunct faculty titles described above be incorporated into the new Faculty Handbook at the appropriate time.

Professor Reynolds continued that these resolutions are intended to align Bouvé's non-tenure track faculty titles with terms used at other health science schools throughout the country. Difficulties presented by the NU term 'clinical specialist' are in the area of recruiting strong faculty candidates (as they do not understand what this title means) and in promotion reviews. The resolutions have received much support within Bouvé which depends upon this group of faculty to provide clinical services and clinical instruction to its students.

Dean Zoloth echoed Professor Reynolds and explained that the current terms were established ten years ago when NU first began hiring clinician educators. The titles have become increasingly arcane so the proposal is to use titles identical to those found nationally in the field.

Professor Herman informed the Senate that he'd been involved with inventing the original titles. NU has prided itself on American Association of University Professors (AAUP) principles that people in professorial

ranks need to follow the same procedures and have the same rights and privileges as all others within the same ranks. This adherence has been very effective for NU faculty and the more that is diluted—the more we pick and choose which AAUP principles to which to adhere—the more the door opens for other problems. The AAUP does not distinguish between clinical professors and other kinds of professors. The risk of creating a non-tenure-track professoriate could open the door to other questions about whether tenure is worth retaining at NU. It is important to understand why these titles were adopted—first with respect to Coop, then at Bouvé, and finally with respect to CAS in the School of General Studies. The argument of AAUP at the time the titles were created was that because non-tenure-track faculty members have only part of the responsibilities of a full tenured/tenure-track faculty member, they are excluded from the rules that apply to full faculty members. Each time we do this we run the risk of diluting the distinction.

Dr. Onan agreed that being in tune with the rest of the nation in regard to titles is desirable but we should also think about what the title change means in terms of the rest of NU and she suggested a coordinated effort to look at this.

Professor Bruns said that she'd been persuaded by Dean Zoloth's argument, but became alarmed at Professor Herman's clarification of the history of the terms. She asked Professor Reynolds how other universities who are using the titles deal with the issue.

Professor Reynolds, addressing an earlier question, offered that there was no reason that other units at NU would need to eliminate the clinical specialist title. He thanked Professor Herman for the historical background and added that his understanding of AAUP language is that it is intended for the traditional professoriate which is distinct from clinical professoriate. The document submitted provides distinctions in some areas of performance between tenured & tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty. Scholarship for non-tenure-track faculty relates to demonstration and development of clinical practices whereas the scholarship of traditional tenured & tenure-track faculty is very different.

Dean Zoloth added that he wasn't aware of these objections when he looked at other institutions. He was impressed by the number of institutions who have adopted the modified professorial titles. He offered that one difference between the time when the clinical specialist titles were adopted and now is the great increase (+10%) in non-tenure-track titles in the US and the AAUP has probably looked at the issue since that time.

Professor Herman responded that he'd been to the AAUP website and could find nothing referencing clinical faculty but suggested making inquiry. Other universities are less risk averse than we are and many do not concern themselves with AAUP. He guaranteed that both Coop and the Law School will make the same resolutions to the Senate within a year and urged a university-wide investigation and consultation with AAUP to see if the situation has changed.

Professor Peterfreund stated that Coop's use of the title *Coordinator* rather than *Professor* came about because instructors could not fulfill the research part of the tenure formula and were regularly denied tenure, as the result of which the Coop faculty grew demoralized. The teaching faculty turnover was high with replacements being hired on what could be called false pretenses. The coordinator positions resolved the difficulties and provided more employment security. In the health professions, clinical professorial appointments are a matter of fact. If the Law School and Coop come with similar proposals, then perhaps it's time to talk about it. He expressed support of the resolution.

Professor Kane indicated that his recollection of the title issues at Coop was different; however, he offered support of the Bouvé proposal and further stated that the Senate could likely expect a similar resolution from Coop, perhaps as early as the next session.

Professor McKnight expressed concern that term faculty would push for representation on the Senate which he deems inappropriate. He offered a motion to commit the issue for more research.

Deans Zoloth and Stellar and Professor Reynolds urged the body not to vote a motion to commit. In response to questions about how many and what types of schools were looked at, Dean Zoloth confirmed that they had looked at institutions that do not have medical schools and ventured that 98% use the clinical modified titles.

Professor Herman seconded the motion to commit asking that the Faculty Development Committee consult the AAUP in order to present a strong case to the Board of Trustees. He expressed the desire to see a global solution to the issue as other academic specialists also work hard and want the title of professor in the classroom.

Several Senators then spoke against the motion to commit and for the original resolution. Professor Kane agreed that Coop faculty would bring the issue back to the Senate and supported a vote on the original resolution.

VOTE on the motion to commit to the Faculty Development Committee, FAILED: 8-17-1.

VOTE on the Bouvé College of Health Sciences' proposal to update titles, PASSED: 19-4-3.

Professor Herman encouraged the movers to research AAUP attitudes towards this issue before the resolutions get to the Board of Directors as someone will ask that question.

XX. 2005-06 Senate Special *Ad hoc* Committee on the Calendar Report, Resolution #1. Professor Alper moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That, given the manifest shortage of classrooms documented in the Calendar Committee's report, the University undertake an immediate study of its current space utilization to identify and reallocate centrally located administrative space for classroom purposes as outlined in its Recommendations.

The floor was yielded to Professor Lowndes who stated that there was an excellent report from the Academic Policy Committee three years ago which stated the need for more classrooms. The number of classrooms in those three years has remained the same at 169 registrar-controlled classrooms. Actual classrooms have changed somewhat as new ones have been added and others removed, however the total number is the same. The quality of classrooms has improved as has the mix of size. The problem identified by this committee, based upon data, in part, from the Registrar, is an insufficient number of classrooms and a number of classrooms that are not necessarily geared to our specific needs. Referencing tables at the end of the report, Professor Lowndes noted that many classrooms show 100% utilization which is not a desirable place to be in, particularly in light of NU's aspirations to the top 100 and with the NEASC accreditation coming up. Maximum utilization rates at other universities are 80%. The Registrar informed the Committee at the beginning of the academic year that 100 courses could not be scheduled because of lack of regular Registrar-controlled classrooms. The immediate need is clear as is the need to build new classroom space into the Master Plan for the long term.

Dean Soyster added that the COE has performed a benchmark study over the past 5-6 years of all seniors by posing 75 questions, including those concerned with classroom space. Quality of classrooms continues to get the lowest ratings. One-half of engineering classes are held in the basement of Snell in rooms originally designed as vaults which Dean Soyster considers an embarrassment. He expressed support for the resolution.

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

VOTE on Calendar Committee resolution #1, PASSED: 27-0-0.

Professor Alper moved the following resolution, and it was seconded:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That, in order to satisfy NEASC teaching/learning environment requirements, the University make the provision of classrooms that are of adequate numbers, sizes, and equipment a high priority in its Master and fund raising planning for the next ten years.

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

VOTE on Calendar Committee resolution #2, PASSED: 27-0-0.

Professor Alper moved the following resolution, and it was seconded:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the University adopt the sequencing model proposed in the Calendar Committee Report, for implementation beginning in the Fall Semester, 2007, subject to further modifications that may result from a Registrar-initiated study of its impacts.

He explained that the Committee identified significant stress in the 2-day per week sequences—91% for the 65 minute sequences and 69% utilization for the alphabetic 2-day week sequences. Therefore the Committee has attempted to develop, with the Registrar, a revised schedule with additional 65 minute 3-day week sequences and fewer 2-day week sequences. The activities period is reduced to 65 minutes rather than 1½ hours. The Committee had representation from all Colleges as well as student representation.

Professor Bruns motioned to postpone discussion of resolution #3 to a time certain to be the first Senate meeting following November 1, 2006 in order to allow the impact to be studied by the individual colleges. CBA voted against this in the Committee as it will have significant impact. The motion was seconded.

Dean Finkelstein, who was on the Calendar Committee, noted that CBA did not make their concern known at the time of the vote. He noted that Registrar Allen said that the earliest date for implementation would be September 07 so he supports the motion so that the Colleges can review it.

Professors Peterfreund and Herman both noted that a November 1 reporting date will postpone implementation to September 08 but that it's a small price to pay for getting it right. There was agreement from among the Senators.

Professor Lowndes noted that the fundamental problem is lack of classrooms and that temporarily changing the sequences could get some new classrooms on line quickly.

Following discussion on a date for postponement, the Senate agreed that the resolution should be postponed to *no later than 1 November*. There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

VOTE to postpone Calendar Committee resolution #3 to no later than November 1, 2006, PASSED: 26-2-0.

Professor Alper moved the following resolution, and it was seconded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That some limited number of questions related to classroom quality be added to the existing TCEP questionnaires.

Dean Stellar, who is studying TCEP on the Faculty Development Committee, offered a friendly amendment to make this a recommendation rather than a requirement to add this to the TCEP questionnaire. Professor Alper did not accept the friendly amendment.

In answer to questions, Professor Herman, Senate Parliamentarian, noted that a number of committees perform overlapping functions. It should not pose a difficulty; it simply says to the FDC that, as TCEP questions are developed, some need to address classrooms. Professor Peterfreund reminded the Senate that the Senate Agenda Committee can orchestrate and encourage committees to communicate with one another and this request is simply adding a new desideratum that the FDC may not have thought about. It will produce some baseline data and may be a limited time frame. He stated that SAC will orchestrate this.

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

VOTE on resolution #4, PASSED: 22-3-2.

Professor Alper moved the following resolution, and it was seconded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the University take immediate action to equip the remaining registrar-controlled classrooms, of sizes appropriate for such installation, with the current approved standard classroom technology.

Professor Melachrinoudis noted that the resolution excludes classrooms that are not controlled by the Registrar and offered that all classrooms should be equipped with modern technology.

Professor Herman noted that the Classroom Committee has been trying to address this but the only sure number is that of Registrar-controlled classrooms. This is the beginning of the process. Classrooms controlled by individual units are probably the next group that should be addressed and there are probably others. If The Committee included the 100+ rooms outside the Registrar's control that are being used as classrooms, it would be too big for the University's budget all at once. The Registrar-controlled number is finite and doable.

In response to Professor Cokely's question, Professor Herman explained that "size appropriate" means classrooms for 8 students and less that are probably not appropriate to receive the equipment. Too much equipment in those small rooms would make them unusable.

Professor De Ritis said that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Information Technology Policy had also done a good deal of work and could answer questions.

Professor Futrelle noted that we should put the students first and equip the rooms where the classes are being held regardless of who schedules them. Dean Soyster agreed, adding that COE has four rooms that they have refurbished because their selection of rooms was so poor.

Professor Lowndes explained that the only data the Committee had to work with was from the Registrar's office—169 rooms—and suggested the wording be amended to "all classrooms", deleting "registrar-controlled".

Professor Herman noted that classroom upgrades have not been done for the past several years because prior to that the upgrades were funded by University surplus and, prior to that, by the UTC. The Committee's intent was to make this resolution a starting point. Making the number too big is the perfect excuse to ignore it altogether and would be self-defeating as it could include an additional 80-100 classrooms.

Dean Finkelstein agreed that it is important to fix the common pool so that faculty can find appropriate classroom space. This issue is at crisis stage.

The friendly amendment was not accepted. There being no further discussion, the Senate turned to a vote.

VOTE on resolution #5, PASSED: 21-4-1.

A motion to adjourn was seconded. Professor Glod thanked the Provost for his support and again thanked the Senators for their hard work throughout the year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart S. Peterfreund, Secretary
Faculty Senate