

October 06, 2010

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 10/06/2010

Stephen W. McKnight
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

McKnight, Stephen W., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 10/06/2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 120.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20000482>

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



Northeastern University
Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: STEPHEN W. MCKNIGHT, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
RE: MINUTES, 2010-2011 FACULTY SENATE, 6 OCTOBER 2010

Present: (Professors) Adams, Alper, Alshawabkeh, Barberis, Board, Bruns, Chilvers, Fox, Hafner, Herman, karma, Kruger, Lane, Lifter, McKnight, Morrison, Muftu, Poriss, Portz, Ramirez, Sherman, Sherwood, Strauss, Suciu, Thrush, Waszczak, Zaremba
(Administrators) Director, Falcon, Finkelstein, Loeffelholz, Moore, Spieler, Van Den Abbeele, Zoloth

Absent (Professors) Basagni, Gaffney, Hanson,
(Administrators) Powers-Lee, Luzzi,

Provost Director convened the meeting at 11:48 AM

- I. The minutes of 22 September were approved as amended.
- II. SAC report. Professor Kruger reported that the following committees have been staffed and charged. Full transcripts of charges may be found at the Faculty Senate website.

2010-2011 Senate Committee for Administrator Evaluations Oversight:

Members:

Professor Robert N. Hanson, Chair, Chemistry & Chemical Biology-College of Science
Professor Barbara L. Waszczak, Pharmaceutical Sciences-Bouvé College of Health Sciences
Professor Stephen L. Nathanson, Philosophy & Religion-College of Social Sciences & Humanities
Associate Dean Colleen C. Pantalone-College Business Administration
Associate Dean Kay D. Onan-College of Arts & Sciences, Shared Administration

The first meeting will be held on 8 October. The following is a partial listing of administrators scheduled for evaluation:

Professor Ralf Schlosser, Chair, Speech/Language Pathology/Audiology-BCHS
Professor Marjorie Platt, Accounting Group Coordinator-CBA
Professor Marius Solomon, Information, Operations & Analysis Group Coordinator-CBA
Professor Frank Spital, Entrepreneurship & Innovation Group Coordinator-CBA
Dean David Luzzi, Dean, COE
Provost Stephen Director

Ongoing evaluations from 2009-10:

Professor Laura Lewis, Chair, Chemical Engineering-COE
Professor Steven Vallas, Chair, Sociology & Anthropology-CSS&H
Professor Emmett Price, Chair, African American Studies-CSS&H
Professor Malcolm Hill, Chair, Earth & Environmental Sciences-COS

2010-2011 Senate Standing Committee for Financial Affairs

Members:

Professor Paul J. Bolster, Chair, Finance & Insurance-College Business Administration
Professor Harry W. Lane, Int'l Business & Strategy-College of Business Administration

Professor Emanuel J. Mason, Counseling & Applied Psychology-Bouvé College of Health Sciences

Professor Hameed Metghalchi, Mechanical & Industrial Engineering-College of Engineering

Professor Gregory H. Wassall, Economics-College of Social Sciences & Humanities

Charge:

1. Make recommendations on resource allocation and appropriate merit and market adjustment raises for FY 2012 for Senate consideration no later than November 17, 2010.
2. Collaborate with the Provost for the purpose of implementing previous FAC's recommendations pertaining to the budget process.
3. Collaborate with the Provost's Office for the purpose of reviewing the implementation plan of hybrid budget management system.

2010-2011 Senate *ad hoc* College Liaison Committee

Members:

Professor Stefano Basagni, COE

Professor Elizabeth A. Chilvers, CBA

Professor Carole D. Hafner, CCIS

Professor Gerald H. Herman, CSS&H

Professor Karin N. Lifter, BCHS

Professor Deborah A. Ramirez, LAW

Professor Alexandru I Suciu, COS

Professor George H. Thrush, CAM&D

Charge:

To facilitate communication between the Faculty Senate and the faculties and deans as follows:

- inform faculty members and Deans in their respective Colleges about Senate issues, events, resolutions, and meetings;
- provide the Senate Agenda Committee with feedback regarding faculty concerns and suggestions; and
- coordinate discussions of Senate issues with faculty members at College meetings or other appropriate forums within the Colleges.

Professor Kruger also reported that SAC met twice since the last Senate meeting and once with the President; and that he met once with the Provost at which meeting he discussed college evaluations and the Senate agenda.

III. Provost's report. Provost Director acknowledged that two new deans present at the Senate meeting: Georges Van den Abbeele (CSSH) and Murray Gibson (COS). The Provost had no further report.

IV. Questions and discussion

Professor Strauss noted the pending college reviews and wondered what role the Senate, which traditionally oversees such evaluations, would take. The Senate heard about the reviews only about a month ago. Also, as the Graduate Council is responsible for oversight and review of graduate programs, how will that Committee be utilized?

The Provost noted that the impetus for the college reviews was the Board of Trustees. They are administrative reviews undertaken by the Provost's Office and the process has been discussed with College Deans for over a year. They will consist of an internal self-study by faculty of the unit (enrollments, research, etc.) and an external review by distinguished members of the academic community who will meet with faculty, students, and administrators and will write a report to guide decisions about the future of the college. CBA had undergone an AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) review recently which served the purpose. It was decided, in consultation with the Board of Trustees, to review COE and CCIS this year. It is envisioned that reviews will take place on a rotating five to seven year basis and, if possible, be aligned with accrediting reviews.

Dean Finklestein added that CCIS faculty will review the self-study soon. The College is eager to include external reviewers as it has not done so in past accreditations which only reviewed the undergraduate program. He responded to a question posed that he had nominated participating faculty to the Provost.

Provost Director explained that the process is a more holistic view of the colleges which will also serve to raise outside visibility. Faculty will be involved in collecting data. He also indicated that other universities have similar evaluation processes.

Professors Strauss and Waszczak noted that faculty involvement in the process through the Senate would promote buy-in as well as contribute to the uniformity of the reviews. Professor Bruns questioned how outside reviewers will be chosen.

The Provost said that the outside reviewers were suggested by the Deans and added to by the Provost. He noted that Colleges are free to develop their own self-study to seek out problems as each College is different. Dean Finkelstein, Dean Spieler and Professor Thrush spoke to the merits of such reviews to enhance national reputations and gain insight.

Professor Kruger noted that the evaluations may be a good idea, but faculty should be involved at both the University and College levels in planning the process. Best practice in evaluation processes is to include input from all stakeholder groups.. The merit of the evaluations is unarguable but it is important that the process be credible to guarantee the acceptance of any recommendations. He noted faculty involvement in the design and direction of the evaluation process is the practice at many peer and aspirant universities

Professor Herman lauded porous boundaries between the Colleges but noted this implies that cross-University issues are important as well. University representation is needed in the evaluation process to make sure that interdisciplinary issues are fully addressed.

In response to questions from Professor Board concerning the Graduate Council, Vice Provost Falcon confirmed that the Council is a sub-committee of the Senate and is presently awaiting elections to complete staffing. He has made recommendations regarding membership for SAC consideration in light of the new Colleges. The Vice Provost asserted the difficulty of engaging the Council in the evaluations.

Professor Board again asked whether the Graduate Council will have a role in the College evaluations and the Provost responded that faculty within the units will be involved, including graduate faculty..

Professor Herman noted that the current Graduate Council Bylaws require the Council to undertake formal graduate program reviews on a regular rolling basis which involve the unit and

an outside visiting committee. Vice Provost Falcon responded that legislation several years ago which downsized the Council mandated program reviews but the process for Graduate Council-led evaluations has not been established. He had broached the subject with a Senate Agenda Committee several years ago but it has not been resolved.

Professor Karma agreed that an external review is a good way to raise program visibility but expressed concern that faculty to be involved would be chosen by the Deans. He professed that the Faculty Senate can ensure that all voices are represented.

- V. Report on NU Athletics (Mr. Peter Roby, Director of Athletics). Director Roby thanked the Senate and introduced his colleague Madeleine Estabrook, Executive Director of University Health and Counseling Services who will serve as the chair of the NCAA Recertification Committee. Director Roby proceeded with an overview of the core values within Athletics which provide tools for success and ensure that athletics supports both the institution and the best interests of the student athlete. Those core values are leadership, critical thinking, coach as educator, appreciation of difference, and community service.

Academic accomplishments by NU athletes have risen with 309 on the dean's list this past year. Participation in more than 3,000 hours of community service allows the athletes to appreciate their position as part of the 2% of high school athletes who are fortunate to receive a Division IA scholarship and builds empathy. The nationally recognized Lecture Capture Innovation program, which came out of Senate several years ago, has evolved into a broader program across many colleges to allow traveling athletes to keep up with their course work and was featured in NCAA Champions magazine. Director Roby lauded the various competitive accomplishment of the athletes and the robust club program wherein 1000 students participated in over 40 club sports, including two national championship club teams (the men's and women's club tennis teams).

The Director summarized campus recreation, compliance and enrollment services. In addition, Athletics Development increased to 2047 donors in fiscal year 2010 and produced the second highest fundraising figure in Athletic Development history despite the discontinuation of the football program.

Looking forward, NCAA recertification will include faculty, athletes and the NU community and will be an open and transparent process. Title IX compliance with equity and opportunity will now extend to male athletes due to lost football scholarships. As well, NU athletes will continue to achieve and sustain excellence athletically, academically, personally.

The 2009 Annual Report may be found at <http://www.gonu.com/index.aspx>

Responding to Professor Fox's question concerning scholarships, Director Roby reported that 209 were available last year. A portion of the football scholarships went back into general student financial aid and others were used to comply with Title IX.

Regarding enhancement of student support of athletic events, the 2009 annual report shows 95% of incoming students indicated intent to attend an athletic event. Card swipe data revealed that 94% attended. Student interest and enthusiasm is growing.

Professor Muftu inquired of the former football athletes and Director Roby responded that 27 have graduated, 23 decided to stay with their scholarship through graduation, and the remainder are playing football elsewhere. Of those playing elsewhere, six have asked to return to receive a Northeastern University diploma.

Madeleine Estabrook, who was appointed as chair of the NCAA recertification process steering committee, reported that NU was last recertified in 2003 and the next process will take place in 2020 as the NCAA has recently adopted a ten-year cycle of recertification. The purpose of the process is to open up athletic affairs to the university community and the public, to set operating principles, and to establish sanctions for failure to conduct a comprehensive self-study or correct problems. Benefits of the process include self awareness, affirmation, and opportunities to improve.

The process will take seven to nine months to complete and will have the following operating principles: : governance and commitment to rules compliance; academic integrity; gender/diversity issues, and student-athlete well-being. The self study will then be forwarded to the NCAA which will review it and respond. Next fall a peer review team will visit whose report will be forwarded to the NCAA and NU may respond. Final, results will be made public in April 2012.

A first meeting was conducted by telephone with the NCAA and a second will take place on Tuesday, 12 October. The NCAA may review anything they deem relevant. Three outcomes are possible: re-certification; certification with conditions; certification revoked.

Representatives from among faculty and from the Senate Standing Committee for Athletics are participating.

Responding to Professor Zaremba's query, Director Estabrook did not know the percentage of universities who were not certified but would attempt to find out. She also indicated to Professor Fox that data indicating missed classes percentage changes generated by NU's change in conference were being generated and would be available in a public report.

VI. Report of the *Ad hoc* Senate Committee to review the Faculty Handbook (Professor Cokely)

The Committee has been at work since June. Professor Cokely is chair; other members are Professors Sharon M. Bruns, Professor Mal Hill, Professor Judith Hall, and Professor Gerald Herman.

The Committee has procured a copy of the 2005 Senate-approved Faculty Handbook and all Senate resolutions passed since 2001. Those resolutions have been sorted by those approved by the President and the Board of Trustees, those not signed by the President, and those deemed informational by the President.

The Committee has identified organizational changes and has received permission from SAC to make editorial changes such as changed office names and changes in quarter/semester language. It has also identified materials which might be better referenced at another site such as the University organizational chart; non-controversial issues that may need attention; and issues that could require further discussion and negotiation.

Next, the Committee will deliver an annotated Faculty Handbook integrating passed resolutions to SAC to determine which need to be re-voted upon by the Senate and which issues need further discussion and negotiation with the Provost's Office.. The Committee will also recommend how the Handbook can be made available to the faculty.

Professor Karma asked the status of the resolution regarding tenure language passed last year to which the Provost replied that it is under discussion by the Board of Trustees.

Professor Kruger commended the Committee for their work on such a significant matter. He reminded the Senate that there is no more important issue to SAC than bringing the Faculty Handbook to completion and voting upon it.

Provost Director urged the Committee to view Boston University's Faculty Handbook website as a template for a modular approach.

The Senate adjourned at 1:07 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen W. McKnight, Secretary
Faculty Senate