

Northeastern University

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

November 02, 2011

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 11/02/2011

Arun Bansil Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Bansil, Arun, "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 11/02/2011" (2011). Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. Paper 125. http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20003777

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



TO: FACULTY SENATE

FROM: ARUN BANSIL, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2011-2012 FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF 2 NOVEMBER

Present: (Professors) Adams, Alper, Alshawabkeh, Aroian, Aslam, Bannister, Bansil, Basagni, Daynard, Fitzgerald, Fox, Gaffney, Hanson, Herman, Katula, Kruger, Muftu, Poriss, Rappaport, Sandler, Sherman, Strauss, Todorov, Yang, Young, Waszczak

(Administrators) Costa, Director, Finkelstein, Gibson, Lane, Loeffelholz, Van Den Abbeele, Yener, Zoloth

Absent (Professors) Barberis, Sherwood, Strasser, Zgarrick

(Administrators) Spieler

Provost Director convened the meeting at 11:46 AM.

- I. The minutes of 19 October were approved as written.
- II. SAC report. Professor Kruger reminded Senators that Roberts Rules are a means to an end and that all Senators should feel free to voice their opinions.

Professor Kruger reported that Professor Ena Vazquez-Nuttall passed away on October 20, 2011. During Ena's twenty years at Northeastern University, she was a program director and later Associate Dean in the Bouvé College of Health Sciences. Ena tirelessly championed the importance of cultural diversity, long before it was the norm to do so. Today, we take for granted that psychologists must understand culture to be effective service providers. However, when Ena published her first journal article on the relationship between culture and children's development in 1970, this notion was not widely accepted. In addition to her contributions to scholarship and national and international contributions to the profession of psychology, Ena founded the first doctoral program in school psychology in Massachusetts. She personally recruited several faculty and dozens of graduate students from underrepresented minority backgrounds to Northeastern. Above all else, Ena was a warm and caring person who spent countless hours helping graduate students, junior colleagues, and psychologists.

SAC has met twice in regular session since the last Senate meeting and once with the Provost. Professor Kruger has met once with the Provost.

The call for nominations for the Klein Lectureship is being sent this week.

The following Senate Committees have been staffed and charged. Full transcripts of the charges may be found at www.facultysenate.neu.edu

Special Senate Committee for Library Policies and Operations

Members

Professor Fleura Bardhi, CBA-Marketing

Professor John Casey, CCIS

Academic Specialist Leslie Hitch, CPS

Professor Nathan E. Israeloff, COS-Physics

Assistant Dean Sarah Hooke Lee, Law-Research & Information Services

Professor Joseph Reagle, CAMD-Communication Studies

Professor David A. Rochefort, CSSH-Political Science

Professor Mohammad E. Taslim, COE-Mechanical & Industrial Engineering

Professor David P. Zgarrick, BCHS-Pharmacy Practice

Dean William M. Wakeling, ex officio member

Charge

To advise the Dean and Library staff, and to report to the Faculty Senate as appropriate:

- On the development of library information resources and collections in a variety of formats;
- On the priorities and options for Library resource and collections support of University research and scholarship across all relevant disciplines;
- On means to ensure that the Library's information resources support all methods of teaching, including distance education and online learning; and on the integration of library information resources into educational technology platforms;
- On the opinions and sentiments of the faculty and staff relative to library information resources and collections;
- On ways to advocate for the importance of open access and related scholarly communication initiatives on campus to increase the distribution, impact and benefit of faculty scholarship and research, and on policies for the ongoing development, use and content of the University's digital repository to preserve and present the scholarly and research output of the campus community; and
- On the adequacy of the resources available to the Library to carry out its mission.

Professor Kruger reminded faculty that the Library Policy and Operations Committee had passed a resolution in support of Open Access and urged deans to promote it with their faculty.

And finally, the President's recent email announcement of the Charlotte opening stated that two years of planning had included extensive discussions with the Faculty Senate. While the Faculty Senate was not involved, Professor Kruger has interpreted that statement as an acknowledgement of the need to include the Senate in such discussions.

Ad hoc Committee on the Role of the Faculty Senate in University Governance

Members

Professor John J. Gatley, Chair, BCHS-Pharmaceutical Science Professor Peter D. Enrich, Law Professor Stuart S. Peterfreund, CSSH-English Professor Elizabeth J. Podlaha-Murphy, COE-Chemical Engineering Professor Simon E. Singer, CSSH-Criminology & Criminal Justice Vice Provost Mary Loeffelholz, *non-voting member*

Charge

To evaluate and make recommendations about the Faculty Senate's role in University governance; to recommendations pertaining to the appropriate governance principles and structures of the colleges, and their relationship to the Faculty Senate, taking into account:

- the principles of shared governance as reflected in the Faculty Handbook's bylaws, policies, and procedures;
- the principles of shared governance as reflected in documents such as the AAUP, the American Council on Education (ACE) and Association of Governing Boards (AGB) joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities;
- the effectiveness of the Colleges and the Faculty Senate in performing their governance roles;
- the satisfaction of the faculty and administration with the current roles of the Colleges and the Faculty Senate in governance; and
- governance institutions and practices at other universities.
- III. Provost Director reported that he had attended the Charlotte opening and the new facility showcased Northeastern quite well. He hopes that many faculty members will have the opportunity to visit over the years. A virtual tour will be available soon. A number of programs are being launched and there are many ideas for additional programs.

IV. Questions and discussion

Professor Gaffney noted that some students were forced to take an exam outside of normal hours even though resolutions have been passed to prevent this from occurring. This particular situation was resolved through the Ombudsman's Office but he urged that the provost's office issue an appropriate reminder to faculty to avoid this situation in the future.

Dean Gibson offered the explanation that exam took place outside of regular hours due to multiple sections of this particular course and that the students were notified well in advance. He will bring the matter to the dean's council. Provost Director suggested it would have been better addressed within the college.

Professor Hanson, noting a quote in the NU Press that many new instructors will be hired to teach courses [in Charlotte] asked if that would be a condition of future employment. The Provost responded that there is no precondition for hiring faculty; the programs will be taught by NU faculty.

Professor Hanson noted too that President Aoun stated that NU will closely monitor programs and discontinue those not performing and asked how this would affect campus courses. The Provost clarified that if a course was not working at a satellite campus it may be discontinued.

Professor Strauss expressed concern about monitoring academic quality and asked how that would be done. Dean Lane responded that students at remote locations enrolled in CBA courses must live up to the same standards as on campus. CBA is working strenuously on issues of academic dishonesty and faculty must establish standards. There is added challenge when monitoring on-line courses and CBA has gained much experience in maintaining quality. CBA has also been making use of OSCCR which maintains a record of behavior. Dean Zoloth added that hybrid sites allow face-to-face student contact and faculty will retain control and normal oversight over all aspects.

Professor Waszczak suggested that on-line students take courses simultaneously with campus students however the Provost pointed out that flexibility must be offered to adult students.

V. Director Roby reported on the state of athletics at NU; please see the on-line annual report at http://catalog.e-digitaleditions.com/issue/42321/0. Core values of leadership, critical thinking, coach as educator, appreciation of differences, and community service continue to be emphasized. Academic achievement remains a priority with overall GPA strong.

Director Roby expressed appreciation of faculty support and flexibility. He explained that the NCAA measures the academic progress rate using a formula that establishes a baseline standard which NU athletes far exceed. Athletes have established a grant pool, which they administer themselves, for local associations that aid children.

NU successfully completed NCAA recertification without provisional requirements where many other institutions did not.

NU now has 42 club sports involving well over 1,000 students. These are predominantly student-run providing leadership development opportunities.

HD-quality video streaming has provided the added benefit of being of high enough quality to be picked up by ESPN as they scan for content. Seventy-five students are now employed in marketing and communications, including many journalism students.

Dean Finkelstein asked if anything may be instituted at the college level to assist students to engage in sports. Director Roby noted that presently the physical space will not support more students but that solutions are being examined. Student satisfaction in availability of space is low. There is a broader issue of healthy lifestyle which engages the entire University community. Human Resources is involved and there may be room for partnership with Athletics.

VI. Vice Provost Loeffelholz reminded Senators that the joint committee for program review oversight was established by Senate resolution in 2010-2011. The committee members (Professors Fell, Loring, Setta and Thrush plus the Vice Provost) met last spring. The rationale for the mix was to include a faculty member from a college where external accreditation is mandated; a faculty familiar with the graduate program process; and a faculty member from a department with only undergraduate programs which has been outside the process until now.

CCIS completed the first full college review last year and COE is in process. Vice Provost Loeffelholz recognized CCIS Professor Rajaraman who explained that the process was intense and lacking in procedures. The College used the Provost's guidelines and collected

much data about the programs, the research, and contributions by faculty and students. A significant amount of time was devoted to this phase and it was very challenging. Grant data, for instance, required asking the right questions to get a clear picture. The report was objective and presented purely data. Another important piece of the review was analyzing where the College curriculum stands among other IS colleges which required a collective process. The site visit was fruitful although, in retrospect, earlier communications with the reviewers could have provided helpful information prior to the visit. There also was student participation.

Vice Provost Loeffelholz explained that the Joint Committee learned much from this first review. As stated by Professor Rajaraman, outside reviewers desired more information up front about the College's strategic vision which is currently subordinated to the end.

Professor Bansil expressed surprise at Professor Rajaraman's comments concerning difficulty of obtaining grant information, and wondered if the database maintained by ORAF is not adequate. Professor Rajaraman clarified that the ORAF's grant database is quite complete for the last four years but finding earlier data is a challenge, and that much effort was needed in figuring out how to present the data and how the relevant information could be extracted from the database.

Dean Finkelstein noted that the review provided excellent feedback in terms of interdisciplinary strategies, vision and marketing. In addition, the outside reviewers were pleased with what they saw and had a good message to take with them.

Professor Waszczak was pleased to hear that the process is a work in progress. She suggested the need to formalize and standardize the submission of self-studies as much as possible and that the process be public. She also recommended that faculty be allowed to view the reports generated.

Dean Finkelstein stated that the report was shared with faculty moments after he received it. He explained, as well, that faculty meetings were held in four research areas and faculty from other colleges were included in interdisciplinary talks.

Vice Provost Loeffelholz offered that a guidelines toolkit will be published shortly. She also noted that standardization must provide room for the units to declare what matters in their fields. In response to another question, she assured the Senate that programs outside the campus would be included in the College reviews.

Further brief discussion took place regarding differences between disciplines, defining unique visions and flexibility.

VII. Vice Provost Bernstein began by reminding the Senate that it had passed the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the specific allocation for indirect costs return to the principal investigator be fixed at 10% of the indirect cost. In the future, this rate may be revised to vary by College based upon discussions between the Dean and faculties of each College.

The Provost responded to that resolution by convening a committee that would look at issues such as how other research institutions treated indirect cost return and provide him

with general conclusions and recommendations. The resulting committee looked at broad issues such as how policies at NU fit within the larger framework of research institutions and how money is being used to foster research.

In general, private research institutions allocate 50% of indirect costs to the college and 50% to administration. At Northeastern, under the hybrid budget model, most is allocated to the College and the deans decide where the money is distributed with a small amount allocated to the PI. Internal decisions are made about distribution and the protocol for enhancing research. Conclusions and suggestions resulting from the Committee meetings were passed on to Provost. Among these are:

- The 50-50 split at many universities seems appropriate and allows investment;
- A 6% indirect costs return seems reasonable and is defensible. The Committee suggested that this distribution should be implemented for the next three years and then reevaluated;
- Other uses, such as some conference travel and computer services should be admissible:
- Colleges should be transparent as to how funds are being used to support research;
- A policy should be developed jointly with RPOC, the Provost's Office, and the academic deans to establish a soft cap on the length of time overhead funds from grants accumulate in the individual accounts of researchers.
- IDC return for centers should be examined on a case-by-case basis.

Professor Gaffney inquired whether there was outreach to faculty by the Committee. Vice Provost Bernstein responded that it was his understanding that he was to convene the Committee and there were five faculty members who served.

Professor Waszczak asked what the basis is for the differing treatment for centers and for faculty not in centers. Vice Provost Bernstein responded that there are a greater number of complexities involved which, in the Committee's opinion, require case-by-case review.

Professor Kruger noted that the Senate voted upon a resolution in February following work by the Research Policy Oversight Committee and after extensive debate stretching over three Senate meetings, which included a presentation by Vice Provost Bernstein. The committee convened by the Provost was not a Senate committee.

Professor Daynard agreed and stated that, procedurally, convening a second committee is unusual. Normally, if administration has concerns about a resolution, discussion should be undertaken at the Senate. A new committee should not be appointed to second-guess a Senate committee.

Dean Gibson noted that the Senate resolutions provided for the flexibility of rates among the Colleges while the Provost's committee was not in support due to the difficulties it can create. He requested that this be reevaluated.

Provost Director stated that he had the option of rejecting, disapproving, or taking the Senate resolution as "informational". As indirect cost return is a budget decision, the Senate resolution would bind the deans and other considerations needed to be addressed that were not raised at the Senate. The resulting report is advisory and does not override

the Senate resolution. Provost Director averred that he should be able to gather information in order to decide how to respond to the resolution.

Professor Gaffney noted that the Senate debate included input from many faculty members and should not be taken lightly. He proposed a sense of the Senate resolution requesting that the deans report on how they are developing a process for determining the overhead return rate. Professor Strauss seconded.

Professor Kruger motioned to postpone to 16 November; Professor Gaffney accepted.

VOTE to postpone a sense of the Senate resolution to time certain: PASSED, 34-0-0.

The Senate adjourned at 1:25 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Arun Bansil, Secretary Faculty Senate