

December 15, 2010

## Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 12/15/2010

Stephen W. McKnight  
*Northeastern University*

---

### Recommended Citation

McKnight, Stephen W., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 12/15/2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 140.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20003792>

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, 15 DECEMBER 2010**

---

Present: (Professors) Adams, Alper, Alshawabkeh, Barberis, Board, Bruns, Chilvers, Fox, Gaffney, Hafner, Hanson, Herman, Kruger, Lane, Lifter, McKnight, Morrison, Muftu, Poriss, Portz, Sherman, Sherwood, Strauss, Waszczak, Zaremba

(Administrators) Director, Falcon, Finkelstein, Loeffelholz, Powers-Lee, Spieler, Van Den Abbeele, Zoloth

Absent (Professors) Basagni, Karma, Ramirez, Suciu, Thrush

(Administrators) Deans Moore, Luzzi

Provost Director convened the meeting at 11:49 AM

- I. The minutes of 1 December 2010 were approved.
- II. Professor Kruger reported that SAC met twice in regular session and once with the Provost. Professor Kruger and Provost Director also met one.

SAC has been asked to convene an ad hoc search committee for a Dean of the Bouvé College of Health Sciences. Staffing is underway. Professor Kruger extended gratitude to Dean Zoloth for his ten years of outstanding service.

The following faculty members have agreed to serve on the **CPS Academic Council for Lifelong Learning**:

Professor Chester L. Britt  
Professor Anthony P. De Ritis  
Professor Gerald H. Herman  
Professor Raymond M. Kinnunen  
Professor Thomas H. Koenig  
Professor Samuel J. Matthews  
Professor Alan J. Zaremba

The following committees have been staffed:

**Senate Handbook Committee**

Professor Sharon Bruns  
Professor Dennis Cokely  
Professor Gerald Herman

**Search Committee for a chair of the Department of Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology**

Professor Michael Epstein, Department of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology  
Clinical Professor Sandra Cleveland, Department of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology

Professor Therese O'Neil-Pirozzi, Department of Speech-Language Pathology and  
Audiology  
Professor Karin Lifter, Counseling & Applied Psychology-BCHS  
Professor Joanne Miller, Psychology-COS

Dates for 2011-2012 Senate meetings may be found on the Faculty Senate website at <http://www.facultysenate.neu.edu/meetings/20112012/>. Meetings will continue to be held on Wednesdays at 11:45 AM to 1:25 PM

- III. Provost Director anticipates a discussion of dissolution of the activities hours early next semester. He reported that the Student Government Association passed a sense of the body resolution in support of the elimination of activities hours.

The Provost's Faculty Handbook Committee has been staffed as follows: Vice Provost Loeffelholz, Deans Van Den Abbeele, Speiler and Kenner, University Counsel Lembo, and Professor Hajjar (COE).

- IV. Professor Adams read the following and it was seconded.

***WHEREAS* providing the most up-to-date and easy-to-access Faculty Handbook is in the best interests of the University;**

***BE IT RESOLVED* That a modular and web-based *Faculty Handbook* be developed; and**

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* That the modular and web-based *Faculty Handbook* be maintained by the Faculty Senate on its website.**

Professor Adams explained that the process will allow effortless modifications and access. The content will be the same 2000 version plus fully-approved proposals since 2000 and editorial revisions. Professor Morrison noted that the issue had been raised with SAC two years ago and was agreed to at that time.

Dean Speiler supported the updating of the web Handbook and indicated her concern that the Handbook on the web lacks resolutions passed by the Senate and Trustees in the intervening period between the current Faculty Handbook and the present. A modular style will allow updates.

Professor Herman, having served on several Faculty Handbook Committees, assured the Senate that the current Committee has a good understanding of what the current Handbook should look like with Trustee-approved motions and editorial updates.

Several senators spoke in favor and Professor Kruger expressed the support of the Senate Agenda Committee noting that SAC would be working with the two Handbook Committees – the Senate Handbook Committee and the Provost's Handbook Committee announced today – with the goal of posting the new version in the spring. It was explained that the present vote was not a vote on content, but a vote to allow an on-line, modular format. A snapshot of the modular on-line version would be printed in paper format for archival purposes.

VOTE for a modular and web-based Faculty Handbook: PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, 31-0-0

- V. Professor Lane read the following and it was seconded.

***BE IT RESOLVED* That the Faculty Senate support the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Committee for a merit pool of 4.5% in the fiscal year 2012 effective 1 July 2011.**

Professor Bolster, Chair of Senate Committee for Financial Affairs (FAC), was recognized and provided a presentation of the FAC Report on the faculty merit and market raise pool. He provided information on the financial status of the University which is much improved over 2009; trends in faculty salary, inflation and tuition; and a salary comparison of aspirant and peer institutions. FAC recommends a 4.5% raise pool to maintain a competitive position with the current group of matchmates.

In response to Professor Bruns inquiry concerning lack of a recommendation for an equity pool, Professor Bolster said that the FAC had focused on total increase percentages which include merit and equity.

Professor Bruns inquired where the operating surplus of \$50M was attributed. Provost Director responded that it is in various places, such as the faculty hiring pool which was not fully spent last year but must retain the funds for anticipated faculty hiring and associated costs. It was not added to the endowment.

Professor Bolster noted that the FAC report also contains concerns related to matchmates related to use of CUPA. Professor Lane noted that data on research exists which shows Northeastern at the lower end but an analysis of that data has not yet been made.

VOTE in support of a 4.5% merit pool as recommended by the Senate Committee for Financial Affairs: PASSED, 24-0-7

- VI. Professor Kruger motioned to reverse the last two agenda items and, as there were no objections, it was made so.
- VII. Professor Fox read the following and it was seconded.

***BE IT RESOLVED* That the Law, Policy and Society Program and degrees be renamed to Law and Public Policy in the College of Social Sciences and Humanities as approved by the College Council and by the University Graduate Council.**

The floor was yielded to Professor Fitzgerald, Director of the Law, Policy and Society Program (LPS) who explained that the rationale for the proposal is that it more clearly represents the content of the program since 2003. The name change was approved by the faculty of the program by an 11-3 vote.

Professor Hanson spoke in favor, noting that the University Graduate Council had voted unanimously for the proposal.

Vice Provost Powers-Lee requested and received clarification that the name change is to apply to the undergraduate minor and to undergraduate courses as well. This resulted in a friendly amendment by Professor Herman to more clearly state this change. The friendly amendment was accepted by Professor Fox.

Dean Speiler noted that the only member of the program from the School of Law had voted against the proposal due to ambiguity concerning the extent of participation by the Law faculty. She noted, too, that the Law School does not have representation on the University Graduate Council.

Professor Sherwood noted that the proposal does not address possible affects on the School of Criminal Justice and Criminology portion of the program and moved to table the motion. His motion to table was seconded.

Several senators spoke against the motion to table on the grounds that no concerns had been brought forth, that the Dean was fully aware of and in support of the motion, and the University Graduate Council had voted unanimously in support following their review. It was noted, too, that the College Council had noted in favor and that there are no changes in content being proposed. A motion for cloture produced no objections.

VOTE to table the resolution for name change: FAILED, 1-28-2.

Professor Zaremba requested clarification on reservations about the name change to which Professor Sherwood replied that the faculty-at-large in the School of Criminal Justice had not been informed and so had not discussed the issue. Professor Portz noted that the term 'public policy' is interdisciplinary and other units, such as economics, political science, and criminal justice use the term, and the Department of Political Science had no objection to the name change.

Dean Speiler again noted the awkwardness of the relationship of the program with the Law School, the focus of the program, and the need for future discussion.

A call for cloture produced no objections. The resolution, as amended, is as follows:

***BE IT RESOLVED That the "Law, Policy and Society Program" be renamed the "Law and Public Policy Program," that its undergraduate academic programs in the College of Social Sciences and Humanities, and its graduate academic programs be similarly renamed.***

VOTE to change the name of the current Law, Policy and Society Program: PASSED, 27-1-5

Professor Kruger urged those invested in the program to continue dialog.

VIII. Professor Kruger introduced Vice Provost for Research Mel Bernstein who was invited to speak to the Senate concerning Indirect Costs.

Vice Provost Bernstein noted that he had been asked to provide context for discussions undertaken by the Senate upon presentation of resolutions by the Senate Committee for Research Policy Oversight (RPOC) on issues of indirect costs and indirect cost return distribution.

There are many differences in research activities among universities. NU has a negotiated on-campus rate of 55.5% and an off-campus rate of 26.7% through 2013. Those monies are for costs already accrued and it is within the province of the University how to distribute dollars received from federally-supported grants and contracts. The Vice Provost stated that no

university recovers the full 55% due to the exclusion of capital equipment, subcontracts, and other adjustments; the actual rate is nearer to 25%.

The Council on Governmental Relations, which acts on behalf of all universities, surveyed 150 colleges and universities regarding their research income, use of that income and policies regarding research income. Twenty to twenty-five of those universities look similar to NU and the Vice Provost has attempted to identify their policies and practices.

Indirect Costs include funds used to support the research mission of the institution. On average, at universities like Northeastern 60% of indirect costs were directed toward the recovery of administrative costs while 40% were distributed directly to the research enterprise. Of that 40%, typically 20% was given to the deans, 10% to departments, 4% to research centers, 1% to PI's, and 5% to other uses. Among deans there is considerable discretion on distribution of their 20%.

Vice Provost Bernstein emphasized that indirect costs collected from overhead on grants do not fully cover the real costs of the research infrastructure and caps do not allow recovery of more than 26% for administrative support. Nevertheless, the goal of the University is to reinvest some of the funds to support the research mission.

Professor Strauss suggested that the former 10-10-10 distribution was not out of line with federal guidelines for use of the money; however it would not be inappropriate to reconsider if there are better distribution strategies. She suggested 10% to the Principal Investigators, 10% for departments, and 20% to the deans.

Professor Hafner suggested that some portion of the overhead be deposited into a faculty development account which is not specifically earmarked as support for the PI but may be for any faculty development expenses to support research. The Vice Provost agreed that this is the general practice.

Professor Gaffney, noting that the 1% return to the PI appears misleading, wondered what that looked like at other universities and whether the data could be disaggregated. Vice Provost Bernstein responded that he had attempted to create some sense of where the money is distributed but each institution is very different. General policy documents may be found at [www.cogr.edu](http://www.cogr.edu), but the data itself is closely held as it identifies the practices of specific universities.

Professor Morrison inquired whether overhead costs will be borne by the Colleges under hybrid management. Provost Director responded that 100% of indirect costs' recovery will be distributed to the Colleges who will then reimburse the University for attributed costs (library, security, etc.) according to a formula. All units are additionally taxed on an income of 20%, some of which is returned [to the Colleges] as general funds allocations and as support for joint expenses and interdisciplinary efforts.

In response to Professor Alshawabkeh's inquiry concerning faculty incentives, the Provost noted that not all faculty members have access to funded research and those that do have significant incentives such as summer salary, support of graduate students, travel, and many others. In addition, seed funding will be provided to enhance research and the Colleges will make decisions concerning availability of some central funding as well.

Professor Sherman stated that it is apparent that funds may be spent in any way as, once the overhead return is provided, there are no restrictions. Provost Director countered that

government agencies examine how the monies are spent when setting the rates. The Vice Provost noted that there are expectations and advice from the Office of Budget and Management as to how the monies are spent. Professor Sherman, however, noted that money is fungible and the source of funds cannot be unambiguously identified.

Professor Strauss asked whether the monies spent, then, are rolled back into the next calculation. The Vice Provost responded that the government agrees to return an overhead rate based on all legitimate research expenses, but this does not include faculty salaries. Any expense that can be defended as essential to the conduct of research may be counted toward the indirect costs.

The Senate adjourned at 1:26 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen W. McKnight, Secretary  
Faculty Senate