

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: STUART S. PETERFREUND, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
RE: MINUTES, 2006-07 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 18 OCTOBER

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bruns, Daynard, Gilbert, Glod, Hafner, Hall, Herman, Janikian, Kane, Marshall, Meador, McKnight, Peterfreund, Reucroft, Reynolds, Robinson, Sanchez, Sherman, Starr, Strauss, Willey, Zaremba
(Administrators) Abdelal, Falcon, Finkelstein, Onan, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bosso, Cokely, Fox, Hansberry, Hill, Krishnamoorthy, Touran, Welch,
(Administrators) Hopey, Moore, Soyster

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:55 AM

A. Professor Glod welcomed President Joseph Aoun to the Faculty Senate to share ideas and work toward the future.

President Aoun began by saying that he would like to share his impressions, not about the meetings he has had with faculty, student groups & staff where he has been apprised fully about the past, but about the future. The President noted an eagerness to assume ownership and responsibility for the destiny of this Institution. As a direct result, the Deans and Provost have assumed ownership, with Central Development, of advancement activities. Central Development will focus on interests and activities involving the entire University community while the Deans and faculty will articulate excitement at the College level. He pointed out that this came about due to collaborative discussions.

The President continued that he believes a fundamental principle of all the University's activities is that those activities will be driven by academic priorities. Every aspect of Northeastern's operations, from the budget forward to the master plan, to recruitment, to remodeling, or to whatever is done, will be based on academic priorities identified by the academic planning process. The academic planning process is co-chaired Provost Abdelal and Mark Putnam, Chief Planning Officer and will involve faculty, staff, students, Trustees, alumni and members of the corporation as well as, at some point, our partners in Coop. Once the UNIVERSITY community agrees on those academic priorities, everything should follow in a deductive manner—budgeting, the master plan, recruitment, everything. President Aoun wished to clearly articulate that the academic plan is not another dogma, but a way to have common vision, discourse and strategy. He noted that strategies change and are living entities in order that threats and opportunities, or priorities that were overlooked, may be discussed openly.

The President pointed out that faculty is integrally involved in deciding where the University should be going and assessing what risks there may be in getting there. He averred that what is past is past, and that we are now moving forward together based on our priorities and goals. For this reason, there should be no instances wherein the SAC Chair must call the Provost to say that something was not agreed upon and does not fit with the academic priorities of the faculty. We—the collective *we*—need to establish the framework to make this a reality. Not the Provost, not the senior leadership team, but the collective *we* in which each of us assumes responsibility for the success of this institution.

Summing up, President Aoun asked the Faculty Senate to imagine a country where women are not allowed to work. It is unacceptable. Imagine, then, a situation where the faculty cannot assume ownership. The President said that he would not wish to be part of this University if that were the case. He came to listen, to discuss aspirations, and to move forward.

The Provost opened the floor to discussion.

Professor Strauss expressed a longstanding concern about the asymmetry of the size and priorities of the various academic units at Northeastern. She noted, that there are some very large and very small Colleges, citing the difficulty of managing, for instance, the College of Arts and Sciences, where priorities compete and disciplines may not be well-served by keeping the College together. Professor Strauss wondered if consideration would be given to dividing the units into smaller groupings for better representation.

President Aoun responded that any discussions going forward will do so with collaboration at all levels. He took note of the spirit of collegiality that he has observed operating at Northeastern—with the result of a number of highly successful interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary collaborations. President Aoun cited as an example of such collaborations the one that has recently resulted in a grant to Professor Bosso for studying and assessing the social and political impact of nanotechnology. When a university such as Northeastern, which is a powerhouse in nanotechnology and a powerhouse in the study of policy issues, is able to bring about a collaboration that results in a study of the policy issues raised by nanotechnology, it is able to engage in path-breaking work not previously undertaken by academia or the larger society. The President noted that this type of joint, interdisciplinary project is an asset of the University must be leveraged to maximum effect.

Professor Hall noted that some of what Professor Strauss had suggested had been done by the formation of the new School of Social Sciences without breaking up the CAS. He noted, too, that the University is moving toward general education requirements university-wide which may relieve the situation as well.

The President agreed that these were two very important points. The general education requirement is essential for many reasons, such as creation of a common culture. He noted that institutions without the general education component experienced lower retention rates and that students nationwide change majors 2.7 times. The general education requirement facilitates a process for students to explore various majors/minors. The President expressed encouragement that Northeastern decided to look at its identity and explore a different approach to undergraduate education.

Professor Kane noted that one of the first structures the President changed was that of Coop, which is now decentralized, by placing the College Coop Coordinators in the respective Colleges and having them report directly to the Deans of those colleges. He asked the President what his thoughts are on how the decentralization will affect students.

The President explained that during the transition period he had met with many students and faculty colleagues and with the Deans and the Senate, many of whom expressed the opinion that Coop needed to be integrated more fully into the fabric of the students' studies. Noting that this process had begun many years ago, the President merely agreed that it was a natural evolution and implemented it. He said that it is a strong cognitive statement to the rest of world about how people learn because study cannot be divorced from practice nor practice from study and there are opportunities abounding. For instance, Professor Herman mentioned providing distance learning, so that students on remote Coop rotations do not feel so disconnected from the University. Coop is Northeastern's number one differentiator.

Returning to integration, the President noted that while it should be done at the college level, it should also allow students to explore different Coop opportunities across disciplinary boundaries. Therefore, Coop opportunities are not to be owned by the Colleges, but should instead be treated as potentially interdisciplinary and owned by the entire University.

Professor Peterfreund said that conversations about more broadly construed tuition benefits had historically encountered resistance, especially when concerned with the issue of the University becoming a member of a consortium whereby employee dependents could enroll at other institutions within that consortium. More recently, the same resistance was encountered on the issue of dependent tuition benefits for on-line courses. He asked if the President is willing to reopen and reconsider these matters.

President Aoun, citing experience at his last institution, stated that in general the exchange program did not work well, as most of the consortium participants are small institutions whose budgets are more limited than those of the large institutions, and when faced with the prospect of exchanges with the larger institutions, the smaller ones have discouraged employees from sending their dependents to the larger ones.

The President also said that he has been meeting with University employees to ask where their children are attending University and if they would send them to Northeastern. The President stated his opinion that this is important because in many ways it is insider trading and, if insiders are not willing to trade in the stock of their own institution, perhaps they should not be part of the institution. The point is that are we looking at our primary asset, the human asset, as something that is compelling. Are we looking at our education as something equally compelling?

Returning to Professor Peterfreund's question, President Aoun said that he would talk to the Provost about the issue of dependent tuition benefits for on-line courses, as he hadn't been aware of the restriction. However, he added that if employees can convince their children to come here, they can convince the world that this is a great institution.

Professor Peterfreund noted that his daughter is a Northeastern student but that, as Northeastern has risen in the ranks, some employees' children can no longer qualify for admission. The President responded that he will investigate the matter with the Provost.

Professor Herman noted that there were two parts to Professor Peterfreund's question. The inability of dependents to take on-line courses did not matter in the past when there were only few available, but there are now some programs that cannot be completed without on-line courses, and the restriction therefore creates an internal barrier and diminishes the tuition benefit. Professor Herman expressed concern as to whether the same maximum tuition benefit is available for all Northeastern students. The President agreed that these were good points.

After informing the body that he had to attend to another commitment, President Aoun left the Senate.

B. **Minutes** of the 4 October Senate meeting were accepted as amended.

C. **SAC Report.** Professor Glod reported that the SAC met twice in regular session and once with Provost Abdelal. Issues discussed with the Provost focused on anticipated changes in the University budget process and the implementation of workload policies.

Professor Glod highlighted the new "Life of the Mind" discussion series that will bring together three to four faculty members from across the University to discuss a topic in an interdisciplinary manner. The series will entail three or four discussions and the Senate was urged to submit ideas for topics and faculty participants. Other announcements: Professor Wallin replaces Professor Marshall on the Faculty Senate beginning 1 Nov for remainder of this year; Professor Hill replaces Professor Powers-Lee for remainder of 2006-07 + 2007-08. The SAC has been asked to initiate a search committee for an internal search for a chair of the Department of Psychology. Staffing is underway.

The Ad Hoc Committee for the Quality of Campus Life has been staffed and charged as follows:

Members:

Professor William Sanchez, Chair (Couns. & Applied Edu. Psych)
Professor Daniel D. Burkey (Chemical Engineering)
Professor Stephen M. Kane (Coop-Engineering)
Professor Susan J. Roberts (Nursing)
Dean Emily A. Spieler (Law)
Professor Phyllis R. Strauss (Biology)
SGA Rep (TBA)
GPSA Rep (TBA)

Charge:

- The quality, delivery and responsiveness of student health and counseling services
- The quality, delivery and responsiveness of campus police and security measures
- Concerns about pedestrian safety in various areas of campus, including city streets that traverse the campus and MBTA transportation facilities located within the campus perimeter
- Satisfaction with the variety and nutritional quality of food offered by dining services
- Satisfaction with dormitory, classroom and office facilities in terms of cleanliness and maintenance
- Opinions regarding the appropriate extent of the smoking ban on campus
- The University's preparedness for crowd/mob behavior (e.g., incidents associated with sport celebration)
- Other concerns about safety hazards within the campus environment

D. **Provost's report.** Provost Abdelal reminded the Senate that he had sent an e-mail about the integration of Coop faculty coordinators into the Colleges. This has been a major goal and a step taken that will work

advantageously. Those coordinators now report to the Dean of their college. Some functions will remain centralized such as employer relations and coordination of some of the Coop coordinator's responsibilities. The initiative is already experiencing progress in securing many more opportunities as well as pursuing international experiences. These will further strengthen Northeastern's hallmark in terms of experiential education.

Regarding the resolution on the agenda concerning tutorial support/academic assistance, the Provost noted that he had been thinking about this on the administrative side as well. He would like to determine if it is best to have each College responsible for academic assistance, supplemental instruction and tutorial support. Integration is the word for today: integrating responsibilities. The Provost reported that he had been discussing this with the Deans and looked forward to feedback from the Senate later, during discussion of the resolution.

The Provost reported that he and the SAC had agreed to meet bi-weekly to share issues and topics. He has found the meetings to be very helpful and noted that harmonious communication fits with the model the President is implementing which is to rely on the Provost's office to work with the Deans and the faculty. The Provost will meet with Senate Financial Affairs Committee during the budget process to relate academic priorities from the Deans and the Provost's perspective and listen to faculty priorities.

Provost Abdelal opened the floor to questions.

E. Questions. Professor Alper expressed concern that, with Coop decentralization, the Coop coordinators' foci will be on students within their own colleges. He asked the Provost how to ensure cooperative relationships and a willingness for coordinators to share opportunities in which students in other colleges may have interest.

Provost Abdelal noted two safeguards. There will continue to be central support for web-based services including advertising all opportunities across the University on Place Pro. The other is continuation of a strong collaborative environment. He noted that the Deans were collaborative when he became Provost and are even more so now. If a faculty member or a student has concerns, they should expect that the Deans can resolve them.

Dean Stellar noted that with the decentralizing of development, processes have become simpler and he expects the same with the decentralization of Coop.

Professor Kane noted that the COE, CCIS and Coop work together on a regular basis to convince employers to be open about the kind of students they may need. The Provost added that he and Professor Kane had discussed what types of professional activities are needed to be sure the Coop coordinators work together and so were cognizant of the issue. He assured the Senate that there will be appropriate measures to assess success.

F. 2005-06 Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Library Policies and Operations Report. Professor Willey moved the following substitute resolution and it was seconded. Professor Peterfreund noted for the record that the prior motion had been withdrawn with the consent of the seconder.

WHEREAS there are many academic requests, needs, and expectations indirectly involving the Library when new academic initiatives are initiated,

BE IT RESOLVED That academic initiatives directly or indirectly involving library resources or personnel include consultation with the Dean of Libraries or his/her designee and, when appropriate, collaboration to identify and secure those resources

Professor Herman explained that the substitute wording is an attempt to clarify what should be in the resolution and what should be excluded based on discussions at the last Senate meeting.

In response to a question by Professor Zaremba as to who will determine when collaboration is appropriate, Professor Peterfreund, crafter of the substitute motion, explained that the motion assumes a collegial process which, by definition, is improvisatory and somewhat spontaneous. Strict protocols are not needed to go forward.

Discussion took place concerning what sort of problems had arisen in the past. Dean Warro cited incidents where faculty had assumed that materials would be available for large assignments or new courses and the

Library had been unable to respond. He also referred to the general education initiative where the Library should have input. He noted, too, that there are times when it might not be appropriate or necessary for the Library to be involved as the anticipated demand on resources would not be significant. However, when a new initiative or program is being considered, it is always appropriate.

Professor Herman noted that this resolution merely says 'Let's not forget the Library' when discussing resources. They are expensive and the Library is an important part of the resource base that must support programmatic initiatives. It is important that contacts be made during construction of new buildings as well, such as took place at Shillman and Behrakis, so that connectivity does not have to happen after the fact.

Professor Daynard moved to delete "directly or indirectly" and "when appropriate" and add "significant" before library resources. The motion was seconded and, following brief discussion concerning addition of the word "significant", a vote was taken.

Vote to amend the substitute resolution as stated by Professor Daynard: PASSED, 23-1-3

The amended resolution reads as follows:

WHEREAS there are many academic requests, needs, and expectations indirectly involving the Library when new academic initiatives are initiated,

BE IT RESOLVED That academic initiatives involving significant library resources or personnel include consultation with the Dean of Libraries or his/her designee and collaboration to identify and secure those resources

Vote to approve the motion as amended: PASSED, 21-2-3

Professor Willey moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

WHEREAS peer tutoring is an important component within the Northeastern University structure, and that presently at least 11 peer tutoring services exist on the Boston Campus

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate endorses the need for additional study and the issuing of recommendations regarding the current state of tutoring at the University. Such additional study shall be undertaken either by establishing an ad hoc committee on peer tutoring or by charging a Standing Committee of the Senate.

Professor Willey noted that he had not been aware of peer tutoring until he received the charge. He explained that it is an active group at the library with a full-time staff member. Tutors are certified by the College and Learning Association at several levels. The Library supplies the budget of \$130,000 but some students are supported by work/study.

Professor Daynard noted that it appears to be a wonderful program but wondered why it is not a matter for the SAC to charge to a committee rather than discussing it on the floor of the Senate. Professor Glod responded that it had, in fact, been charged to the Senate Committee for Library Policies and Operations, in very specific terms. The charge requested a report on the status of peer tutoring. Following brief discussion, a motion was made to withdraw the resolution based on assurances by the Provost that his office is investigating the matter of peer tutoring and will consult with the SAC on the outcome of that investigation. The motion was seconded; the resolution was withdrawn.

Professor Willey moved the following resolution and it was seconded.

WHEREAS Northeastern University's longstanding commitment to the free and open publication, presentation and discussion of research advances the interests of the scholarly community, the faculty individually, and the public, and

WHEREAS the costs of scholarly journals are continually rising at rates greater than the rate of inflation and higher than the rate of University budget increases, and

WHEREAS the activities of these publishers directly depend upon the continued participation of faculty at Northeastern University and similar institutions acting as editors, reviewers, and authors, and

WHEREAS a lasting solution to this problem requires not only interim measures but also a long range plan, and

WHEREAS publication in open access journals and repositories is an increasingly effective option for scholarly communication,

The Northeastern University Faculty Senate:

a. Encourages faculty to become familiar with the pricing and business practices of journals and journal publishers in their specialty, and to support journals and publishers whose pricing and accessibility policies promote broad and continuing access to scholarship.

b. Urges faculty, especially tenured faculty, to exert a positive influence on the direction of scholarly publishing through the choices they make in the submission of papers, the commitment of time to refereeing activities, and participation in editorial work.

c. Encourages faculty and the University to support new models for scholarly publishing, including open access journals and archives, disciplinary and institutional repositories and other approaches that enhance the broad dissemination of knowledge while preserving peer review and excellence in scholarship.

d. Urges faculty to maintain control of their scholarly work by retaining intellectual property rights, in order to allow them greater freedom to disseminate their work and thereby maximize the impact of their scholarship.

e. Calls upon the faculty and University administration to support these changes by providing incentives and assistance to for those advancing alternative models.

[Note: Nothing in this resolution is intended to detract from recognition of the link between journal quality and scholarly benefits to individuals, departments and the University, or to undermine the central role of the peer review process in academic publication. Rather, the goal is to encourage publication in open-access sources where these goals will not be compromised, to increase the range and quality of open access journals and archives, and to encourage journal editors and publishers to support open access goals.]

Professor Willey explained that the motion was an appeal for faculty to support open access and was modeled after a University of Iowa faculty resolution. In response to Professor Gilbert's question, he explained that if copyright is held by a journal, the article cannot be posted. However, some publishers are allowing articles to be posted just prior to the final proof.

Professor Herman noted that open access is an international movement. Many journals take control of copyrights; others leave the copyright with the authors. Therefore, some journal articles can be published in the open access environment. The Library is just creating an open access environment using the IRis system. The first on-line journal has just been accepted by the University. There is a range of scholarly activity in which faculty engage. This is not encouragement for faculty to violate copyright laws but there is no harm in asking. Where there is opportunity, it will be beneficial to the students and faculty take advantage of open access.

It was noted that there are websites where faculty can find information on obtaining or keeping copyrights and what publishers will allow. Professor Peterfreund suggested information on the Library homepage on the open access initiative.

Dean Warro noted that there will be a breakfast on 24 October concerning IRis and open access and that the Library staff is able to give additional workshops should faculty desire it.

Motion to vote the resolution was seconded.

Vote to accept the 2005-06 Senate *Ad Hoc* Committee on Library Policies and Operations resolution on open access: PASSED, 20-0-4

The meeting adjourned at 1:27 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart S. Peterfreund, Secretary
Faculty Senate