



Northeastern University

Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary
SUBJECT: Minutes, 24 April 2019

Present: Professors: Adams, Barberis, Bart, Beauchesne, Bourns, Brooks, Carr, Cisewski, Desnoyers, Dyal-Chand, Ergun, Erdogmus, Gonyeau, Hayward, Herlihy, Kaeli, Kelly, Lerner, McOwen, Onan, Powers-Lee, Shefelbine, Stephens, Wahl, Wertheim, Wood
Administrators: Bean, Echambadi, Hackney, He, Isaacs, Loeffelholz, Poiger, Ronkin, Wadia-Fascetti

Absent: Professors: Dau, Kevoe Feldman, Stowell, Vicino
Administrators: Parish

CALL TO ORDER: 11 a.m.

MINUTES of 10 April 2019 were approved.

I. SAC REPORT of 24 April 2019.

- Since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met 5 times, with one meeting including SVP Franko, one meeting including the Senior Leadership Team and one meeting including the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Student Experience Committee.
- Topics included entrepreneurship development, experiential learning, combined majors, NU's hubs, and the compensation module.

Curriculum Updates

- CSSH Certificate in Information Ethics Approved
- Inactivated Programs:
 - Computer Systems Engineering MS with Concentration in the Internet of Things (COE)
 - Data Mining Engineering Graduate Certificate (COE)
 - Nursing Anesthesia MS & CAGS (BCHS)
 - College Student Development and Counseling MS (BCHS)
 - Biomedical Nanotechnology MS (BCHS)
 - Music Industry Leadership MS (CAMD)

Interdisciplinary Arts MFA (CAMD)
Leading Communication Strategy and Talent Development Graduate Certificate (CPS)
Thanks to the 2018/19 Senate.

- 12 of the current senators will be continuing on the 2019/20 Senate
- Michelle Beauchesne (BCHS) will be retiring from the Senate and from Northeastern.
- Kay Onan (COS and previously CAS and CSSH) will also be retiring from both the Senate and from Northeastern.

II. **PROVOST REPORT:**

The Provost said that the Dean searches for College of Science and College of Engineering are well underway. The Provost added that SEIU filed a petition to organize the FTNTT Faculty. There was a NLRB hearing scheduled for 4.24.19. The hearing was cancelled on 4.23.19. The Provost stated that the University did nothing to precipitate this action.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

There were no questions and there was no discussion.

III. **CONTINUED BUSINESS**

A. FACULTY HANDBOOK RESOLUTION: COMPENSATION (PROFESSOR POWERS-LEE)

The Provost asked for someone to move for adoption of the version of the module reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC). Professor Dave Kaeli so moved. Professor Lorna Hayward seconded. (It was noted for the record that Prof. Lerner was the official seconder of record.)

BE IT RESOLVED that the proposed module entitled “Compensation replace the current module entitled “Compensation”.

Prof. Kaeli noted that SAC had a discussion on the version of the module edited by the (OGC). Based on that discussion, SAC offered two friendly amendments to the document. The first friendly amendment involves *Part A. Merit, 1. Function of Merit*. In the second sentence of paragraph 1, the recommendation is to add the word “both” between “from” and “the”. The idea behind this suggestion is to be inclusive and to emphasize both the committee and unit head. The sentence would now read:

“In terms of guidance, the merit report from both the merit committee (full-time faculty of the department or the relevant academic unit where departments do not exist) and the unit head should show each faculty member where they are doing well and areas where improvement is needed.”

The second recommendation involves *A. Merit, 2. Process for Determining Merit*, the last sentence in the fifth paragraph. The suggestion is to replace the word “consider” with the word “use” and to delete the word “in” after the word “assessment” and instead add “as the basis for”. The sentence would now read as follows:

“The department/unit head shall use the merit committee’s assessment as the basis for their recommendation for salary increase.”

The Provost asked if this was considered a friendly amendment? Professor Kaeli responded that SAC felt this was a friendly amendment. Professor Powers-Lee added that these revisions revert to the language before OGC review.

The Provost said he thought this was very different wording depending on whether we are talking about a chair or a dean. He said if we are talking about a chair, he is comfortable with this language. If we are talking about a dean, he was not comfortable with this language because the dean needs to include other things besides the peer evaluations. So the issue would only be in units that do not have departmental structure.

Professor Adams asked Professor Powers-Lee if she could summarize the differences between the document the Senate has before them now and the last iteration of the module.

Professor Powers-Lee responded that the big changes occurred in the equity section. The OGC initially had said a big concern was in bringing the module up to date with the MA Equal Pay Act (MEPA). They made changes in the equity wording that align with how that law is interpreted. SAC felt these were not substantive changes.

Professor Gonyeau asked if the first sentence in section 2. *Process for Determining Merit*, conflicted with the last sentence in paragraph five that is the basis for one of the friendly amendments? Professor Kaeli said that committee does not make any recommendations regarding salary. He said the two sentences are disconnected.

Professor Kelly’s question centered around the phrase “material changes” that appears on p.3 in the third paragraph, first sentence and on p. 4, b., first sentence. She said she thought the Senate had a discussion about this phrase and now that language is back. She added she is not sure what “material changes” means.

Professor Powers-Lee said she thought the Senate discussed the phrase but did not arrive at a change.

Professor Adams asked for clarification if the suggestion being discussed was a friendly amendment or a regular amendment. Provost Bean said that in Roberts Rules

there is no such thing as a friendly amendment but that the Senate uses the term to simplify things. He added that this is complicated because the Provost, as chair, was not sure he considered these friendly amendments. He said he was happy to have the Senate to vote on them but would like all the issues aired.

There being no further discussion the Provost called for a vote on the the two amendments put forward by Professor Kaeli.

VOTE to accept the amendments PASSED 24-0-7.

The Provost noted the Senate was now considering the compensation module as amended.

For the purposes of the discussion going forward, the Provost said there are two things happening in the evaluation process. One is the evaluation of performance which comes out of a peer review committee and differs from unit to unit. The next thing that happens is that a faculty person gets a raise but that is not a decision until approved by the Provost's Office. There are a number of intermediate steps in there. The Provost said what he thought was important was for the faculty member to have a sense of transparency, but he didn't think we want to get into paper shuffles at every slice of this.

Following a discussion on 3. *Communication of Merit Evaluations, a. Academic Unit level*, Professor Kaeli said to the point on workload, that is something the Senate worked on last year and has become much more transparent. In regards to the numbers (median and range), he thought the numbers are there for transparency. It is to benefit the administration because it builds trust with the faculty. It helps to create a faculty that is more loyal and more committed and improves morale.

Professor Dyal-Chand suggested a word change in section 3. *Communication of Merit Evaluations, a. Academic Unit level* to make clear that this section is a description of the reporting of the process that takes place in section 2. Professor Dyal Chand suggested the first line of section 3.a. be written as follows.

“All faculty members shall be given the specific written feedback (according to the department/unit procedures as required in section A.2) in regard to the outcomes of their merit review.”

Professor Dyal Chand added this was a reference back to A. *Merit, 2. Process for Determining Merit* not an additional reporting requirement. Professor Kaeli seconded.

VOTE on the motion PASSES : 31-0-0.

Dean Poiger found the first sentence of section A.2 problematic. Provost Bean agreed the sentence was inconsistent and asked if there was a motion to eliminate that first sentence.

Professor Lerner proposed that the first sentence in Section 2.A be eliminated. And that on p.2 in the first sentence of paragraph one, the phrase *full-time faculty of the* be added after the word “The” and before the word “department”. Professor Kaeli seconded the motion.

The new sentence reads as the follows:

“The full-time faculty of the department (or the relevant unit) maintains written procedures for determining merit criteria including procedures or formulas for translating each individual’s merit into an annual salary recommendation.”

VOTE on the motion PASSES 33.0.0.

There was continued discussion on the module. Professor Adams recommended caution in passing something today that the Senate might not be able to change next year. Provost Bean said he did not want to take two versions of the module to the BOT in the December. Professor Kelly said she thought the Senate was reaching some consensus.

Dean Hackney said he heard substantitive objections to the document. He didn’t think the Senate was uniformly there yet. He said he couldn’t vote on this affirmatively given the fact the Senate didn’t have a red line version and that the Senate had received the most recent version 72 hours ago.

Professor Stephens said she wanted to continue discussion around the merit/equity separation -- specifically on the 3 year issue.

Professor Kelly wondered if it is possible to vote on the document up to the equity part and then table equity for further discussion. Professor Kelly made such a motion but after discussion withdrew the motion.

Professor Adams said that given there are disagreements regarding the module and the BOT will not meet until December, maybe it would be best to review the document over the summer.

Professor Adams made a motion to table the module until fall 2019. Professor McOwen seconded it.

Provost Bean said the motion now before the Senate is to table this motion to the fall.

He noted that the 2018.2019 senate can table this module but then the 2019.2020 senate will have to take it off the table.

Professor Ozlem asked what is the roadmap for thinking about this over the summer?

Provost Bean responded that we would charge the SAC to continue the conversation working with Handbook Committee or however it sees fit to hand off to the new SAC which we now know has the same chair and secretary.

Professor Ergun asked if the Senate could identify the points that needed to be discussed by SAC. What are the disagreements? Provost Bean's said that so far we issues involving percentages and the three year equity.

Dean Hackney said that one piece that could be discussed over the summer is the interrelationship between MEPA and the equity section.

Professor Silbey said she had both the previous version of the module and the one edited by the OGC which she redlined. She said the OGC took out all variables under B.1. that were comparative analyses about equalizing salaries. It made the equity provision less like an equity provision and more like a merit provision. She added the problem with MEPA is that it is new and people are not sure how it will be applied going forward. It is her sense that the OGC is being quite conservative about their concerns of how the Equal Pay Act will be applied to institutions and they are constraining the equity evaluations accordingly.

There being no further discussion, Provost Bean called for a vote and noted that a "YES" vote is to table until the fall and a "NO" vote it to continue discussion and vote today. Professor Dyal-Chand said that this vote only required a simple majority.

VOTE on the motion to table discussion of the Compensation module until Fall 2019
PASSED 18-13-2.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: GRADUATE COUNCIL – PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING.

Professor Ergun read the following and Professor Erdogmus seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in Human Factors in the College of Engineering as approved by the Graduate Council on 3 April 2019 (8-0-0).

VOTE to establish the Master of Science in Human Factors in the College of Engineering
PASSED 33-0-0.

B. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: GRADUATE COUNCIL – PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING.

Professor Kaeli read the following and Professor Hayward seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in Data Architecture and Management in the College of Engineering as approved by the Graduate Council on 3 April 2019 (8-0-0).

In regard to the program, Professor Kaeli said that Data Engineering is an emerging field and recognizes data engineers as first class citizens. He said, this addresses how data is designed; how it is architected and how it is then used to solve a wide variety of problems.

Professor Carr and Professor Herlihy asked if there are any legal issues or conflicts with using the word architecture? Professor Kaeli explained that Data Architecture, like Computer Architecture, is a commonly used phrase in the field of data management.

VOTE to establish the Master of Science in Data Architecture and Management in the College of Engineering PASSED 32-0-1.

C. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: GRADUATE COUNCIL –

Vice Provost He read the following and Professor Lerner seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the proposed Graduate Council Bylaws replace the current Graduate Council Bylaws as approved by the Graduate Council by electronic ballot in April 2019 (8-0-0).

Vice Provost He acknowledged the ad hoc committee members who worked on the Bylaws including Kristin Madison, Tom Sheahan, Linda Allen, and Natasha Frost.

Noting that there were friendly amendments that came to their attention after the graduate council vote, Vice Provost He moved that the amendments be discussed as appropriate. Professor Kaeli seconded the motion.

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti said that when reviewing the Graduate Bylaws she noted points for clarification and sent Vice Provost He a list.

Speaking on behalf of the committee, Vice Provost He said there are 7 friendly amendments. Several of these were simple and the committee was ready to accept them. Others, the committee considered to be more substantive.

Provost Bean advised that anything that is a typo or a clarifying word that doesn't change the substance, be edited in and that the Senate should hear the substantive material.

For the first substantive item, Vice Provost He referenced p. 5, section IV., the second sentence. "Program-specific policies that are not addressed by the Graduate Council bylaws must be made available, in writing, to students in the program."

The friendly amendment suggests adding *available on the web open on password protected sites*. Vice Provost He said the committee felt that was too specific to be included in the bylaws.

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti made a motion to make this change. Professor Herlihy seconded the motion.

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti, said the reason she added those words was that even with the availability Bylaws or other department guidelines, there are still instances when students don't know how to find them. The suggestion was so that if a student asked where to find this information, someone could say it is on the web. The site would be password protected using the Northeastern login credentials.

After continued discussion, Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti withdrew the motion.

Vice Provost He said the next suggestion referenced p.8, second paragraph.

"Graduate programs may approve advanced standing credit towards its degree programs from industry-based courses deemed equivalent to, or in place of, degree requirements, not to exceed 9 semester hours or 12 quarter hours."

The proposed language would add the following sentence to this paragraph. *In each case, the degree program curriculum committee must approve of the course assessment or provide an assessment to evaluate learning outcomes.*

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti said the reason she added this sentence was because we are talking about an industry-based course and industry is not an accredited institution. She said her intent in the comment was to ask how do we ensure when a company issues a certificate that the learning has happened.

Vice Provost He acknowledged Kristin Madison. Associate Dean Madison said she thought this was an important goal that we should all share. She asked if the Senate was prepared right now on the floor to accept this particular governance structure that would be applicable to all colleges rather than allowing each of the colleges to develop their own structure.

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti offered to revise here friendly amendment and instead propose that the 2nd paragraph on p.8 be deleted and that it could be put back after the language could be reviewed more thoroughly.

Provost Bean asked if her amendment could be a broader statement addressing NECHE assessment but let an individual college decide how they would do this.

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti suggested that an Individual college could establish a framework for how to deem industry-based course equivalents and then run that through governance.

Provost Bean said normally transfers are governed by the faculty in that area. But now you want the entirety of the senate structure to approve how that discipline group determines how something is equivalent to their current courses.

Provost Bean asked Vice Provost Madison for her thoughts. She said her role on this bylaws committee was to think about the language we are putting together. She added a lot of time goes into thinking about each of these positions and how to structure them. It is very hard to do that kind of drafting right now. Provost Bean asked if she was suggesting that this be an amendment we look at after the fact so that we can tighten it up. She said that would be her suggestion.

There being no further discussion the vote was taken. The vote was 0-0-0. Provost Bean cast the tie breaking vote. Voting NO the motion DOES NOT PASS.

Vice Provost He noted one additional amendment in regards to p.14, section 8. PhD Dissertation Committee, the first paragraph.

The amendment calls for striking the phrase “or an appropriate terminal degree for the discipline.”

Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti made a motion to remove the end of the sentence. Professor Powers-Lee seconded the motion.

Provost Bean said clearly this is a substantive change. He asked what if you have a senior research professor? Is this precluded in this wording? Vice Chancellor Wadia-Fascetti said the intent of this change was only for the chair adding other committee members do not need to have a PhD. She also said there is also a sentence that allows for exceptions that is not being removed and so that handles the senior research professor.

Professor Gonyeau said another issue with this might be in the area of Health Sciences where we have large number of terminal degrees that are not PhDs.

Professor Desnoyers said not only does it require PhD but also T/TT faculty person.

Dean Loeffelholz asked if this a solution without a problem. Provost Bean asked who has to approve the PhD committees? Vice Provost He said once a committee is constructed a student can submit the paperwork indicating who is the chair and the committee members to the Graduate Office.

Provost Bean said that we have a situation where what is in the by-laws is probably not strict enough because we don't have processes in place to do case by case adjudications but he also didn't want it to be so rigid that we make the PhD the be all and end all.

Professor Onan said she thought the sentence about exceptions provided a way out of this complication. She said she agreed with Professor Wadia-Fascetti that exceptions will be rare and they can be evaluated as they come up.

The Provost said we need to think about how to do this correctly and that is not going to happen here today. The question is do we want the tighter language and then work to relax it or do we want the softer language and hope nothing bad happens.

Professor Wahl said the current languages makes everything hinge on the degree and T/TT vs NTT. The exception clause might suggest a way out, but we need a better language in the future.

The Provost said the motion on the floor is the amendment put forward is to take the more relaxed language and replace with the more restrictive language.

VOTE to replace the language the more relaxed language with the more restrictive language DOES NOT PASS 33-0-0.

There being no other substantive amendments to discuss, the VOTE to replace the current Graduate Council Bylaws with the proposed Graduate Student Bylaws PASSES 33-0-0.

D. 1st EAPC Resolution. Professor Powers-Lee read the following and Professor Loeffelholz seconded.

Whereas Northeastern students increasingly customize their plans of study, including a dramatic increase in combined major enrollments,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate Agenda Committee work with the Provost's office to establish a University-wide working group, with membership drawn from the Academic Advisors, Associate Deans, Office of the Registrar and ITS, to be charged with recommending a software platform (e.g., Degree Works, already in use by CPS or an expansion of the DARS system currently in use in the other colleges) be implemented that permits students to create, visualize and save multi-year course planning and "what if" scenarios, allowing access to these plans across Colleges by academic advisors, co-op advisors, and faculty mentors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That this working group also (1) identify mechanisms to enhance FACT/Salesforce for use in combined majors and (2) design a resource that allows Academic Advisors for combined majors to be adequately trained in advising practices in partner colleges.

The Provost said It will be useful to get a perspective from the SAIL group later

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 31-0-0.

- E. 2nd EAPC Resolution. Professor Powers-Lee read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

Whereas Northeastern students increasingly customize their plans of study, including a dramatic increase in combined major enrollments,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate recommends that the Provost's Office and the College Deans (1) consider providing a two-year course schedule to facilitate longer-term planning and (2) review best practices for student-to-advisor ratios.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 31-0-0.

- F. **Academic Policy Committee Report.** Professor McOwen read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate accept the report of the 2018/2019 Academic Policy Committee.

A voice vote approved the acceptance of the report.

- G. **Academic Policy Committee Resolution.** Professor McOwen read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

Whereas there are a number of faculty with administrative appointments who might benefit from faculty input during performance review,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate recommends that deans identify their administrative appointees who interact regularly with faculty and for whom faculty input would be valuable as part of their annual review, with the mechanism(s) for this faculty input left to the dean's discretion. The Administrator Evaluation Process is an option for those administrative appointees whose function is similar to that of department chair.

Professor Powers-Lee made a friendly amendment to drop the word "annual" from the resolution. Professor McOwen agreed.

The resolution now reads:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate recommends that deans identify their administrative appointees who interact regularly with faculty and for whom faculty input would be valuable as part of their review, with the mechanism(s) for this faculty input left to the dean's discretion. The Administrator Evaluation Process is an option for those administrative appointees whose function is similar to that of department chair.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 33-0-1.

- H. Report of the Financial Affairs Committee.** Professor Wertheim read the following and Professor Gonyeau seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate accept the report of the 2018/2019 Financial Affairs Committee.

A voice vote approved the acceptance of the report.

- I. 1st FAC resolution on raise pool for FY2020.** Professor Wertheim read the following and Professor Herlihy seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the recommended raise pool for merit and equity for FY 2020 is 4.0% of continuing salaries starting on July 1, 2019.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 34-0-0.

- J. 2nd FAC Resolution.** Professor Mueller read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate recommends that the University present a proposal for the development of competitive housing benefits at Northeastern University to the Faculty Senate during the 2019/20 academic year.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 34-0-0.

- K. **3rd FAC Resolution.** Professor Wertheim read the following and Professor Gonyeau seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University explore moving to an “Opt Out” format for the retirement plan and report on this issue to the Faculty Senate during the AY 2019/20 academic year.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 30-0-2.

- L. **4th FAC Resolution.** Professor Wertheim read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University explore the costs and benefits associated with lowering or removing the fee for full-time faculty/staff use of recreation facilities.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 27-0-5.

- M. **5th FAC Resolution.** Professor Wertheim read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University consider commuter rail benefits similar to those of other Boston area universities (e.g., 50% subsidy provided by BU and 60% subsidy provided by MIT).

After discussion indicating “commuter rail” might be too specific, Provost Bean recommended a friendly amendment to substitute “MBTA” for “commuter rail.” The resolution now reads:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University consider MBTA benefits similar to those of other Boston area universities (e.g., 50% subsidy provided by BU and 60% subsidy provided by MIT).

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 31-0-0.

- N. **Report of the Research Policy Oversight Committee.** Professor Powers Lee read the following and Professor McOwen seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate accept the report of the 2018/2019 Research Policy Oversight Committee.

A voice vote approved the acceptance of the report.

- O. **Report of the Information Technology Policy Committee.** Professor Kaeli read the following and Interim Dean Isaacs seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate accept the report of the 2018/2019 Information Technology Policy Committee.

A voice vote approved the acceptance of the report.

Professor Kaeli recognized Prof. Riedewald, the chair of the committee to present the report.

- P. Report of the Faculty Development Committee.** Professor Bart read the following and Professor Kaeli seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate accept the report of the 2018/2019 Faculty Development Committee.

A voice vote approved the acceptance of the report.

- Q. 1st FDC Resolution.** Professor Bart read the following and Professor Powers-Lee seconded.

Whereas Dialogue of Civilizations (DOC) faculty leaders have identified challenges with multiple Global Experience Office policies and practices, and do not have sufficient opportunities to provide timely input on frequent changes in DOC-related policies and procedures that directly affect their effectiveness and satisfaction with leading DOC programs,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate recommend that the offices of the chancellor and the provost establish a DOC Faculty Advisory Board, with membership drawn from faculty members with DOC experience across multiple colleges, to be charged with recommending policies and procedures that affect the experience of DOC faculty leaders, improving communication and interactions between DOC faculty leaders and GEO, and conducting regular surveys among DOC faculty leaders to enable reliable feedback and monitor their satisfaction with GEO policies and practices,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Senate recommends that GEO should work with the offices of the chancellor and provost and the colleges to develop a sustainable and strategic multiyear plan that supports the needs of our students and faculty, and that addresses the concerns raised in regular surveys of faculty and students.

Provost Bean noted that at the most recent SAC-SLT meeting, this resolution was presented, and the Chancellor was very receptive and acknowledged that he is already looking into similar improvements.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 31-0-0.

- R. 2nd FDC Resolution (PROFESSOR BART)**

Whereas Northeastern faculty members need to have efficient and impactful mechanisms for disseminating their accomplishments in teaching, research and professional activities,

BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate recommends that the University Communications team should consider (1) communicating to faculty the availability of an email account monitored by the University Communications team that faculty members interested in disseminating their accomplishments may use to share their pitch ideas and receive helpful and timely feedback; (2) organizing a series of regular workshops for faculty on how to market their research findings outside academia (e.g., via an Op-Ed, social media tools); and (3) increasing the opportunities for major outlets to meet on campus with interested faculty members.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 31-0-0.

Additional item. Academic Proposal Graduate Council – Professor Kaeli read the following and Interim Dean Isaacs seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in Cyber-Physical Systems in the College of Engineering as approved by the Graduate Council o 14 April 2019 (7-0-0).

VOTE on establishing the Master of Science in Cyber-Physical Systems in the College of Engineering PASSED 31-0-0.

IV. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: STATUS OF THE FTNTT UNION VOTE

Professor Kaeli recognized Sebastian Stockman, Associate Teaching Prof in the English Department. Professor Stockman read the position statement of the administration: FTNTT are managers, and legal precedence is incorrect, and the university intends to challenge it. There are many examples of universities in and outside MA where FTNTT are unionized.

DISCUSSION: Professor Adams said the FTNTT should be allowed to vote for themselves and decide if they want a union or not. Provost Bean said the university did not instigate the cancellation of the hearing. Professor Adams noted that the administration was objecting to unionization, right? Provost Bean responded that the administration thinks due to One Faculty, FTNTT are now part of the management.

Professor Brooks said he didn't understand why the administration simply cannot allow a vote.

Professor Desnoyers said, if he had known when we were voting on One Faculty that it would be used for something morally reprehensible, he would not have voted in favor of it. Professor Kelly said she supports the FTNTT right to vote. She said she

also would have voted against the One Faculty vote if she had known it would be used in this fashion.

Professor Cisewski said issues that concern the FTNTT faculty like equitable pay, job security, sabbatical and program development funds are being addressed in the senate.

Professor Gonyeau said while some issues are being discussed in the senate, not all FTNTT issues have been addressed. Renewals of contracts, for instance, is one important issue.

Professor Dyal-Change said she also agrees to the right to vote. She said she would like to be mindful of time and suggested moving towards crafting a resolution. Professor Brooks asked if he was allowed to propose a resolution?

The Provost made a motion to come out of the committee of the whole and come back in to session. Professor Kaeli seconded.

Vote 24-0-2.

Professor Brooks proposed the following resolution:

It is the sense of the Senate that Full-time Non-tenure-track Faculty members should be allowed to vote on the question of union representation and that the University administration should commit to no longer filing legal objections to their eligibility to do so.

VOTE on the resolution PASSED 19-0-7.

Adjourned 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary, Faculty Senate