



Northeastern University

Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary
SUBJECT: Minutes, 13 February 2019

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

Absent: Professors Stowell, Wahl, Wertheim
Administrators: Bean, Echambadi, Parish

CALL TO ORDER: 11:47 a.m.

MINUTES of 23 January 2019 were approved.

I. SAC REPORT 13 February 2019.

- Since the last Senate meeting, SAC has met 5 times.
- One meeting included Provost Bean and one included the Senior Leadership Team, with both focused on the recent organizational changes.
- College meetings are scheduled to elect dean search committee members:
 - COE, February 14
 - COS, February 20
- The Graduate Council approved the following change for a BCHS program:

The Physician Assistant Leadership and Management, Graduate Certificate is renamed the Physician Assistant (PA) and Nurse Practitioner (NP) Leadership and Management, Graduate Certificate (8-0-0, 1/16/19).
- Gail Begley (COS) is serving as the at-large UUCC member this term
- English Chair Search Committee
(internal search with designated candidate Neal Lerner)
 - Libby Adler (SOL)
 - Erika Boeckeler (English)
 - Lori Lefkowitz (English)
 - Cecelia Musselman (English)
 - Steve Vallas (Sociology and Anthropology)
- Sociology and Anthropology Chair Search Committee

(internal search with designated candidate Liza Weinstein)

- Amy Farrell (School of Criminology, CSSH)
- Kristin Madison (SOL)
- Ineke Marshall (Sociology & Anthropology)
- Laura Senier (Sociology & Anthropology)
- Nina Sylvanus (Sociology & Anthropology)

- Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Chair Search Committee (external/internal search)
 - Ozlem Ergun (MIE)
 - Jerry Hajjar (Civil and Industrial Engineering)
 - Rifat Sipahi (MIE)
 - Bridget Smyser (MIE)
 - Jennie Stephens (CSSH)

Distribution of Elected Senators, 2019-2020 Senate

College	T/TT Faculty	FTNTT faculty	Total FT Faculty	Faculty/44.30	# 2019/20	# Empty Seats	# College Seats in
					Senate Seats	for College Elections	
BCHS	68	121	189	4.27	4	4	3
CAMD	73	75	148	3.34	3	2	3
COE	158	82	240	5.42	6	4	6
COS	144	84	228	5.15	5	3	6
CPS	1	83	84	1.9	2	2	0
CSSH	146	94	240	5.42	6	3	6
DMSB	102	83	185	4.18	4	2	3
Khoury	47	53	100	2.26	2	1	2
SOL	30	18	48	1.08	1	0	1
Total	769	693	1462		33	21	30
Total University Faculty = 1462; 1462/33 = 44.30 faculty per Senate seat							

II. PROVOST REPORT

There was no report due to Provost Bean’s absence.

Questions & Discussion

Referencing the Senate Distribution slide, Prof. Erdogmus asked if a college changes all senators in one year like Bouve, would that have a negative impact on the college’s interests? Prof. Powers-Lee responded that there was a sense that the overlapping senate terms gives some institutional knowledge to a college. She also added that in the example of Bouve, one of those four senators will complete the term of a senator who is exiting the senate and so that term will be one year.

Prof. Brooks asked if some of the Bouve senators might be eligible for re-election and therefore, continue on the Senate. Prof. Powers-Lee said that the Faculty Senate Office sends detailed letters to the deans of each college indicating the senators who will continue; who is eligible for re-election; and who is not not eligible for re-election.

Prof. Adams asked if the discussions SAC had about the new leadership organization with the Provost occurred before or after the decisions about the new structure were announced. Prof. Powers-Lee responded that discussions occurred both before and after. She added that SAC got a chance to ask a lot of questions. The responses to these questions did not lead to any concerns by SAC. Prof. Powers-Lee said that the Provost is very happy about this arrangement because it allows for two academic representatives on the senior leadership team. She added although Northeastern is not copying MIT, MIT is currently functioning with a similar relationship between the chancellor and the provost.

III. PRESENTATION BY DAVID LUZZI, SENIOR VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH

(Among other topics, Vice Provost Luzzi's presentation covered the effect of the partial government shutdown on research, the reorganization of research offices and progress on research support processes. The presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

The following is a sampling of comments during and following the presentation.

In response to V. P. Luzzi's statement that where it makes sense, there is a movement from university-wide NDA's to individual NDA's, Prof. Kaeli asked if the individual NDA would cover a faculty member's students. V.P. Luzzi responded this would be part of the conversation with the faculty person. He added that the faculty member would have to identify the members of their research group and communicate to those members that they are now bound by an agreement.

Prof. Wadia-Fascetti said that it was her understanding that when it came to PHD students with the NDA's, it is actually the students who need to sign the NDA. The student would be separate signatory. V. P. Luzzi said this was something he would clarify.

Prof. Herlihy was wondering if there was a negative effect on the willingness of outside parties to interact with us absent the university-wide NDA. V. P. Luzzi said the university was still signing lots of university-wide NDA's with industry. He said what they were trying to do with corporate partners is to become more flexible in accepting the company's wording. The test has now become does this put the university at risk rather than does this match our preferred language. This is another step forward in accelerating this process of industry sponsored research agreements.

In reference to the reduction and consolidation of communications from the newly formed Research Enterprise Services (NU-RES), Prof. Brooks noted that his perception was that email communication has gotten worse since NU-RES came in. He said he gets more emails, many of which he can't decipher. In response, V.P. Luzzi said he would invite Prof. Brooks to sit with himself and Jeff Seo to have a conversation and get more details on this matter.

In response to discussion of research across the global network, Prof. Powers-Lee referenced the earlier discussion that Prof. Adams and Prof. Hayward had in regard to the university reorganization. She said SAC had asked why Boston, Burlington and Nahant reported to the Provost still and the rest of these global locations reported to the Chancellor. The response was that the first 3 are strong research centers, while the others at this point are primarily Life Long Learning Centers.

Prof. Herlily said he was intrigued by the Center for Research Innovation (CRI). He asked if there could be any workshops for faculty so they could learn about the center for research and commercialization and how the university can support that. V. P. Luzzi responded that clearly, CRI had a marketing issue. He said CRI does

have workshops but that he would love to see CRI get more input from faculty and others to see what kind of workshops would be most in demand.

Prof. Kaeli asked what was V. P. Luzzi's vision for supporting research computing going forward. V. P. Luzzi said research computing is extraordinarily important. He said there was a lot of capacity at Holyoke that we are not using and that there was plenty of room to expand for pretty low cost. He added that they have just hired a new Associate Vice President for Research Computing and once this person is onboard, V. P. Luzzi, V. P. Camplese and the new person will sit down and determine a plan.

Prof. Stephens asked V. P. Luzzi if he had a strategy or plan for the integration of social sciences into the deployment of technology innovations. V. P. Luzzi responded that as a university that is focused on Humanics as a major component of the strategic plan and the research/academic portfolio, the university cares deeply about this integration.

He said what he is seeing through the development of the research institutes is a significant engagement and reach into the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, Media and Design. As an example, he noted the Kostas Research Institute is funding Arts Media and Design faculty on Dept. of Defense programs because their skill set is desperately needed. He said there is a growing awakening to the reality that technology alone is not going to get us where we need to go.

Dean Poiger said we need to continue to have a commitment to basic research in humanities. Not everything we generate may be commercialized, but we need to take pride in these outcomes for other reasons.

V.P. Luzzi agreed. He added entrepreneurship does not only mean commercial entrepreneurship. Understanding the social context and the ability to make a difference is also important.

Prof. Kelly said while CSSH did have some support for people who were pursuing research grants in the Humanities and Social Sciences, it would be much welcome to have that support at the University level. V. P. Luzzi said he would love to have a conversation on this topic. He wondered how it would be structured. He said they have a seed program, and everybody can write proposals to apply. But he wondered are there specific things we could do for the social sciences and humanities or the creative arts? Let's discuss how to facilitate more output and productivity.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Professor Dau read the following and Loeffelholz seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in Quantitative Finance in the D'Amore-McKim School of Business as approved by the Graduate Council on 16 January 2019 (8-0-0).

Professor Dau noted that this was a new quantitative track to the MA of Science with a STEM designation. He added this was important because the financial industry is increasingly becoming technology intensive. Prof. Onan asked for further clarification of what the STEM designation meant and who are the people to whom this designation matters.

Prof. Powers-Lee offered that this category of STEM eligible programs is maintained by people like Registrars. She added it matters to international students because they can work longer in this country. Prof. Dau added for STEM eligible programs, students are eligible for three years of practical training as

opposed to one year. Prof. Adams asked in regard to the name of the program, if the college thought of using a different description? Prof. Dau recognized Kate Klepper, Assoc. Dean Graduate Programs, DMSB Office of the Dean, who said their competitors like BU and BC use that same lexicon and that students were searching on that term.

Noting that Northeastern is a leader, Prof. Kaeli asked why are we not calling it Financial Analytics. He added we shouldn't follow; we should lead. Prof. Dau recognized Prof. Robert Mooradian. Prof. Mooradian said in terms of curriculum, there were two financial analytics classes in the program. But he emphasized, students were specifically looking for quantitative finance and that is what is drawing students.

Prof. Carr asked what was the anticipated enrollment for the program? Kate Klepper said in the last two years, they have seen a decline in enrollment. Students apply, are admitted, make their deposit and then abandon their deposit to enroll in a program that is more quantitatively and analytically rich. This year they have enrolled just under 60 students. She added she thought going forward they will be closer to 90 to 100 students per year.

VOTE on the Master of Science in Quantitative Finance PASSED: 35-0-0.

B. Prof. Lerner read the following and Prof. Erdogmus seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Master of Arts in Economics in the College of Social Sciences and Humanities be renamed to the Master of Science in Economics as approved by the Graduate Council on 16 January 2019 (8-0-0).

VOTE on the Master of Arts in Economics in the CSSH PASSED: 34-0-0.

V. CONTINUED BUSINESS

FACULTY HANDBOOK RESOLUTION: COMPENSATION (PROFESSOR POWERS-LEE)

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

Prof. Dyal Chand moved that the additional edits in red in the new draft (dated 1.30.19) be accepted as a friendly amendment. Prof. Kaeli seconded.

Looking at p. 1, Prof. Powers-Lee noted the change in the first paragraph, replacing "base contract" with "workload as defined by the unit workload policy."

Prof. Powers-Lee also noted that the other two changes on this page were to provide consistency that faculty pointed out. A variety of terms were being used when we meant the same thing. So, we are now consistently using merit and evaluation. On p. 2, at the suggestion of Prof. Adams, we directly took some wording in the current module and moved it into this module. The red is bringing in what currently exists and adding it to the draft.

Prof. Dyal Chand asked the Faculty Handbook Committee representatives (Prof. Jessica Silbey, Prof. Rhonda Board, and Prof. Marina Leslie) to elaborate on the relationship between the language in the first paragraph

of number 2 on p. 2 that refers to peer involvement in determining criteria for merit and the language in the last sentence of the third paragraph on p. 2 that refers to the peer evaluation component.

Prof. Silbey responded that the peer evaluation component is the anchor for how most units around the university start their merit evaluation. Apparently, most units have a merit committee made up of colleagues. Those colleagues evaluate your work and they come up with the recommendation that goes to the chair.

Prof. Dyal Chand then asked how that does add to or is it just a clarification to the requirement in the current module that is in place, that the unit evaluation process must involve more than one person's judgement.

Prof. Board said the top paragraph says that there has to be a process. The third paragraph notes what it needs to include. It must have the peer evaluation component and needs to have the evaluation by the academic unit head. All units must have a policy. It must include peers and the academic head. How they do it is up to the units.

Dean Hackney asked if he was understanding this clearly. He said that paragraph three was dictating the procedure and in paragraph one there was discretion in regard to the substance. Prof. Silbey said no, the components of the procedure are being dictated.

Dean Hackney suggested as a friendly amendment adding to the third paragraph following the phrase "The peer evaluation component" a phrase like *or as agreed upon by the unit faculty*.

Prof. Board said there are key things that the Handbook Committee thought should be included in the process. It has to be more than one person's judgement, so really, a committee. And it has to have a peer evaluation and an evaluation by the unit head. She added she would hate to add something that would change that.

Prof. Powers-Lee called for a straw vote to retain the peer evaluation component.
Results of the straw vote to retain the peer evaluation component: 32-1-1.

The Office of the Faculty Senate will email to the senators this latest version of the Compensation Module.

Adjourned 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deniz Erdogmus, Secretary, Faculty Senate