



# Northeastern University Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE  
FROM: Secretary, Faculty Senate  
SUBJECT: Minutes, April 12, 2023

Present: Professors: Avalon, Caracoglia, Carr, Chiou, Cisewski, Di Credico, Godoy-Carter, Gonyeau, Hertz, Jaeggli, Krishnamoorthy, Landsmark, Lin, Marano, McSherry, Molnar, Moore, Musselman, Oet, Rappaport, Rawson, Rolland, Sivak, Smith, Spencer, Strange, Van Pelt, Willey

Administrators: Madigan, Hackney, Isaacs, Mynatt, Reid, Seshan, Wadia-Fascetti

Absent: (Professors) Folmar, Kitagawa, Nieves, Toledano Laredo, Vollmer

(Administrators)

**CALL TO ORDER:** 11:45 a.m.

## I. SAC REPORT:

*(The SAC report has been posted the Senate website.)*

Given the lengthy agenda, Prof. Gonyeau presented a brief SAC report.

- Prof. Gonyeau noted that since the last senate meeting SAC has met twice.
- SAC and the Provost Office have also met twice.
- Senate elections for AY 2023-2024 are complete.
- A number of search committees continue their work.

## II. PROVOST REPORT:

Provost Madigan noted that the CSSH Dean search is moving along with a candidate visiting campus today.

- NECHE just finished a visit to Mills College at Northeastern in Oakland. It appears it was a successful visit.
- Donathan Brown has been appointed Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity.
- On Friday, April 14 at 12p.m., there will be a tree planting event in the quad in front of Cabot to commemorate the tenth Anniversary of the Boston Marathon bombing.

## QUESTIONS:

There were no questions.

## III. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Professor David Smith presented the report of the Library & Information Collaboration Committee. Members include Daniel Cohen (CSSH, Vice Provost & Dean of the Library); David Smith,

chair (Khoury); Monica Borgida (CPS/SOL, Undergraduate Programs); Angela Chang (DMSB, Marketing Group); Kelly Conn (CPS, Graduate Programs); Ron Willey (COE, Chemical Engineering.

*(The committee's report and final presentation are posted to the Senate website.)*

Prof. Smith thanked all the members and acknowledged Dean Dan Cohen.

Dean Cohen gave an overview of the renovations in the Snell library. He noted they are adding a lot of light, adding acoustic dampening, and group study rooms. They are also adding new space dedicated to faculty research.

Renovations should be wrapping up in the next year; the university is currently in phase 2. Working on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor which will see expanding study space, collaboration space, quiet study space. They are also expanding seating throughout the building.

In the fall, they will start working on phase 3 which is the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. In 2024, will start on first and second floor.

Dean Cohen noted they added another physical library this year – the library at Mills at Northeastern in Oakland.

The library has a world class rare book collection and art book collection.

Dean Cohen said much of what they do in terms of collections is digital. He noted the Library Committee focused on the ability of faculty members to publish. He said one of the tasks they are working on are these new transformative agreements called “Read and Publish” where the library under a single agreement offers to both fund the access to e-journals across many fields but also to cover the article processing charges that a lot of faculty members pay to publish and make open access on some of their research materials. They have agreements in place with Springer and Wiley.

Prof. Smith concluded the presentation by briefly putting Dean Cohen's description of the library renovation in the context of the committee's charges and resulting resolutions.

He noted that charge 1a asked the committee to identify best practices for the Snell Library to connect with the global campus library services, especially Mills College at Northeastern.

Consulting with Dean Cohen and Janice Braun, head of the Mills Library at Northeastern, the committee recognized the unique value of Mills' special collections, from the early printed books before 1500 to artists' books of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to early work on digital music.

Prof. Smith noted that charge 1b called for the committee to identify best practices for the library to communicate the role of librarians in supporting new and existing faculty. He noted the library's efforts in negotiating Read/Publish agreements should be supported by other units in the university that are already spending money on publication charges.

Charge 2 called for the committee to identify opportunities for the University community to support and amplify messaging related to ongoing library renovations.

A new version of the library website, with portals for each campus in the global network, has also been rolled out successfully. Especially during renovation, study space is tight in Snell Library, the most-used Boston-campus building.

The largest problem in library space allocation is a shortage of study space, which is really a university-wide issue. While the renovation will increase overall seating to 3100 seats, more quiet and group study space will be needed.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Prof. Caracoglia said this is something for consideration in the future which is more faculty are required to publish open access even with journals that are on some platforms that originally might not be for open access. There are certain grants might that may require that. Will the library have some funding to assist with this?

Prof. Smith said that is precisely what our 2<sup>nd</sup> resolution is about. The library has done a great job negotiating 2<sup>nd</sup> resolution to encourage a coordinated view across individual colleges how to best support this important faculty activity.

- B. Prof. David Smith read the following:

**RESOLUTION #1:**

WHEREAS over the past year the Northeastern University Library has achieved integration at the operations level with the Mills College Library;

WHEREAS the Mills Library's special collections are a unique resource with value to the entire Northeastern community; and

WHEREAS Northeastern University has staff with world-class experience in library digitization;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Library should allocate resources and staff to digitizing important parts of Mills' special collections to make them available for teaching and research.

Prof. Gonyeau noted that a second was not required as the resolution came from a committee.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 25-1-0.

- C. Prof. David Smith read the following:

**RESOLUTION #2:**

WHEREAS publishing research articles by faculty, staff, and students is a fundamental

part of Northeastern's mission;

and WHEREAS individual faculty and their deans have often paid for publishers' publication charges out of their individual research funds;

BE IT RESOLVED that the University provost, deans, and librarian adopt a holistic approach to allocating funds for library subscription and publication costs and enter into flat-fee agreements whenever possible.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 26-0-0.

- D. Prof. David Smith read the following:

**RESOLUTION #3:**

WHEREAS Snell Library, as the hub of 24-hour student studying, is at capacity especially during its renovation;

and WHEREAS the availability of study spaces in other locations is distributed among different entities within the University;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Library, Registrar, and representatives from individual colleges coordinate on providing students with tools to find study space.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 26-0-0.

- E. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – COMBINED PROGRAM IN D'AMORE-MCKIM SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND SCHOOL OF LAW.

Prof. Valentina Marano read the following:

**RESOLUTION #4:**

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Bachelor of Science in [Business Administration and Law](#) in the D'Amore-McKim School of Business and the School of Law as approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on 5 April 2023 (15-0-0).

Prof. Marano said they were very excited about this program. She said one of the key people for this proposal, Todd Alessandri, the D'Amore McKim Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs was not able to attend. She acknowledged other colleagues that helped with the creation of this program -- Ben Hescott, Sr. Associate Dean at Khoury College of Computer Sciences, Kara Swanson, Assoc. Dean for Research and Interdisciplinary Education at the SOL, Chris Gallagher, Special Advisor to Exec. Vice Provost, Curriculum & Programs, and working with Provost Office in

combined programs. This program is targeted toward business students who are interested in pursuing a career where business and law overlap. Examples include areas in finance related to securities and mergers and acquisitions and areas in Marketing related to digital privacy.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 28-0-0.

- F. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – COMBINED PROGRAM IN KHOURY COLLEGE OF COMPUTER SCIENCES AND SCHOOL OF LAW.

Prof. Laney Strange read the following:

**RESOLUTION #5:**

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Bachelor of Science in [Computing and Law](#) in the Khoury College of Computer Sciences and School of Law as approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on 5 April 2023 (15-0-0).

Prof. Strange said this is not a combined major; it is its own own program. It is for computing students who are interested how computing intersects with law. They may go on to law school to consider where law and technology overlap -- intellectual property patent law. It is for undergrads who are thinking about that career path.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 28-0-0.

- G. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE– PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS MEDIA AND DESIGN.

Prof. Mark Sivak read the following:

**RESOLUTION #6:**

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in [Extended Realities](#) in the College of Arts Media and Design as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 5 April 2023, (16-0-0).

Prof. Sivak said that this program comes with an interesting university-wide course code -- EXRE. That is interdisciplinary and would be open to any of the colleges to add courses to it which is really awesome.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Prof. Godoy-Carter asked what does Extended Realities mean?

Prof. Sivak said it is the umbrella term for the technologies that include virtual, augmented and mixed reality. It includes everything from projection mapping and related rehabilitation

technologies that have been around since the '80's as well as virtual reality that has been around that long to forging new technologies augmented reality that we see on our films today.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 26-0-1.

H. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF SCIENCE.

Prof. Cisewski read the following:

**RESOLUTION #7:**

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Doctor of Philosophy in [Human Behavior and Sustainability Sciences](#) in the College of Science as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 22 March 2023, (11-0-0).

Prof. Cisewski said we all know that climate change is happening and we need to do something about it but the problem is changing people's behaviors and that's where the psychology piece comes into it. This proposed curriculum interfaces degree requirements from existing College of Science PhD programs in Psychology and Marine Environmental Sciences.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Prof. Lin said it was great to hear about this program and if they want input from College of Engineering, let her know.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 25-0-0.

I. REPORT OF THE ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS POLICY COMMITTEE.  
(*The EAPC presentation and final report has been posted to the Senate website.*)

Prof. Van Amburgh, committee co-chair, reported on the charges of the Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee (EAPC) out of order and started with charge 3.

**Charge 3:** Identify current university infrastructure related to the admissions / marketing of programs (majors, minors, concentrations, graduate certificates, etc.) and assess any impact on student enrollments across the university system.

**Committee recommendation:** With the recent changes within the admissions & enrollment management platform, the EAPC recommends this charge be assigned for the AY 2023-24 so that specific collected data can be analyzed and evaluated.

**Charge 1:** As combined UG majors are a goal of the university and concerns have been raised regarding adequacy of advising for students in combined majors, the committee shall:

- Solicit feedback from faculty, staff and students related to combined major advising
- Evaluate attrition numbers of academic advisors in each college
- Provide recommendations related to infrastructure with respect to advisor: student ratios and methods/processes for student advising

Committee recommendation: Based on the substantial evidence from faculty, academic and co-op advisors, and this year, directly from students about the challenges with combined majors. The student survey results are consistent and it is evident that the concerns in previous years shared around academic advising are real.

EAPC recommends that the 2021-22 EAPC resolution regarding advising and accompanying recommendations be implemented and acted upon. (*NOTE: this resolution passed at the 4\_6\_22 senate meeting, 27-0-0. It was not approved by the Provost Office.*)

#### Charge 1: 2020/22 Resolution Reiterated

##### **2021-22 EAPC Resolution:**

Based on interviews conducted this academic year, EAPC found that there remains inconsistent access to academic advising across colleges.

**WHEREAS combined majors across colleges represent a large and increasing percentage of the undergraduate student population and students pursuing combined majors should not face unnecessary impediments due to college boundaries.**

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate recommend that the Office of the Provost works with Administrative Advisory Group and Associate Deans across colleges to implement a policy where a student is assigned two academic advisors, one for each side of a combined-major (perhaps a primary and secondary advisor to maintain developmental relationships), so that students have direct access to timely information and advisors for both areas of their degree and consider the required effort when allocating resources.**

#### Charge 1: 2020/21 Recommendation Reiterated

**2021-22 EAPC Recommendation:** EAPC recommends that the Office of the Provost work with Academic and Co-op Advisory Groups and Associate Deans across Colleges to create structures and practices that are consistent and student-centered in support of combined majors (especially for those whose combined majors across colleges).

**Charge 2:** Given concerns raised regarding the university's undergraduate student admissions process related to enrollment disparities across colleges and potential program closures, the committee shall explore the impact on over- and under-enrolled programs with respect to:

- Number and type of programs with enrollment changes over the past 5 years
- Resource re-allocation to programs based on enrollment changes
- Number and type of programs closed

Provide recommendations on best practice policies for university admissions.

**Committee recommendations:** The EAPC was not provided any program or college-level admissions data as requested from the Chancellor's office. Therefore, the EAPC was unable to address the following aspects of charge #2:

- Number and type of programs with enrollment changes over the past 5 years
- Resource re-allocation to programs based on enrollment changes
- Number and type of programs closed
- EAPC recommends that the SAC, in collaboration with the EAPC members, works with NU administration to receive the data for review. We recommend that the administration share the needed data with the EAPC in order to fulfil its charge, thereby fostering a

greater sense of transparency between the administration and faculty/staff.

**Charge 2 Addition: Faculty/Staff Dependent Benefits**

*Qualitative analysis of SAC Fall 2022 survey responses*

*Questions:*

1. Are there any concerns or feedback you'd like to share regarding this benefit for dependent child(ren)?
2. Are there any other tuition remission benefits programs you would like Northeastern University to explore? (e.g., tuition exchange, college consortium, payment at other colleges, etc.)?

*Themes:*

1. Respondents expressed: That this dependent tuition benefit was one of the main reasons why they chose to work at the University. Concerns about their dependents being admitted to the University due to the decreasing acceptance rate.
2. Respondents encouraged the University administration to explore other tuition benefit options such as tuition exchange programs, college consortium programs, or reimbursement opportunities for other colleges/universities.
3. Respondents questioned why Northeastern does not cover the full tuition or equivalent for 1 semester of tuition cost for N.U.in or other possible pathways that dependents may be admitted into.

**Charge 2 Addition: Faculty/Staff Dependent Benefits**

The number of faculty/staff dependent applicants has remained steady over the past three years; however, there is a steady decline of the fall admit rate with a corresponding increase in contract admits.

- Explored 16 competitor institutions' dependent tuition benefits
- MAJOR DIFFERENCE: 8/16 (50%) of the competitor institutions offer dependent benefits to faculty/staff for other colleges / universities.
- For some it is equivalent to the 'home' institution (100%) while others offer a percent of tuition reimbursement or specific dollar amount per term or per year.

**Committee recommendations:** EAPC recommends that a Benefits Human Resources Task Force be formed to explore the financial implications for faculty/staff dependent of the University for the following:

1. Increase the tuition remission for N.U.in from 1/3 be tuition equivalent.
2. Explore options for faculty/staff dependents to participate in NUBound and Global Scholar with tuition equivalent.
3. Provide coverage for faculty/staff dependents to participate in Dialogue. This recommendation is consistent with the University's aspiration to be a global university.
4. Explore tuition reimbursement for other University's / College's for dependents that may not find the University to be the right fit or that their preferred degree is not offered by the University.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

- J. REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.  
(The FAC presentation and final report has been posted to the Senate website.)



Prof. Copeland thanked her fellow committee members and reviewed the committee's charges.

Charge 1:

- *Merit compensation recommendation*
  - Presented in January

Charge 2:

- *Equity process*
  - Met with FTNTT fall 2022
  - Survey questions developed with the committee
  - Summary of survey findings in the FTNTT report

Charge 3:

- *Retirement plan--fiduciary obligations and fund selection process*
  - Survey
  - Over 400 respondents and 119 specific comments
  - Detailed results in report

Prof. Copeland turned the presentation over to Prof. Shridhar to discuss charge 3 and review aspects of the resolution.

Faculty can see the detailed comments in the report. A number of these comments were worked into the resolution.

The committee was fortunate to discover Prof. Nicole Boyson chair of finance group in DMSB. She is a unique authority on 403b plans. She has done an unprecedented analysis much of which has been worked into the resolution.

At a high level, the resolution has 9 items in it. The first 4 involve cost saving. The next two have to do with membership and fiduciary responsibility. Then the committee has additional recommendations.

The analysis the committee completed was actually broader and more thorough than the initial charge. In fact, it seems there has not been a comparable analysis since the plan was set up decades ago.

This is our money, your money. It is important to us to see us through our retirement.

The committee identified several areas of improvement. Not saying the plan is in trouble. These are recommendations to improve the plan.

#### **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

#### **K. RESOLUTION OF THE FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.**

Prof. Copeland read the following:

**RESOLUTION #8:**

WHEREAS the FAC conducted a thorough review of the Northeastern University retirement plan, WHEREAS the NEU retirement plan currently has assets exceeding \$2B and nearly 9,000 participants, with two recordkeepers, *viz.* Fidelity and TIAA-CREF, and WHEREAS FAC identified several potential areas of improvement related to the plan's fund menu, fees, and quality of reporting to plan participants,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost bring to attention of the appropriate office for evaluation several cost-saving actions including (1) negotiating a uniform dollar-per-participant record-keeping fee, (2) using lowest cost mutual fund share classes preferably those without embedded revenue sharing, (3) moving to a single record-keeper, and (4) prohibiting plan recordkeepers from soliciting or suggesting investment products outside the plan, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Provost bring to the attention of the appropriate office for evaluation the following actions, namely (5) the investment committee membership should be broadened to include participants with retirement plan expertise, and (6) that all members of the investment committee are ensured to have training in their fiduciary responsibilities, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Provost bring to the attention of the appropriate office for evaluation the following action, namely (7) a plan participant committee should be established to review the plan annually and suggest improvements to the retirement plan, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that (8) participant education should be provided independent of recordkeeper-provided advice, and (9) communication and website design should be improved to better convey information to plan participants.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 28-0-0.

- L. REPORT OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.  
(*The report and presentation have been posted to the Senate website.*)

Prof. Hertz of the committee turned over the presentation to Prof. Herlihy, committee chair.

Prof. Herlihy thanked his fellow committee members for their work.

**Charge 1.** Faculty Handbook Consistency.

- a. Compensation module: Merit review process  
Requested data from across the university and did not get everything they needed. The committee recommended ongoing evaluation for 2024.

b. IP/Copyright module and related policy

Did a lot of research about intellectual property. The committee did a fresh new dive into this and looked at it from across different categories.

Drafted Resolutions 1a and 1b [see Resolutions # 9 and 10 in Faculty Senate agenda] – David read wordage below.

c. Changes to reflect NU global presence

- Drafted Resolution 1c [#10]

d. Research NTTF to institutes

- Ongoing evaluation for '24

M. Prof. Herlihy read the following resolution from the Faculty Handbook Committee:

**RESOLUTION #9:**

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook module entitled “Patent and Copyright” includes both the University Patent Policy, adopted in 1995, and an Interim Copyright Policy, last revised in 1982; and

WHEREAS The University administration proposes to adopt new University policies on intellectual property; and

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook Committee recommends that patent and trade secret policies be treated separately from copyright policy. The Committee supports the provisions of the proposed University policies on intellectual property pertaining to patents, trade secrets, and copyright; and

WHEREAS The Committee concludes the Copyright ownership policy issue should not be overshadowed by the University’s patent and technology transfer policy; and

WHEREAS, Every faculty member produces Original Works of Authorship (“Works”), yet only a few faculty members ever produce patentable inventions or develop trade secrets; and

WHEREAS, a separate policy or an overall intellectual property policy with separate sections is preferable so that copyright policy is not lost in the midst of the complications of the patent and/or trade secret policy; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon adoption by the University administration of the new University Policies on Patent and Trade Secrets, consistent with this Resolution, the Faculty Senate shall take steps to remove from the Faculty Handbook the module entitled “Patent and Copyright.”

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Prof. Herlihy said the large take away is that we are separating the trade secret and patent policies for copyright. The copyright for creative works which is the bulk of what faculty create. Faculty will be deemed the authors of that work.

Prof. Rolland said it is interesting. Where did you intend to situate online course development or has this not been discussed yet?

And it also presents slightly differently in that there are some online courses where it is mostly the faculty's work and others with the involvement of an instructional designer. There is a whole range of processes for developing online courses.

Prof. Herlihy said the committee did consider that. The previous university policy talked about works made for hire. The administration would be the authors. This seemed incompatible with academic freedom. This new policy enables faculty to be recognized as authors of both their traditional academic works and their pedagogical works. The starting point is that faculty would own both those works.

Prof. Hertz said directly to the point of online courses there is no distinction made in the new copyright policy between an online course vs. on-ground course. It is simply any material made by a faculty member for the purposes of instruction that is owned by the faculty member. They are the author. They provide a license to the university to use the works but the faculty member is deemed the author.

Staff is different. If you are talking about instructional specialists, then it is more of a work made for hire.

The other point I want to make is that this came from the idea that right now in the Faculty Handbook there is a lot dealing with university policy writ large about patents and trade secrets and instructional media and so one of the initial driving forces for this change embodied in these two resolutions is to have a broader university policy that applies to both faculty and staff and even grad students. And strengthen the special role faculty have with regards to copyrighted creations in both pedagogical and traditional academic outputs.

Prof. Rolland said what I understood from the resolution is that the university policy is in the process of being developed. Is that correct?

Prof. Herlihy said no. It had been developed over time and we were charged with reviewing that because one of the things the administration wanted to do was remove this from the Faculty Handbook and part of that was to update the policy. We were looking at updating the policy and also assisting with the decision of where that policy should reside – in the Faculty Handbook or in university governance documents in a larger sense.

Prof. Rolland asked what is the value of the resolution there in terms of university obligation to abide by it? If it is in the Faculty Handbook, maybe we have more control over revising it. But if it is a university policy, then the university administration is driving the ship and our

resolutions are hopefully helpful in informing that debate and outcome but that is about as far as it goes. Or is there an actual binding input from the faculty senate?

Prof. Herlihy said they wanted to make any changes of the policy subject to a Faculty Senate vote or there would be no enforcement of it but Deb Franko said there is a policy committee on policies.

And so if there was going to be any change in the policy that would affect the faculty, there would be a required opportunity of faculty to be involved in that and would have to have all relevant constituencies involved in that conversation.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 25-0-2.

N. Prof. Hertz read the following resolution of the Faculty Handbook Committee:

**RESOLUTION #10:**

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook module entitled “Patent and Copyright” includes both the University Patent Policy, adopted in 1995, and an Interim Copyright Policy, last revised in 1982; and

WHEREAS The University administration proposes to adopt new University policies on intellectual property; and

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook Committee recommends that patent and trade secret policies be treated separately from copyright policy. The Committee supports the provisions of the proposed University policies on intellectual property pertaining to patents, trade secrets, and copyright; and

WHEREAS The Committee concludes the Copyright ownership policy issue should not be overshadowed by the University’s patent and technology transfer policy; and

WHEREAS, Every faculty member produces Original Works of Authorship (“Works”), yet only a few faculty members ever produce patentable inventions or develop trade secrets; and

WHEREAS, a separate policy or an overall intellectual property policy with separate sections is preferable so that copyright policy is not lost in the midst of the complications of the Patent and/or Trade Secret Policy; and

WHEREAS, Instructional Media was not defined in the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, The Committee recommends the Faculty Handbook be amended to include definitions of Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works; and

WHEREAS The Committee recommends that faculty shall be deemed Authors of all Works created by them, including Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works such that ownership of all rights in and to such Works shall reside solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

WHEREAS The Committee acknowledges certain Works created or developed by a faculty may be considered works made for hire for the university, namely Works created in the course of or pursuant to a grant or agreement for sponsored research between the university and a third party, or pursuant to any written agreement between a faculty member and the university expressly for the production of such Work; and

WHEREAS, The Committee acknowledges certain works created by faculty may be considered works made for hire for the university, namely administrative documents relating to the university's decision-making processes, measures dealing with organizational, administrative or budgetary matters, or other business records which are proprietary to the university.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that faculty shall be deemed Authors of all Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works created by them, such that ownership of all rights in and to such Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works shall reside solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon adoption by the University administration of the University Policy on Copyright, consistent with this Resolution, the Faculty Senate shall take steps to remove from the Faculty Handbook the module entitled "Instructional Media."

#### **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION ON RESOLUTION #10:**

Prof. Hertz said this resolution is about removing the instructional media module out of the Faculty Handbook.

Prof. Spencer asked Prof. Herlihy if faculty are afforded more protection if this resolution stays in the Faculty Handbook? She said she understands that there is a committee to review the policy but she doesn't know what authority faculty have with that committee.

Prof. Herlihy said he understands that concern. Keeping it in the Faculty Handbook keeps it squarely within our province.

Prof. Spencer asked if there is any objection to keeping this language in the Handbook? She said it was her understanding that the main concern was the works that are being federally funded and they wanted that to come out of the Handbook. And so should we make the resolution that this language should go into the Handbook instead of a policy?

Prof. Herlihy said you can make the argument that this applies to all faculty and that all faculty create copyrightable subject matter so this is separate from patented trade secrets policies that are more about funded research and commercialization.

He said he agrees with the changes in definitions that we are deemed authors of traditional academic and pedagogical works and there was language offered by Andy Curtin. That might need to be revisited if we are not going to remove it from the Faculty Handbook.

Prof. Spencer are you saying the language that is here would need to be revisited?

Prof. Herlihy said no. There is language that we talk about externalizing this policy. We could keep this in place in the Faculty Handbook as well.

Prof. Spencer said that would make sense to her. We have met the administration's request to take out the separate funded research and we've met your goal of protecting the faculty. She asked the committee members if they had the same thoughts.

Prof. Hertz said he would defer to Prof. Herlihy's expertise here but his belief is the current language in the Instructional Media module in the Faculty Handbook, we have control as the Faculty Senate over that language. That gives us control over the current and future definitions and ownership of instructional media. Whereas if we adopt this resolution we lose the control over that language to what would become a university copyright policy. However, the language currently in the Faculty Handbook Instructional Media module provides us less ownership than the draft copyright policy that has been proposed. We would be losing control but at least given the draft language of the new copyright policy we would be gaining greater ownership over our created works as faculty members.

Prof. Spencer asked if the two goals could be combined and make the change but make it within the Faculty Handbook so we get the improvement and we get the added protection?

Prof. Gonyeau said to move this forward, if Prof. Spencer was proposing a change to the resolution, he needed Prof. Spencer to say how the resolution should read so the Senate can decide which resolution they would want.

Prof. Rolland said her question goes in the same direction. Looking at the Instructional Media language as it currently stands some provisions don't seem to be in conflict at all with the question of authorship. For example, the first paragraph pertains to academic freedom than any copyright issue.

Prof. Rolland wondered if some parts of Instructional Media policy could be preserved or they overlap with academic freedom enough that it is keeping the academic freedom provision sufficient. I don't think it is all or nothing.

Prof. Herlihy said the problem is that Instructional Media isn't defined anywhere. The Instructional Media Policy is not as strong in terms of clearly defining that faculty are the authors of those works. I feel the policy we are talking about changing and the language that was put together could be inserted into the Faculty Handbook and would be better than the Instructional Media Policy.

Prof. Rolland said on procedure – it would have to be a separate resolution. And we vote on each separately.

Prof. Spencer proposed an amended resolution striking the existing last paragraph from the resolution and replacing it with the paragraph noted below. Prof. Carr seconded this.

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon adoption by the University administration of the University Policy on Copyright, consistent with this Resolution, the Faculty Senate shall take steps to replace from the Faculty Handbook the module entitled “Instructional Media.” With a policy addressing pedagogical works in this presentation.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon adoption by the University administration of the University Policy on Copyright, consistent with this Resolution, the Faculty Senate shall take steps to replace the Faculty Handbook the module entitled “Instructional Media” with a policy addressing pedagogical works consistent with the Faculty Senate Handbook Committee report.

Prof. Gonyeau said we will now need to vote on each resolution.

Prof. Gonyeau called for a vote on the Handbook Committee’s original #10 resolution.

**RESOLUTION #10:**

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook module entitled “Patent and Copyright” includes both the University Patent Policy, adopted in 1995, and an Interim Copyright Policy, last revised in 1982; and

WHEREAS The University administration proposes to adopt new University policies on intellectual property; and

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook Committee recommends that patent and trade secret policies be treated separately from copyright policy. The Committee supports the provisions of the proposed University policies on intellectual property pertaining to patents, trade secrets, and copyright; and

WHEREAS The Committee concludes the Copyright ownership policy issue should not be overshadowed by the University’s patent and technology transfer policy; and

WHEREAS, Every faculty member produces Original Works of Authorship (“Works”), yet only a few faculty members ever produce patentable inventions or develop trade secrets; and

WHEREAS, a separate policy or an overall intellectual property policy with separate sections is preferable so that copyright policy is not lost in the midst of the complications of the Patent and/or Trade Secret Policy; and

WHEREAS, Instructional Media was not defined in the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, The Committee recommends the Faculty Handbook be amended to include definitions of Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works; and

WHEREAS The Committee recommends that faculty shall be deemed Authors of all Works created by them, including Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical



Works such that ownership of all rights in and to such Works shall reside solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

WHEREAS The Committee acknowledges certain Works created or developed by a faculty may be considered works made for hire for the university, namely Works created in the course of or pursuant to a grant or agreement for sponsored research between the university and a third party, or pursuant to any written agreement between a faculty member and the university expressly for the production of such Work; and

WHEREAS, The Committee acknowledges certain works created by faculty may be considered works made for hire for the university, namely administrative documents relating to the university's decision-making processes, measures dealing with organizational, administrative or budgetary matters, or other business records which are proprietary to the university.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that faculty shall be deemed Authors of all Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works created by them, such that ownership of all rights in and to such Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works shall reside solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon adoption by the University administration of the University Policy on Copyright, consistent with this Resolution, the Faculty Senate shall take steps to remove from the Faculty Handbook the module entitled "Instructional Media."

The vote on the original resolution #10 FAILED: 3-20-1.

Prof. Gonyeau called for a vote on the amended Floor Resolution #10.

**FLOOR RESOLUTION #10:**

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook module entitled "Patent and Copyright" includes both the University Patent Policy, adopted in 1995, and an Interim Copyright Policy, last revised in 1982; and

WHEREAS The University administration proposes to adopt new University policies on intellectual property; and

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook Committee recommends that patent and trade secret policies be treated separately from copyright policy. The Committee supports the provisions of the proposed University policies on intellectual property pertaining to patents, trade secrets, and copyright; and

WHEREAS The Committee concludes the Copyright ownership policy issue should not be overshadowed by the University's patent and technology transfer policy; and

WHEREAS, Every faculty member produces Original Works of Authorship (“Works”), yet only a few faculty members ever produce patentable inventions or develop trade secrets; and

WHEREAS, a separate policy or an overall intellectual property policy with separate sections is preferable so that copyright policy is not lost in the midst of the complications of the Patent and/or Trade Secret Policy; and

WHEREAS, Instructional Media was not defined in the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, The Committee recommends the Faculty Handbook be amended to include definitions of Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works; and

WHEREAS The Committee recommends that faculty shall be deemed Authors of all Works created by them, including Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works such that ownership of all rights in and to such Works shall reside solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

WHEREAS The Committee acknowledges certain Works created or developed by a faculty may be considered works made for hire for the university, namely Works created in the course of or pursuant to a grant or agreement for sponsored research between the university and a third party, or pursuant to any written agreement between a faculty member and the university expressly for the production of such Work; and

WHEREAS, The Committee acknowledges certain works created by faculty may be considered works made for hire for the university, namely administrative documents relating to the university’s decision-making processes, measures dealing with organizational, administrative or budgetary matters, or other business records which are proprietary to the university.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that faculty shall be deemed Authors of all Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works created by them, such that ownership of all rights in and to such Traditional Academic Works and Pedagogical Works shall reside solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon adoption by the University administration of the University Policy on Copyright, consistent with this Resolution, the Faculty Senate shall take steps to replace the Faculty Handbook the module entitled “Instructional Media” with a policy addressing pedagogical works consistent with the Faculty Senate Handbook Committee report.**

The vote on the amended resolution #10 PASSED: 21-1-2.

O. Prof. Joshua Herlihy read the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #11:**

WHEREAS Mills College has been added as the tenth college of the university

BE IT RESOLVED that Section 2 of the College Faculties module in the Northeastern University Faculty Handbook be amended to add “j. Mills College”.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED 21-0-2.

P. RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.

Prof. Hertz noted that this resolution was about lengthening contracts for our initial faculty appointments. There was back and forth with the administration and the language all agreed with is in resolution 12. It allows for colleges to make appointments of teaching faculty at the assistant level to be at least 1 year and up to 2 years.

Prof. Hertz read the following:

**RESOLUTION #12:**

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook module entitled Appointments, Terms and Reappointments, Section B, currently states that the term of appointment for “First level/rank (e.g., Assistant Teaching Professor) is one year”, and

WHEREAS in a competitive hiring market, units of the University report that it would be advantageous to be able to offer initial appointments of a greater duration,  
THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Appointments, Terms and Reappointments module in the Northeastern University Faculty Handbook, Section B be amended to read “First level/rank (e.g., Assistant Teaching Professor) is at least one year and no more than two years”.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

Prof. Strange said she thought this was a great resolution and she was in favor of longer contracts. She asked if there was any discussion about doing something similar at other levels?

And at a previous senate meeting, someone was showing all the different titles for teaching faculty and there were like 15 of them. Do we know what the entry level / first level appointment is among all those titles?

Prof. Herlihy said no. There is incredible variability for the appointment of NT research faculty.

Prof. Yildirim said they didn’t have a solution for the variety of titles that they had but that doesn’t mean they can’t have a solution. This could be a task for next year’s committee.

Prof. Gonyeau said every appointment type has a progression

Prof. Rolland said she was receiving emails from colleagues asking is this in regards to initial appointments and renewals?

Prof. Jaeggli suggested there could be longer contract times as you move up the ladder. He suggested that might be pushed to next year.

Prof. Rolland proposed a Floor Resolution for #12.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Appointments, Terms and Reappointments module in the Northeastern University Faculty Handbook, Section B be amended to read:

“The initial terms are as follows:

- a. First level/rank (e.g., Assistant Teaching Professor) is at least one year and no more than two years;
- b. Second level/rank (e.g., Associate Clinical Professor) is three years; and
- c. Third level/rank (e.g., [Full] Teaching Professor) is five years.  
Renewal terms subsequent to the initial terms are as follows:
- d. First level/rank (e.g., Assistant Teaching Professor) is one year;
- e. Second level/rank (e.g., Associate Clinical Professor) is three years; and
- f. Third level/rank (e.g., [Full] Teaching Professor) is five years.”

Provost Madigan noted there are market forces at play, we need to be more competitive. Prof. Rolland said there is no need for the floor resolution.

Decided not to go with it, no vote on floor resolution. Voted on original Resolution #12 as is.

The vote on the original #12 resolution PASSED 22-0-1.

#### Q. RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.

Prof. Hertz read the following:

##### **RESOLUTION #13:**

WHEREAS a number of individual faculty members exercise considerable control over the direction and implementation of university governance when they hold an appointment to a college or university administrative role; and

WHEREAS the special role of faculty members with an administrative appointment is recognized several times in the Faculty Senate Bylaws; and

WHEREAS the composition of the Senate is full-time faculty members with six seats set aside to be composed of “administrators who are full-time members of the faculty appointed by the President or their designee”; and

WHEREAS the current bylaws allow that “Each full-time faculty member is eligible to vote and to serve as Senator,” regardless of their concurrent appointment to a college or university administrative role, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED: The Faculty Handbook module entitled Procedural Guidelines in the Appointment and Evaluation of University Administrators shall be amended to include the following as the first sentence in Part A, Item 1:

Administrative Faculty shall mean any faculty member, at the university, college or unit level with authority over matters such as academic affairs, workload, job description, duties, and/or compensation of faculty members, including but not limited to faculty with titles such as Provost, Assistant / Associate Provost, Dean, Assistant / Associate Dean, Director and/or Executive Director.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED The Faculty Senate Bylaw 3.c.1.a. be amended to read: Each full-time faculty member, excluding Administrative Faculty, is eligible to vote, and to be elected as a Senator.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Prof. Gonyeau asked was an analysis done on how this would impact eligible members to serve on the senate? Prof. Hertz said no.

Prof. Hertz said part of this is changing the Senate Bylaws. And this would require an additional vote in September. Task this charge to next year's Handbook Committee.

Prof. Rolland said that the way the resolution is worded makes less people eligible depending on their role.

Prof. Hertz said the focus was on faculty who had control over workload, compensation.

Prof. Alexis said he thought it makes sense as is from a management perspective.

Prof. Musselman said that as a director of Advanced Writing she helps write job descriptions. There are many different levels to consider. What does authority mean?

Prof. Copeland agreed with that question. What does authority mean? How do you police this?

Prof. Godoy Carter said she doesn't like the vagueness of the language. Too much room for interpretation.

The vote on the resolution FAILED 9-12-3.

**R. RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.**

**RESOLUTION #14:**

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook is a living document which provides essential policy pertinent to university governance and faculty rights; and  
WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook includes modules governing appointments, promotions, and tenure, rights in teaching, research and scholarship, personnel

policies, and academic organization which impacts all members of the university community; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook requires regular review of governance, appointments, promotions, and tenure, rights in teaching, research and scholarship, personnel policies, and academic organization therein; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook should be reviewed on an annual basis by a standing committee of faculty members representative of units across the university, appointed on a rotating basis, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate establishes a Faculty Handbook Committee as a standing committee inclusive of no less than 5 members representative of the degree-granting schools and colleges across the university, appointed by the Senate Agenda Committee to serve 2-year terms, where a minimum of no less than half of the members remain each year to fully support the transition of new members; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Handbook Committee will review the faculty handbook on an annual basis, identify and research areas of concern for future action, and identify and propose changes inclusive of recommendations for new resolutions.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED 21-1-1.

**S. RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.**

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

**RESOLUTION #15:**

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate is the highest faculty governance body in the University; and

WHEREAS, Resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate address significant matters of University concern and embody the Faculty Senate's contribution to the governance of the University; and

WHEREAS, ensuring the efficacy and implementation of Resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate is a matter of utmost importance in the realization of the University's mission;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, The Provost shall submit a written Faculty Senate Resolution Status Report to the Faculty Senate, each academic year no later than the first Faculty Senate meeting in January, addressing each Resolution passed by the Senate in the previous academic year, including the

status of the implementation of each such Resolution, and in the event of an incomplete implementation or a lack of approval thereof, an explanation and justification in connection therewith.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED 23-0-2.

T. REPORT OF THE GLOBAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

*(The complete report of the Global Education Committee can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)*

Prof. Yakov Bart reviewed the details of the committee's report.

U. RESOLUTION OF THE GLOBAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

Prof. Yakov Bart read the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION 16.**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Global Education Committee becomes a standing Faculty Senate committee and the composition of that group includes representation from all colleges and units.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED 22-0-3.

**Recommendation:** The Global Educator Award was recommended to be a university-recognized award that would be derived from college-level recommendations. Based on communications with GEO, the committee learned that nominations had been received from 56% of the college deans and the GEO leadership had plans to review the candidates for a finalist to be selected in early March. This news is a positive step in recognizing faculty contributions to university global experiences. However, improvements to the process should be considered as this initiative moves into its second year. We recommend Colleges, in consultation with Global Education Committee and GEO should establish a transparent process for evaluating and approving DOCs including a community of globally engaged faculty who will assist with the review process and make recommendations to associate deans.

V. RESOLUTION OF THE GLOBAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

Prof. Bart read the following:

**RESOLUTION 17.**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Global Education Committee in consultation with GEO engage in a review of DOC faculty recognition nominees in each college to assist in

the selection of the university finalist candidate. In instances when a Committee member is nominated, that individual will recuse themselves from the review process.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

The vote on the resolution PASSED 26-0-2.

**W. REPORT OF THE INCLUSION AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE.**

*(The complete report of the Inclusion and Diversity Committee can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)*

Prof. Smyser reviewed the details of the committee's report.

**CHARGE 1: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:  
HONORIFIC VS. TIER 1 AWARDS**

**FINDINGS:**

- No gender disparities for honorifics, but some for Tier 1 – fewer female.
- Hispanic/Latinx faculty report fewer honorific awards
- Self-reporting of awards may skew results

**CHARGE 1: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recipient reports to department/unit, put in annual review, dept./unit reports to college, college to provost, provost and UDS evaluate identities, expand types

- Evaluate internal and external awards for DEI
- Announce awards in multiple ways
- Make it clear who is eligible/ Have clear criteria
- Revise award criteria for DEIJ impact
- Diversify nomination pool and selection committees

**CHARGE 2: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**FINDINGS:** No current mechanism or process to make sure DEI is addressed when policies are created or updated.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**NEW PREFACE TO POLICIES WEBSITE:**

Each of the following sections focuses on a critical aspect of Northeastern University's policies and governance procedures. It is important that each section complies with and supports Northeastern University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). As policies are updated and new policies are created, the writers/reviewers are expected to use best practices to embrace inclusive and supportive language and understand the implications of such policies on all populations.

**CHARGE 2: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**



**RECOMMENDATION: NEW GUIDE TO ASSESS POLICIES**Policy CreationExisting PoliciesNeutral language and accessibilityConsiderations of DEIConsiderations of culture and geographical location**Example:**

- Is there a cultural component to this policy that should be considered?
- Is the inclusion of a land acknowledgment appropriate?
- Is there recognition of geographical and religious differences (i.e., holidays in different countries).

Dissemination and ReviewAssessment of policies' effectiveness relative to meeting DEI requirementsAccountability**CHARGE 3: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS****FINDINGS: DIVERSITY DASHBOARD**

- Data hidden from view
- Lack of transparency
- Lack of trust = low reporting of ID data
- Office of University Decision Support not very visible

**RECOMMENDATIONS: DIVERSITY DASHBOARD**

- Emphasize link between identity data and university goals
- Create Data Guide to assist navigation
- Have Office of University Decision Support meet with Faculty Senate and during onboarding for new employees

**FINDINGS: DEI INITIATIVES**

- Initiatives not coordinated across university
- Information about initiatives at all levels not shared
- Action plans not published/reported consistently
- *Calypso* newsletter poorly subscribed

**RECOMMENDATIONS: DEI INITIATIVES**

- Make ODEI central hub for all DEI information
- Use ODEI website to publish and track unit initiatives
- Showcase Communities of Practice
- Send *Calypso* newsletter to all stakeholders by default

**CHARGE 4: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CHARGES:**

1. Address bias in student course evaluations
2. Improve communication of award opportunities
3. Investigate pay equity among faculty and staff
4. Investigate impact(s) of IDC's recommendations from past two years
5. Use data from *One Northeastern* survey to measure impact of Diversity Action Plan

**MAIN TAKEAWAYS FROM IDC 2022-23 REPORT:****MORE RACE THAN GENDER DISPARITIES FOR AWARDS BUT...**

- Need units and individuals to report awards
- Need to publicize awards and have diverse decision committees

**GUIDELINES CREATED FOR UPDATING & CREATING POLICIES WITH DEI IN MIND DEI DATA AND INITIATIVES NEED...**

- More transparency about how data is used
- Guides to using the data
- Central hub for recording/tracking initiatives

**FUTURE WORK SHOULD FOCUS ON...**

- Bias in course evaluations
- Comprehensive database of awards
- Investigate pay equity
- Assessing impact of IDC
- Assessing impact of Diversity Action Plan

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

## X. REPORT OF THE CLIMATE JUSTICE ACTION PLANNING COMMITTEE (PROF. RACHEL RODGERS)

*(The complete report of the Climate Justice Action Planning Committee can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)*

**SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The 2022-2023 committee acknowledges the legacy of the previous committee and reaffirms the priorities outlined by that group.

The committee calls for more urgent and visible action and advancement toward the identified goals.

The committee highlights the increased urgency, responsibility, and potential for Northeastern University to become a global leader in Climate Justice Action, given its Global Campus.

**OPPORTUNITIES: METRICS AND IMPACT TRACKING**

1. Recommend a developing a comprehensive set of metrics and indicators to measure the impact and track progress concerning the strategic plan.
2. These metrics should be aligned with established frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the AASHE STARS rating system.
3. Develop an interactive dashboard similar to those used by other institutions, like Brandeis University's Sustainability Dashboard (<https://www.brandeis.edu/sustainability/data/index.html>).
4. This dashboard should be accessible to the NEU community and regularly updated with relevant data and progress reports.

**DASHBOARD METRICS**

- a. Research and Teaching
- b. Campus Operations and Facilities
- c. Community Engagement and Partnerships

#### d. Planning and Administration

##### **OPPORTUNITIES: VISIBLE AND COORDINATED GROUP OF KEY PLAYERS AND STAKEHOLDERS**

1. Update on the proposed actions listed in the Climate Justice Action plan ( Convene Steering Committee; Host racial equity training; host community conversations)
2. Transparency Climate Hub's community partners and the nature and scope of their engagement.
3. Integration of experiential climate justice learning opportunities into coursework at all levels and disciplines, across the global network.
4. Establishment of a CAB in consultation with the Office of City and Community Engagement and faculty with reservation of one seat for a community member.

##### **OPPORTUNITIES: INTEGRATION WITH DEI**

1. Social justice is central to Climate Justice Action
2. 2023-2024 Committee to pursue engagement with unit-level DEI heads and seeks conversations with the Inclusion and Diversity Committee to ensure alignment and accountability for climate equity.

##### **CONCLUSION**

1. NEU has the potential and the expertise to be a global leader in integrated climate Justice Action across its activities in the Global Network
2. Urgent efforts are needed to accelerate this leadership

##### **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

There were no questions.

#### Y. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.

*(The complete report of the Academic Policy Committee can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)*

Prof. Jaeggli acknowledged co-chair Darin Detwiler to give the report.

#### **CHARGE 1 - APPROACHES TO LEARNING**

In collaboration with the Provost and Chancellor's offices, survey faculty about on-ground in-person, remote online, and hybrid approaches to learning, as well synchronicity of courses. Provide recommendations based on survey data.

Specific areas to obtain feedback (in addition to others identified by the committee):

- Faculty perceptions of quality of their teaching and student learning
- Logistical considerations of teaching technology and any impact on faculty teaching time and/or quality
- Any changes to teaching and assessment strategies and student performance faculty need to make based on type of course (i.e. in person, online, hybrid, etc.)

#### **CHARGE 1 RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS AY 2021 – 2022 instruction modes could be divided into three domains with mixed perception of the quality of the student learning during AY 2021-2022. University and College onboarding/training/other professional development on classroom and online technology support for online or hybrid instruction elicited the larger number of negative responses. Definitive qualitative responses of changes to teaching and assessment strategies and student performance by learning mode did not emerge in the survey.

THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND – Assess faculty onboarding, ongoing training, and other professional development needs related to both in the classroom and online technology for ALL modalities, not just remote online or hybrid learning modalities.

#### **CHARGE 2.A TEACHING WORKLOAD**

In collaboration with the Provost’s office and the FTNTT Committee, review faculty equity across the institution for the following:

Teaching workload limits on number of courses (max or min). Compensation procedures related to faculty paid by credit hour (known to occur in at least DMSB, CPS).

**WHEREAS** Teaching workload policies reviewed appeared well-developed and appeared to be equitable if you met the criteria outlined in the schools. Because of the variability of the teaching, scholarship service, and research workload by various faculty tracks; even within the same college variability exists in expectations for NTT/TT/TT in assigning workload for teaching/research/scholarship. Several noted observations include:

- Teaching workload is described in policy and may be modified at the discretion of the chair
- One teaching workload unit may be 3 or 4 credit hours
- The majority of teaching in reviewed policies is 9 months
- Nowhere in the policies reviewed could we identify compensation procedures by credit hour

THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND that faculty workload criteria be reflected in policy to elect equitable consideration across faculty and that the One Faculty model be evaluated for adoption and impact.

#### **CHARGE 2.B WORKSPACE EQUITY**

In collaboration with the Provost’s office and FTNTT Committee, review faculty equity across the institution for the following:

**Workspace:** Distribution of faculty workspace: breakdown of shared versus individual office space and any procedures utilized to determine distribution of office space. NTT faculty, clinical lab, research, theater rehearsal space not included in decisions. How is this being done? Who are the decision makers, oversight?

#### **CHARGE 2.B RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS Tenured Track/Tenured (TT/T) are 45% more likely than Non-tenured track (NTT) faculty to have a private office and NTT track faculty are 27% more likely to have a shared office than TT/T faculty. There is a 5% adoption of reserved office space by NTT and 5% NTT without office space with minimal or no adoption by TT/T of these office arrangements. When asked if the differences between faculty classifications have been minimized in the last 6 years by the One Faculty model, TT/T were divided in agreement, 65% of NTT were neutral to strongly disagree.

THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND That faculty office assignment criteria be reflected in policy to reflect equitable consideration across faculty. That the One Faculty model be evaluated for adoption and impact

### **CHARGE 3: JOINTLY APPOINTED FACULTY**

Conduct a survey of across the university to explore and provide recommendations on jointly appointed faculty perceptions of:

- Clarify in distribution of workload percentages
- Clarity with merit and equity compensation processes
- Communication processes between unit administrators and jointly appointed faculty
- Unit leader adherence to approved merit/equity and workload policies

### **CHARGE 3 RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS While the combined results of the survey questions seem to suggest satisfactory communication, workload and merit procedures between departments/colleges regarding joint appointments, when asked to expand beyond these questions there are underlying concerns for faculty who hold these appointments.

*It should be noted that this is a small sample size and may not reflect the concerns of all faculty who hold joint appointments.*

THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND:

1. Merit and workload assignments be clarified in written policy for current jointly appointed faculty and negotiated by the departments/colleges prior to joint appointment for new hires.
2. Chairs/department head should collaborate to clearly define expectations for service in addition to teaching load.
3. Service should be limited to the department/college for which the faculty has the largest percentage of affiliation for FTNTT faculty or for T/TT faculty whichever is considered their pre-tenure home department.
4. Regular communication between chairs/unit heads occur with joint appointment faculty to relieve the burden of the faculty having to initiate conversations.

### **CHARGE 4: NU ACADEMIC PLAN**

Review NU academic plan, identify aspects of the plan that apply to the work of this committee, and provide recommendations for possible future committee charges

WHEREAS The pillars of the academic plan were compared to the Committee recommendations

THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND –

1. Explore ways to incorporate diversity and inclusion considerations in office space allocation and workload assignment policies. This could include ensuring that faculty from underrepresented backgrounds have equitable access to resources, as well as accommodating the unique needs of faculty involved in interdisciplinary or collaborative projects
2. Develop guidelines for communication between departments, colleges, and administrative units to ensure that office space allocation and workload assignment policies align with the broader goals and priorities of the academic plan. This may include creating a centralized system for tracking and sharing information about office space allocation and faculty workloads.
3. Monitor the impact of the academic plan's global initiatives on faculty workloads. Consider how expanding global opportunities and partnerships may affect faculty members' needs for office space and resources and develop strategies to accommodate these changes.

**QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Prof. Smith said space allocation is different depending on location. He asked if the committee looked into this? Prof. Detwiler said they didn't.

Prof. Jaeggli said responses from outside of Boston were low.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Prof. Michelle Carr Senate Secretary