



Northeastern University

Office of the Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Secretary, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Minutes, April 20, 2022

Present: Professors: Avalon, Beighley, Board, Bourns, Caracoglia, Carr, Chiou, Dau, Dennerlein, Ergun, Gonyeau, Gundavaram, Herlihy, Hertz, Landsmark,, Mages, Marano, McSherry, Molnar, Mukerjee,, Musselman, Nieves Rappaport, Smith, Spencer, Strange Vollmer, Willey, Wood, Zulick

Administrators: Madigan, Abowd, Cohen, Streets-Salter, Reid, Ronkin, Sceppa

Absent: (Professors) Cisewski, Toledano Laredo, Zimmerman,
(Administrators)

CALL TO ORDER: 11:45 a.m.

I. The minutes for the 4.6.22 Senate meeting were approved.

II. **SAC REPORT:**

Given the anticipated length of the Senate meeting, Prof. Gonyeau kept his remarks brief. He announced the senators who will serve on the FY 2022_2023 Senate Agenda Committee: Professors Gonyeau, Board, Avalon, Carr, Landsmark and Spencer. Prof. Gonyeau will continue to serve as SAC chair. Prof. Board will continue to serve as SAC secretary. Prof. Gonyeau thanked Prof. Caracoglia for his service on SAC this past year.

III. **PROVOST REPORT:**

- Due to the anticipated length of the meeting, the Provost kept his remarks brief. The Provost noted there was a lot of activity around interviewing and hiring. He also thanked Prof. Caracoglia for his work on SAC and welcomed back Prof. Spencer to SAC.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

IV. **CONTINUING BUSINESS:**

I. **RESEARCH POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.**

Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost's Office should ensure that the IT capabilities of HSRP are expanded, and that they are afforded every opportunity to work with the developers to ensure better integration of systems.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 29-0-0.

J. RESEARCH POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate should support, and advocate for, increasing NU-RES capacity in alignment with their already agreed upon hiring strategy, and including IT improvements.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

There were no questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 30-0-0.

K. RESEARCH POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the 2022-2023 faculty senate charge the RPOC committee to conduct a feasibility study of each college to determine whether the demand for stock rooms on campus would alleviate current supply chain shortages.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

- Prof. Hertz asked why the study would be college to college versus a university wide effort?

Prof. Lustig said they weren't sure how this was going to be paid for. This approach seemed more feasible from a budget perspective.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 32-0-1.

L. RESEARCH POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Caracoglia read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the 2022-2023 faculty senate charge the RPOC committee to conduct a survey of all colleges to assess space allocations to ensure that, where possible, labs and offices are co-located.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Dean Abowd asked this is a proposal to do a survey on how we are using space, correct?

Prof. Lustig concurred.

- Dean Abowd said the campus should have IT systems that handle this information. So it is something we should be able to access fairly regularly. He said he is concerned this is an inefficient way to get this information. And it will go out of date quickly. He said he would like the proposal to have more teeth.

Prof. Lustig acknowledged Dean Abowd's concern around this kind of data quickly going out of date however, there is no IT system he knows of that has this information. It is ad hoc how spaces are currently used and assigned. He is not sure this information is in a database that is reliably up to date. If they were to embark on a survey, it would have to be done quickly. He

added he doesn't trust the IT systems.

- Dean Abowd said he wasn't suggesting that we trust the current IT systems. He said he was suggesting that the resolution say that we put in place an IT system to do this.

Prof. Lustig suggested a friendly amendment could be added.

Dean Abowd made a motion to add a friendly amendment.

The revised resolution read:

BE IT RESOLVED that the 2022-2023 faculty senate charge the RPOC committee to conduct a survey of all colleges to assess space allocations to ensure that, where possible, labs and offices are co-located and make concrete recommendations for an IT solution to house this information going forward.

The motion was seconded by Prof. Caracoglia.

DISCUSSION OF FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:

- Prof. Desnoyers said he opposed the friendly amendment. He said in general he was not sure our department or college administrators would appreciate us telling them they need to use this in order to plan space within the department. He is not sure suggesting an IT solution here is useful.
- Prof. Arnold Mages said that similar to that comment, he doesn't think they need a specific IT solution to monitor just lab and office co-location but maybe there is a way we could embed this in our larger processes of space planning. Maybe the issue could be brought to the fore in a periodic way.
- Prof. Dennerlein said he agreed we probably need a database but the friendly amendment seems like a whole different issue that should be addressed at a much larger scale. He supports the idea of the friendly amendment but doesn't think this is the right place for it.
- Dean Abowd says he understands the concerns that people have but his only question here is – how are you going to do the first part of this – survey all colleges to assess space allocations? That has to be done to do a variety of things. Find out where possible co-location of labs and offices. It seems the beginning of this is a general space allocation question.

He is more concerned about us having a way of us getting at space allocation to address a much wider variety of things. He is fine with removing the friendly amendment and maybe it should go somewhere else.

- Prof. Dennerlein suggested in the spirit of that comment that the larger space topic be a charge for next year's RPOC. SAC can figure out where the charge belongs in the committee structure.

Prof. Gonyeau said they would take note of that sentiment as SAC develops charges for next year's committees.

Prof. Gonyeau asked Dean Abowd if he would like to remove the friendly amendment or would he like to call a vote on the amendment.

Dean Abowd agreed to a call for a vote on the amendment.

The vote for the friendly amendment was called.

The VOTE on the Friendly Amendment PASSED: 28-7-0.

DISCUSSION OF REVISED RESOLUTION WITH AMENDMENT:

BE IT RESOLVED that the 2022-2023 faculty senate charge the RPOC committee to conduct a survey of all colleges to assess space allocations to ensure that, where possible, labs and offices are co-located and make concrete recommendations for an IT solution to house this information going forward.

- Prof. Smith said this resolution suggests constrained optimization where possible co-locating offices and labs. One way to make sure your offices are near your labs is to double up. He asked the committee what was discussed about faculty offices specifically. And is there anything in the committee's work that would suggest anything about larger issues about office space. He noted there was a lot of hiring going on. What kind of office space is the university telling new faculty they will get? Is this resolution only about one option of space allocation or multiple?

Prof. Lustig said this was mentioned in their report as a response to their survey to the university survey where they learned some faculty were unhappy with the current situation. They found it unproductive that lab and offices were not as near each other as they wished.

- Prof. Smith said that the way this resolution is written suggests only one way of operations. If we are going to get the data anyway, let's think about these issues globally.

Prof. Gonyeau said that from SAC's perspective they can take this comment and add to the discussion for next year's charges.

- Prof. Wood said the way he read the resolution it was encouraging co-location of the offices and the labs. He was wondering if this is supposed to apply to those who have their offices/labs off the main campus like in Burlington or the Christian Science Center and how that would affect things like office hours.

Prof. Lustig didn't have a recollection of this topic being brought up.

Prof. Gonyeau said he thought that was a good question and SAC would note that for next year's charges.

The vote for the revised resolution was called.

The VOTE on the revised resolution PASSED: 24-8-3.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS POLICY COMMITTEE PRESENTATION AND RESOLUTION

Prof. Zulick acknowledged Prof. Van Amburgh and Prof. O'Haver who noted the committee members and provided updates on the committee's charge #3: Review university efforts to address the mental health needs of students, including WeCare and UHS support, and other NU mental

health resources.

(This presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

There were no questions on the presentation.

Prof. Zulick read the following:

WHEREAS given the importance of mental health on campus as evidenced by the recent creation and distribution of the Faculty Guide: Supporting Student Mental Health by Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, University Health and Counseling Services, and the Office for Prevention and Education at the University, the increased presence of the student organization Active Minds at Northeastern, and the prominence of the JED Foundation as the Leading organization with the best practices assisting college campuses across the country on the emotional health of students.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate recommend that the Office of the Provost collaborates with Vice Chancellor, Wellness and Student Success, in the University's Office of Student Affairs (under Senior Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs) and faculty representatives from the colleges to engage, financially support and assist in the full implementation (4-year commitment) of the JED Campus program at the University.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 33-0-0.

B. REPORT OF THE FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE

Prof. Herlihy recognized Prof. Benda and Prof. Homan who reviewed the committee members, charges and work during the year.

(The complete FTNTTFC report and presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions on the presentation.

C. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

Whereas not all colleges have college-level stand-alone FTFTT promotion committees,

BE IT RESOLVED that stand-alone FTNTT promotion committees are established at the college level where the majority of the committee is comprised of FTNTT faculty members at or above the rank of the candidates.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Prof. Spencer offered a friendly correction. There is a "n" missing in the first line. "Whereas not all colleges have college-level stand-alone FTFTT promotion committees," it should read,

“ Whereas not all colleges have college-level stand-alone FTNTT promotion committees.”

- Prof. Arnold Mages thanked the committee for the report. He said he strongly supported equity and fairness for FTNTT faculty and he has held positions as both in other universities. He knows both sides of conversation.

He wonders if under the one faculty model, if establishing a separate promotion stream for FTNTTF ends up deconsolidating the promotion process and ends up making the two more separate rather than more integrated. Is this the best way for moving forward as one faculty?

And can the committee address their recommendations around the department role in FTNTTF promotion and the actual scope of work and authority of college level FTNTTF promotion committees.

Does college committee take place of department processes? Are they writing the promotion reports? Are they taking votes? Are they advising the Dean? Are they ensuring consistent processes across departments? What does the committee see as their scope of work and the authority of these college level committees?

Prof. Herlihy said the committees are making a recommendation and then that is handled at the college level. The Faculty Handbook is very precise on tenure dossiers and what one has to do and while the FTNTTF promotion process is sort of parallel, they are not quite in lock step. Therefore, having something that addresses the similarities but also given the fact that they are slightly different in their focus, I think it is appropriate to actually have an analogous FTNTT process that as closely as possible maps taking into account who is on the assessing committee for those NTT candidates.

Prof. Carr said there are two committees for review – department and college and then the Provost. She said she doesn't think one can delete any of these review processes.

- Prof. Spencer said the FPC at DMSB took a long look at promotion process that our FTNTT committee was using and we formalized it to have it in synch with the TT process. Missing within our process, was the right of NTTF to respond to the group level or college level or even the green paper.

She would be happy to share that with SAC next year or next year's FTNTTC.

Prof. Spencer said they also, looked at who can vote on the candidates. One of the issues they changed, the language here that you have -- *“.....the committee is comprised of FTNTT faculty members at or above the rank of the candidates”* -- DMSB got rid of “at the candidate's rank”. We left it people that are at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. We didn't think it was appropriate to have faculty at the existing rank voting for someone to go up to a higher rank.

Her final observation is that from her experience TT faculty are sometimes kinder to NTTF than their NTT peers. So they try to have a healthy balance of both on the committee.

- Prof. Gundavaram agreed with the “at or above” comment. He said at the SOL, a much smaller college, they only have 4 or 5 people at the rank of Full Professor at the FTNTTF level. One of his

concerns is that as they have more FTNTTF on other committees, that designating 2 or 3 people on this committee takes away our opportunity to be on other committees.

Echoing Prof. Spencer's point, he finds that having TT faculty on these committees it is sometimes the first time that they find out what kind of work we are doing. These committees can serve as an opportunity to educate tenured faculty on what we are doing and the importance of the work.

- Prof. Benda said they could take as a friendly amendment changing that end part to "at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires" if that seems to be a good idea to the other committee members?

Prof. Herlihy said he thought that made sense.

Prof. Homan agreed and also pointed out the resolution is not excluding tenured faculty but saying the majority of the committee should be FTNTT.

- Prof. Erdogan said in many of the resolutions the co-op faculty were not mentioned maybe you already considered them and there was a discussion around them as well. But she has heard that comment that co-op faculty are also FTNTTF.

Prof. Spencer said she thinks the co-op faculty have a different promotion process separate from this. At DMSB they have a different process.

- Prof. Spencer wanted to address the issue brought up by Prof. Gundavaram and the issue of tenured faculty being involved on the committee. They ran into this issue in DMSB since they have a very small number of lecturers. They have 3 different tracks: Lecturer, Academic Specialist, Teaching Professor. There are going to be so few principal lecturers that it would be hard to corral them all to serve on this committee.

If you run into this situation where you don't have enough NTTF to serve that are above the rank of the candidate, what DMSB did was to assign alternates that were tenured so it didn't slow down the promotion process. The final thing they looked at, if one does have different tracks within a school, could vote if at a comparable rank within their track.

Prof. Benda said it is going to be different for every college and school so should expect each college to come up with their own bylaws/policies to match the individual needs of colleges. He said their resolution was a general statement that they want these types of committees to be put in place.

- Prof. Gonyeau asked Prof. Spencer if she was making a friendly amendment adding the phrase "*to which the candidate is seeking promotion*"?

Prof. Spencer said yes.

Prof. Gundavaram seconded the motion.

The revised resolution with the friendly amendment now read:

Whereas not all colleges have college-level stand-alone FTNTT promotion

committees,

BE IT RESOLVED that stand-alone FTNTT promotion committees are established at the college level where the majority of the committee is comprised of FTNTT faculty members at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion.

QUESTIONS OR DISCUSSION ON FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

There were no additional questions or discussion related to the friendly amendment.

The VOTE for the friendly amendment PASSED: 30-0-0.

There were no additional questions on the amended resolution.

The VOTE for the amended resolution was called.

Whereas not all colleges have college-level stand-alone FTNTT promotion committees,

BE IT RESOLVED that stand-alone FTNTT promotion committees are established at the college level where the majority of the committee is comprised of FTNTT faculty members at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion.

The VOTE for the amended resolution PASSED: 30-0-0.

D. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that Informal or ad-hoc mentoring activities, as described in the best practices, be made more visible to faculty, and colleges or units should be proactive in making those mentoring opportunities available to FTNTT faculty.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 30-0-0.

E. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following

BE IT RESOLVED that college governance bodies formalize mentoring circles for college faculty, adopting the model used by CPS and ADVANCE.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 28-1-0.

F. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following

Whereas not all colleges have developed written college-level FTNTTF promotion guidelines, and some colleges have detailed guidelines for what qualifications are necessary for promotion, and whereas this level of detail seems desirable in the interest of transparency (See Appendix A from the FTNTTFC report for an example from CPS.):

BE IT RESOLVED that all colleges work to develop written college-level FTNTTF promotion guidelines and make them accessible.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 30-1-0.

G. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following

BE IT RESOLVED that ADVANCE and the Provost's Office shall develop programming around writing a good fellowship proposal, including panelists that previously had fellowships. We suggest the programming begin in the 2022/2023 academic year.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Sr. Vice Provost Deb Franko asked if someone from the committee could say something about what they mean by programming.

Prof. Benda said they mean workshops, panel discussions, putting something on the website. He said he knows there is nothing updated on the Advance website. It still says pilot program. Some information about who has been getting these fellowships and what have they been doing with them.

- Prof. Wood asked if the committee had discussions with the Advance office as to their capacity to expand their programming in this way.

Prof. Benda said they didn't. They said they originally had on the resolution that we wanted the programming to begin in the fall but were told that was impossible. They were full up for the fall. We need to get in touch with them about this.

Prof. Homan said she did reach out to ADVANCE and met a couple of times with Vice Provost Isaacs and we discussed both of these things and having something in the fall like a panel of people who were previous fellowship participants who could talk about how they came up with their idea, what their proposal consisted of, etc.

- Sr. Vice Provost Isaacs said yes we did have a discussion about whether such a program could be handled by the Advance Office. She added she does not know what the capacity of the Advance Office is. She is not confirming that the ADVANCE Office could take any of this on. It was a discussion that perhaps this was a program that could be considered.

- Prof. Hertz asked is it still a pilot program? He wasn't clear that this was a permanent fixture of the FTNTT faculty landscape.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said it was a pilot program in the initial year and then we asked the deans to pick up the finances for it. They agreed to do that. We have gone forward with it. Each year it is the deans that make a determination about what they can cover in their colleges. It is no longer a pilot and we expect that it will continue.

- Prof. Spencer asked Sr. Vice Provost Franko are different colleges awarding different numbers of Fellowships?

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said the number of awards are up to the Deans. Faculty can apply and then Deans make a determination because obviously there is a financial piece to this.

- Prof. Spencer asked Sr. Vice Provost Franko if she has seen a disparity in the number of Fellowships awarded by the colleges.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said no, she didn't think so. She said there are actually very few applications that come through for this and mostly they are approved.

- Prof. Spencer asked if we were looking at one Fellowship per college typically?

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said there is variability. She doesn't think there has been more than 2 per college.

Prof. Spencer said maybe a friendly amendment to this resolution we should work on advertising this better.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said we send notice to associate deans for faculty and we ask them to send it to all FTNTTF who are eligible and we do that more than once.

- Prof. Spencer said she knows that at her college they get a notice about a week before its due. Maybe the deans could send it out in the fall if the decision is going to be made in the spring so that faculty can have some time to thoughtfully plan and prepare. If they know what constitutes a good application and they are informed ahead of time, we will have better responses.
- Prof. Carr said in CAMD the information comes out in their memo once a month. Think it is up to the college.
- Prof. Gonyeau said this is something that could be picked up by next year's FTNTTFC to look at the degree to which variability in this exists.

There were no additional questions.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 27-0-0.

H. **FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION**

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that for the purposes of equity review, the Provost's Office shall

provide Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty with the equivalent salary data provided to tenure-stream faculty. This data shall be provided for each rank in each department/unit where there are at least four (4) FTNTT faculty at that rank.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Dean Abowd said in his experience with the COE this past year, this is a difficult task to satisfy for co-op because there are not equivalent positions around the country.
- Sr. Vice Provost Franko wanted to note that they do send out to the deans of the equity colleges the average salaries for FTNTTF as we can given the number of constraints.

Sending out equivalent salary data to the tenure stream faculty is something, as you presented in your report, that is difficult to do given that we have a comparison group with G14 institutions 7 of which agreed to share their FTNTTF data with Rana Glasgal, Univ. Decision Support.

As shown in report, the titles vary tremendously across those 7 universities. Rana Glasgal worked with them to determine what is the equivalent of a teaching professor, research professor, etc. But this is really a small numbers game. While it is true that at Northeastern, we have lots and lots of NTTF we have them across 7 different titles. Within each of those titles there are 3 ranks, with the exception of Prof. of the Practice. At other universities those numbers are much smaller.

The difficulty with a direct comparison with the tenure-stream faculty is that, across other institutions, those numbers are much bigger and they also have 3 titles: Assist. Prof., Assoc. Prof., Prof. We have worked very hard in the last three years to try to get to this. There is no existing database out there. We took on this project to try to create something. We are running up against these difficulties that we can't do anything about. This has been very tough.

- Prof. Spencer said we are running into more of the same here. The Provost Office recently made some NTT data available to some colleges and some have shared data and some have not. She said maybe another issue for next year, is making those colleges respond similarly so that all colleges share the data.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said they shared the data with the 3 college deans that are making the equity requests and the data is to stay within the colleges.

- Prof. Spencer asked if the Provost Office can share the data with all of the colleges and not just the ones doing equity requests so that NTTF would have a sense of what is going on regardless of whether they are coming up for equity reviews?

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said they don't do this on tenure side either. The college salary data is sent to the college deans.

- Prof. Spencer asked didn't the college deans share all the salary data with their TTF?

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said the deans' own college salary data is shared with their own T/TT faculty. And their own FTNTT salary data is shared with their own FTNTTF.

- Prof. Spencer asked if we can make that data available to NTTF within all colleges every year regardless of whether they are coming up for equity reasons. NTTF have been waiting for years and year for this data.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said that in the Faculty Handbook says the salary data is shared with the colleges in the equity process. We would need to make a change there if we were going to make that change.

- Prof. Benda said they do have a resolution later about merging titles within ranks of NTTF. That might help to some extent to help in getting a better idea of what people at those different ranks are making. May still be difficult to compare to the G14 but at least within our own colleges/department we might get a sense.

Prof. Gonyeau said that may be one of the only levers left that we have to advance this topic.

The VOTE on the resolution PASSED: 27-1-1.

I. **FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION**

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost's office, in cooperation with the colleges, shall investigate for discrepancies in pay due to gender or BIPOC status, further breaking down available data (from IPEDS) by discipline to identify underlying issues present by rank, race/ethnicity, and/or gender within each department.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Prof. Arnold Mages offered a friendly amendment – state “all protected classes” versus stating each.

Prof. Herlihy said he wasn't sure if all these were protected classes. Is BIPOC protected by federal law?

- Prof. Arnold Mages said yes. It would be race.

Prof. Herlihy seconded the friendly amendment.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION ON THE REVISED RESOLUTION:

The amendment would read:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost's office, in cooperation with the colleges, shall investigate for discrepancies in pay due to gender or BIPOC status, further breaking down available data (from IPEDS) by discipline to identify underlying issues present by any protected class rank, race/ethnicity, and/or gender within each department.

- Sr. Vice Provost Franko said these data if widened to all protected classes data would be very hard to get. Any data like gender, race, ethnicity, religion, age, etc. would need to be provided by the faculty member and not sure if this is feasible or how it would be done. Many faculty do not provide various pieces of information and we don't ask for certain types of information, for example, religion.

She also pointed out that the Provost Office in conjunction with OGC do a MEPA analysis that looks at differential salaries for male versus female and it is done every 3 years.

- Prof. Chiou's recommendation was to change "present by" to justification of performance. There are many factors that can cause the variation in compensation and if this variation comes from the difference in performance, merit, then it can be justified.

Prof. Gonyeau said we'll come back to that as it would be a 2nd friendly amendment.

Prof. Herlihy said in regards to Sr. Vice Provost's point, he thinks she is right, but the resolution addresses the concern. If someone elects not to give us the data, then we don't have the data available.

- Prof. Poe asked if this will be done yearly? For the T/TT line, we have gender but not race/ethnicity and need parallel. And if small numbers, how would that look?

Prof. Benda said the committee didn't think about this being an annual thing. They thought about doing this once at least and not sure how often to be repeated.

Prof. Gonyeau to the 2nd question, beyond committee to answer. Can make a note for next year to apply to all faculty in spirit of one faculty.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said quick point, race/ethnicity data and to do that by discipline those numbers are really small for some groups.

There were no additional questions on the friendly amendment.

VOTE for friendly amendment PASSED: 25-4-1.

The revised resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost's office, in cooperation with the colleges, shall investigate for discrepancies in pay due to gender or BIPOC status, further breaking down available data (from IPEDS) by discipline to identify underlying issues present by any protected class within each department.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION ON THE REVISED RESOLUTION:

There were no questions.

The vote on the revised resolution was called.

VOTE for the revised resolution PASSED: 28-2-0.

J. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

Whereas the Provost's Office indicates that they have begun the process of polling the Colleges about what college-level administrative positions are available to FTNTT faculty, **BE IT RESOLVED that** administrative and leadership positions shall be open equally to all faculty, TT and FTNTT alike, unless specifically designated in

writing otherwise, and that a list of leadership positions that are and are not open to faculty members shall be made available to all faculty on each college's website, identifying the ranks to which positions are open.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 28-2-0.

K. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that title consolidation shall continue across colleges; specifically, Academic Specialists (Asst, Assoc, and Full) and Instructor titles be similarly transitioned to commensurate Lecturer or Teaching Professor titles, based on each college's workload and promotion policies.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 27-1-0.

L. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that NU shall render best efforts to match NU titles with the salary data acquired from the Colonial Group/G14 salary exchange.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 25-1-0.

M. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

Whereas there is a wide range in expectations for promotion for FTNTT faculty due to differences in practice across disciplines, it may not be feasible, or even desirable, to standardize promotion expectations. Therefore, **BE IT RESOLVED that** every rank of FTNTT faculty shall have available and accessible the specific criteria for promotion by discipline on the Provost Website.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Sr. Vice Provost Franko said this is something that would be college-by-college and with about 45 disciplines at the university, it seems to me this belongs on the colleges' websites. It would be the college faculty looking for this information and it would make sense they look on their college website.

Prof. Benda said he thought the faculty workload information was on the provost website.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said it is. But when you talk about “for every rank” each of the titles has 3 ranks, this is significant detail. A faculty member would go to their website for bylaws, guidelines, etc. She thinks it should be on the college website because that is where promotions occur.

Prof. Herlihy suggested there could be links from the Provost site so there would be one place where this information would reside.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said the issue with that is that if links change every year that is a lot to change on provost site each year. It seems that faculty should know where to find their college website. She said she thinks that is a better place for this information.

Prof. Homan said because there are so many colleges and departments it becomes confusing as to where to find the promotion material you need to prepare your dossier.

Prof. Benda said if it is going to go on the college website there has to be some standardization for where things go on the website.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said senators from each college could work with their leadership to get that done.

- Prof. Board said she agreed with Sr. Vice Provost Franko that this could be too much for Provost office. Prof. Board suggested a friendly amendment that associate deans of faculty for each college be responsible for posting this information. She worries that across colleges there won't be standardization. Prof. Board asked Sr. Vice Provost Franko what she would think of a standardized form that they could follow to provide consistency.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said the difficulty with standardization for criteria for promotion is that the Faculty Handbook says units can decide these issues for themselves.

- Prof. Board said she was not suggesting standardization of criteria. She proposed a friendly amendment that this not be put on the Provost's website but provided by the Assoc. Deans of Faculty Affairs for each college.

The friendly amendment reads as follows:

Whereas there is a wide range in expectations for promotion for FTNTT faculty due to differences in practice across disciplines, it may not be feasible, or even desirable, to standardize promotion expectations. Therefore, **BE IT RESOLVED that** every rank of FTNTT faculty shall have available and accessible the specific criteria for promotion by discipline be provided by Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs in each college and made available on the college website. ~~on the Provost Website.~~

Prof. Benda seconded the friendly amendment.

QUESTIONS ON THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:

There were no additional questions on the friendly amendment.

The VOTE for the friendly amendment was called and PASSED: 25-1-0.

The revised resolution reads as follows:

Whereas there is a wide range in expectations for promotion for FTNTT faculty due to differences in practice across disciplines, it may not be feasible, or even desirable, to standardize promotion expectations. Therefore, **BE IT RESOLVED that** every rank of FTNTT faculty shall have available and accessible the specific criteria for promotion by discipline be provided by Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs in each college and made available on the college website.

QUESTIONS ON THE REVISED RESOLUTION:

There were no additional questions on the revised resolution

The VOTE for the revised resolution PASSED: 27-0-0.

N. FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Herlihy read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Northeastern University Faculty Handbook be updated to include guiding principles for FTNTTF in case of contract non-renewal or contract terminations including:

1. Transparency of decision-making on the non-renewal. In alignment with AAUP guidelines, FTNTTF receive **documentation with the rationale for non-renewal/non-reappointment decision for any reason**, whether it is related to cause or not;
2. In alignment with AAUP guidelines, that faculty have the **right to appeal** the decision within 90 days;
3. Utmost **good faith effort will be made to reassign the FTNTTF** whose re-appointment is not due to cause to another position at the University;
4. Advertisements to fill vacancies caused by termination of FTNTTF will not take place until a **90-day appeal period** is reached.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- (2:06:10) Prof. Benda made a friendly amendment to his own resolution. He said in #3, the word “re-appointment” should be non-re-appointment.

Prof. Gonyeau said because this is coming from the committee it doesn't have to be a formal friendly amendment.

The resolution with the edit reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Northeastern University Faculty Handbook be updated to include guiding principles for FTNTTF in case of contract non-renewal or contract terminations including:

1. Transparency of decision-making on the non-renewal. In alignment with AAUP guidelines, FTNTTF receive **documentation with the rationale for non-renewal/non-reappointment decision for any reason**, whether it is related to cause or not;
2. In alignment with AAUP guidelines, that faculty have the **right to appeal** the decision within 90 days;

3. Utmost **good faith effort will be made to reassign the FTNTTF** whose non-re-appointment is not due to cause to another position at the University;
4. Advertisements to fill vacancies caused by termination of FTNTTF will not take place until a **90-day appeal period** is reached.

- Prof. Hertz asked if finalization of the language that is going to be added to the Faculty Handbook will go to next year's committee?

Prof. Gonyeau said what will happen is that next year SAC will constitute a Faculty Handbook Committee to take up this resolution.

The VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 25-1-0.

- O. REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (PROF. CARACOLIA)
DEB COPELAND (CHAIR)
SHANNON ALPERT.
BLAINE SAITO.
JOSEPH MCNABB.
HAMEED METGHALCHI.
GARY YOUNG.**

Prof. Gonyeau recognized Prof. Alpert who presented the final report for FAC. She reviewed the committee members, charges, resolutions and recommendations. In this presentation, the committee primarily focused on charges 2, 3, 5, and 6.
(The presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

- P. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.**

Prof. Gonyeau read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive compensation data 3 months in advance of the time they are eligible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Dean Abowd Greg said he is not clear on what is meant by “in advance of the time they are eligible”. He is concerned that might be too vague. What deadline is that?

Prof. Alpert said in terms of the eligibility colleges go through this process on a rotating basis. “...in advance of the time they are eligible” is referring to the time that the college is eligible.

Dean Abowd said he gets that. He thinks it would read better to put an actual date for ex. Jan 1, 20xx.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said whatever 3 colleges it is in a given year, they all have the same timelines. She said the issue is getting the data 3 months in advance, whether that is 3 months in advance of January or 3 months in advance of when equity requests are due. Faculty salary data are compiled at certain times of the year because all the data needs to be available and then compiled by UDS. She would suggest a friendly amendment suggesting “as soon as possible.” She thinks this year faculty salary went out in February.

Prof. Gonyeau said it seems we have the makings of a friendly amendment. He added the “college is eligible for equity consideration”, deleting “they are eligible”.

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive compensation data 3 months in advance of the time the college is eligible for equity consideration. ~~they are eligible.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

Prof. Gonyeau asked Prof. Alpert if this was in line with what the committee was thinking. Prof. Alpert said this change was in line with what the committee was thinking and agreed to the change.

Prof. Gonyeau asked Dean Abowd if this made the resolution clear for him.

Dean Abowd said no. He said he thinks that what Sr. Vice Provost Franko said is the right way to think about it. Set the date relative to when faculty requests are required. That is made clear every year. To Sr. Vice Provost Franko’s point about what is realistic, he thinks is another issue. Need a known date.

Prof. Herlihy said 3 months is fine but 3 months from when? Or no less than 3 months.

Prof. Gonyeau said he agreed with Dean Abowd’s premise. What is the deadline? If there is a deadline by which applications must be submitted, is that the same every year?

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said we do have deadline college deans must submit merit and equity requests. It is similar every year but not same date. It varies but is around this time of the year. Before they go the Provost’s Office, the requests go to the Deans and before that to the chairs.

Dean Abowd said he was referring to the date by which faculty submit their requests. That starts the process.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said we can give a date but getting faculty data out depends on when UDS has data available and when they can get them out to the College Deans.

Prof. Gonyeau asked Dean Abowd if he was suggesting that every college have the same submission deadline for equity?

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said they do not.

Dean Abowd said he thinks Sr. Vice Provost Franko's insight is valuable here. We may be putting something forth that is impossible to meet.

Prof. Gonyeau said the resolution is the resolution. We are either going to make a friendly amendment or not. Trying to be clear about what the friendly amendment language will be.

Prof. Herlihy said to his mind the idea behind the friendly amendment is that faculty just need some amount of time for faculty to have to get this done. How much time does a faculty member need?

Prof. Alpert said the three month timeframe came from recognizing that the colleges have different internal deadlines to before they get materials to the Provost Office. We wanted to make sure that was a timeline that was reasonable.

Prof. Gonyeau said and to clarify the "in advance of the time they are eligible" that actually is referring to -- in advance of the time deans need to submit to the provost office?

Prof. Alpert agreed.

Prof. Gonyeau edited the resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive compensation data 3 months in advance of the time that colleges must submit requests to the Provost Office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

Prof. Gonyeau asked Prof. Alpert if the added words were more in line with the committee's thinking. She said yes.

Prof. Herlihy said it should be in advance of time for faculty submission since that starts the process. Prof. Herlihy suggested the resolution should also say "BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive college-wide compensation data" instead of just "compensation data."

Prof. Gonyeau asked Prof. Alpert if this was the committee's intentions. She said yes.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said the data are available at certain times of year. Then it is frozen and UDS looks at it. She looked back this year and last and she was able to send salary data out to colleges in mid to late February. She doesn't think 3 months is realistic. Could have a deadline but may not work.

Prof. Hertz said maybe there is flexibility as to when requests need to be submitted? For example, could we say equity letters is no sooner than 6 weeks after the data available.

Prof. Hertz suggested a friendly amendment:

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process have a deadline for equity submission requests no sooner than 3 months after faculty receive college wide compensation data is received. ~~receive compensation data 3 months in advance of the time they are eligible.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

There was no second for the friendly amendment.

The discussion continued on the original resolution.

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive compensation data 3 months in advance of the time they are eligible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

Prof. Gundavaram said he wasn't sure if the goal was to result in a salary adjustment for July. The three months might mean the adjustment period is missed.

He said as someone who just did this, the SOL got data and had 36 hour turnover. He said he thinks one month is plenty.

Prof. Hemanth suggested a friendly amendment changing 3 months to 1 month.

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive compensation data ~~3~~ 1 month in advance of the time they are eligible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

Prof. Carr seconded the amendment.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION OF FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:

Prof. Herlihy said he still thinks “college wide” should be added to “compensation data.”

Prof. Gundavaram was fine with this addition.

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive college wide compensation data 3 1 month in advance of the time they are eligible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

There were no additional questions on the friendly amendment.

The VOTE on the friendly amendment was called and PASSED: 23-0-0.

The revised resolution now reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive college wide compensation data 1 month in advance of the time they are eligible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION ON THE REVISED RESOLUTION :

Prof. Board noted that Sr. Vice Provost Franko said that the data is available sometime in February.

Prof. Board wondered what was the disconnect here? We can put in dates but SAC received

comments that some of the colleges had a very, very short turn around.

What can we do to improve that?

Prof. Gonyeau said that is the second part of this. Trying to get at that process.

Prof. Gonyeau said he thinks we can all agree that 24 hours is not a fair amount of time.

There were no additional questions.

The vote for the revised resolution was called.

(Although these were discussed together, Prof. Gonyeau wanted to vote on each part of the resolution for clarity sake.)

The VOTE on the first part of the revised resolution was called.

BE IT RESOLVED that faculty in units undergoing the equity process receive college wide compensation data 1 month in advance of the time they are eligible.

The VOTE PASSED: 23-1-1.

The VOTE on the second part of the revised resolution was called.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provost and HR work with units to support a transparent process with clear timelines and proper templates and share smart practices among the units.

The VOTE PASSED: 24-1-0.

The VOTE on the third part of the revised resolution was called.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the heads of units identify and encourage faculty members to apply for equity adjustments, particularly those who may be part of under-represented groups such as women, racial minorities, and non-cis gender people.

The VOTE PASSED: 24-1-0.

Q. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT and PRESENTATION

PROF. LORNA HAYWARD (CO-CHAIR).

PROF. DARIN DETWILER (CO-CHAIR).

PROF. FRANCES MCSHERRY.

PROF. VASO LYKOURINOU.

PROF. NEAL LERNER.

PROF. TED MILLER

Prof. McSherry acknowledge Prof. Hayward who presented the final report for FDC. She reviewed the committee members, charges, resolutions and recommendations.

(The presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

R. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. McSherry read the following:

WHEREAS the GEO Faculty Advisory Board (GEFAB) was established in 2019 by the Office of the Chancellor and the Provost to act (in part) as a conduit between GEO and DOC faculty leaders, and WHEREAS

GEFAB, composed of faculty members with DOC and/or global learning experience across multiple colleges plus a representative from Faculty Senate,

BE IT RESOLVED that a Faculty Senate liaison be appointed to GEFAB by SAC as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 24-0-0.

S. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. McSherry read the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost Office through ADVANCE take a more active role in advising, assessing, and supporting mentoring efforts in the colleges and in the units within the colleges.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 22-0-0.

T. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (PROF. BOARD)

Prof. Mehdi Abedi

Sr. Vice Provost Deb Franko, Ex Officio.

Prof. Kelly Garneau.

Prof. Patty Goodman.

Prof. Zhenyu Liao.

Prof. Connie Lorette Co-Chair.

Prof. Sanjeev Mukerjee, Co-Chair.

Prof. Board acknowledged Prof. Lorette who presented the final report for APC. She acknowledged the committee members, charges, resolutions and recommendations.

(The presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

U. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Board read the following:

Whereas CATLR and Canvas have several types of SETs and faculty survey findings suggest a lack of awareness of such tools,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT all College Associate Deans of Academic Affairs communicate the available university resources and processes for midcourse SETs at the beginning of each semester.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 22-0-0.

V. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION.

Prof. Board read the following:

Whereas TRACE remains the university tool for evaluating “Teaching Effectiveness”, and some units/departments require that multiple scores/factors and or tools be used in the merit and promotion process, and faculty survey findings support multiple methods of teaching effectiveness,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Office of the Provost establish university guidelines for use of multiple “Teaching Effectiveness” evaluation methods in merit, tenure and/or promotion considerations.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 22-0-0.

W. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT University Administration (Offices of the Provost and Chancellor) in collaboration with CATLR (Center for Advancing Teaching and Learning Through Research) revise TRACE questions to improve representation of online or hybrid learning experiences, along with recognition of various learning environment lengths of engagement.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Sr. Vice Provost Franko asked for a little more clarity on this resolution. She said generally TRACE questions have been done in conjunction with the faculty. She assumes this would be a charge for APC for next year to work with the Provost Office, Chancellor’s Office and CATLR. And she also asked what “various learning environment lengths of engagement” mean.

Prof. Goodman said that in CPS there are courses of various lengths.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said they would talk about how TRACE works.

Prof. Gonyeau was wondering about intercession courses in this regard.

- Prof. Wood said he thought he remembered in the past there was an issue with SGA having control of TRACE.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko said no. She thinks there was a time a couple of years ago where the SGA worked with the Faculty Senate to create some new TRACE questions. TRACE is really a Faculty Senate, Faculty and Office of the Provost instrument.

There were no additional questions.

The VOTE for the resolution PASSED: 25-0-0.

X. INCLUSION AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT.

HEATHER HAUCK, CO-CHAIR

PHIL HE, CO-CHAIR

TAD HIRSCH

PHILIP LARESE-CASANOVA

LATIKA MENON

KARL REID, EX-OFFICIO

REBECCA SHANSKY

LES STEIN

MOFEI XU

LYDIA YOUNG

Prof. Avalon introduced the two co-chairs of the IDC, Prof. Hauck and Prof. He and Prof. Young.

(The presentation and report can be found on the Faculty Senate website.)

Prof. Young noted that the committee did not make any resolutions in their final report. This was informed by the fact there are lots of intersections and overlaps with other committees. Also, Northeastern is making great strides and the committee wanted to allow for time for those processes to play out so that next year's committee has an opportunity to reflect back on what has been achieved this year.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

Y. NUPATH ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

WILLIAM EWELL.

MICHAEL JAEGGLI.

KRISTEN MATHIEU-GONZALEZ.

LAURIE NARDONE.

NIZAR ZAAROUR.

Prof. Gonyeau noted that the NUPath report can be found on the Faculty Senate website. Due to

scheduling complications and teaching commitments, committee members were not available to join the meeting.

Z. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE.

PETER DESNOYERS (COMMITTEE CHAIR)
MICHAEL BESSETTE
COLE CAMPLESE - VP-IT AND CIO; EX OFFICIO
UMESH HODEGHATTA
AMY LU
AMY PATTERSON

Prof. Gonyeau introduced Prof. Desnoyers who acknowledge the committee members and who presented the final report for ITPC reviewing the charges and recommendations.

The report can be found on the Faculty Senate website.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

AA. LIBRARY AND INFORMATION COLLABORATION COMMITTEE REPORT (PROF. LANDSMARK).

PROF. ANGELA CHANG.
DEAN DAN COHEN
PROF. ELLY JACKSON.
PROF. SEAN O'CONNELL.
PROF. LYNN REEDE.
PROF. RONALD WILLEY
PROF. TED MILLER

Prof. Landsmark introduced Prof. Willey who noted the committee members and reviewed the charges and resulting recommendations.

Prof. Landsmark noted that LICC was a very stable and forward-looking group that has worked through a year where their primary asset hasn't been as available as we would have liked.

Prof. Willey said he wrote the President and Provost noting the good job Dean Cohen is doing and that the University is very lucky to have him here.

The committee's report can be found on the Faculty Senate website.

One highlight of the report was the noting that the Mills College library will be a significant addition to the Northeastern library system. The Mills College library has an outstanding collection of rare books from the 1500 to 1800 time period.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Landsmark said that LICC's comments on Mills were well placed. Mills has medieval manuscripts and things that will dramatically enhance our holdings.

There were no additional questions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Prof. Rhonda Board
Senate Secretary

DRAFT