



Northeastern University Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: Secretary, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Minutes, March 27, 2024

Present: Professors Adams, Alexis, Chen, Chiou, Diani, DiBattista, Di Credico, Folmar, Godoy-Carter, Henderson, Herron, Homan, Ingemi, Kahn, Krishnamoorthy, Lahr, Landsmark, Lowrey, Mellette, Molnar, Moore, Oet, Rappaport, Rawson, Rejtar, Rivera, Saczynski, Shrivastava, Sivak, Smith, Strange, Toledano Laredo, Triest, Viola, Walker J., Walker L., Wang, West.

Administrators: Abowd, Amidon, Isaacs, Pollastri, Wadia-Fascetti.

Absent: (Professors) Jaeggli, Kitagawa, Lin.
(Administrators) Madigan, Sceppa.

CALL TO ORDER: 11:45 a.m.

I. **SAC REPORT:** (SAC Report has been posted to Senate website.)

Prof. Landsmark said that since the 3_13_24 Senate meeting SAC has met twice and has met with Provost Office once.

SAC met with the Board of Trustees, Academic Affairs and Student Experience Committee on Thursday, March 21, 2024. SAC summarized the priority areas and main tasks of the Senate during the AY 23_24: faculty needs and considerations as we expand the global network, faculty concerns, shared governance, and salary equity. SAC particularly highlighted the main faculty concerns received from the Faculty Senate website online submission platform, including TRACE, Faculty burnout, pay with benefits, potential inequities in faculty salaries, and how the Senate worked with the administration. The Board of Trustees asked a few clarifying questions and expressed gratitude toward faculty members and the Senate after the presentation.

Prof. Landsmark asked other SAC member to share their thoughts on the meeting with Trustees. SAC member, Prof. Lahr, noted that Board members were very generous in their praise of the work that the faculty is doing and very appreciative of senate efforts to really address issues that are being raised by faculty, and again by the faculty's desire to engage with students as much as possible and really uplift the entire Northeastern community. She added it was a very welcoming meeting.

The last Senate meeting of this academic year is Wed., April 10th and will run from 11:45 a.m. until the close of business.

The annual Faculty Senate call for volunteers to serve on the Senate's standing and ad hoc committees is underway. Look for the email subject line: Call for Senate Committee Volunteers.

II. PROVOST REPORT:

(Provost Madigan was not able to attend the Senate meeting. Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Deb Franko gave the report in his place.)

Sr. Vice Provost Franko noted that the *60th Annual* Robert D. Klein Lecture took place Mon., March 25th. Over 300 attendees joined the wonderful lecture by Prof. Ron Sandler, CSSH, the Robert D. Klein Lecture awardee this year. THE title of his lecture was “Should We Engineer Species in Order to Save Them?”

For those who were unable to attend the event, Sr. Vice Provost Franko noted there is a great article on the Northeastern Global news about the event.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko also noted that Provost Madigan met with the department chairs across the university on Monday, March 25 to talk about budget matters, faculty searches and answer questions from the chairs. Vice Provost Franko said she meets with the chairs monthly in a chairs’ forum and will try to schedule the Provost for the next month.

She shared a reminder that the university will have AI in action week in the first week of April. There are a variety of over 40 sessions across the global network. And she shared a reminder about the Academic Honors Convocation that will happen on April 18th this year from 2:00- 3:30 p.m. in the Blackman Auditorium.

Jackie Isaacs, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Otonye Braide-Moncoeur, Provost Fellow for Honorifics, have been gathering all this information from the colleges and schools so that we have a very wonderful, robust list to be presented at the Academic Honors Convocation.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A. REPORT OF THE ENROLLMENT & ADMISSIONS POLICY COMMITTEE (Prof. Jenn Ingemi). (The report is posted to the senate website. Below are some presentation highlights.)

Prof. Ingemi noted this was a continuation of the discussion from the last 3_13_24 meeting. She noted the committee took the feedback from the 3_13 discussion and went back to the drawing board and revisited their resolutions.

She reminded all that the committee was charged to investigate, research and develop a proposal and policy for tuition remission to increase the benefit by providing tuition exchange at other institutions.

She summarized the committee’s earlier report reminding faculty that in 2023 a survey went out to the faculty to get their impressions or their concerns about the tuition remission policy. About 74% of survey respondents completed the tuition remission questions, and the majority of the faculty expressed that the tuition benefit is important to them. It is a reason that they decide to stay at Northeastern or work here to begin with, and the faculty in general encouraged exploration of other tuition benefit options.

The committee noticed the trend is that the number of spring/fall admits is steadily declining. The committee noted an increase in N.U.in admit rates and in contract admissions where students go to another institution for a year and have to maintain a GPA of 3.5.

This year the committee extended their research into tuition remission benefits for dependents at competitor and aspirational schools. They analyzed the benefits at 33 institutions, 31 domestic and two international, and found that 70% of those institutions had some form of tuition remission for dependents ranging in amount from about 30 to 50%. The maximum the committee noted was 75% tuition coverage for outside institutions.

The committee also met with representatives of Mills College to learn about their tuition remission benefit before the merger, Mills College offered 100% tuition for undergraduates at Mills. They also used a tuition exchange scholarship program for students who choose to go to other institutions.

Based on that date and the feedback the committee received from the Senate, the committee decided to split the resolution into 2 resolutions with one focusing on extension of the tuition remission to pathway programs and Global Scholars.

B. Prof. Ingemi read the following resolution:

REVISED RESOLUTION #1:

WHEREAS over the last three (3) years there has been an increase in faculty dependent admissions to pathway programs, which suggests that benefited faculty/staff will not have full access to the tuition benefit, and Northeastern's commitment to global experience

BE IT RESOLVED that the University extend 100% tuition remission for UG N.U.in and Global Scholars.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Viola asked Prof. Ingemi to clarify the current tuition remission policy.

Prof. Ingemi said currently the tuition remission policy is that faculty/staff get 100% tuition for undergraduate and graduate courses in Boston, Mills, London and CPS.

The committee would like to extend that 100% tuition remission for undergraduate courses in the N.U.in program including students for spring admissions that go abroad for their first semester and Global Scholars which are students who get accepted to Northeastern and spend the first year abroad.

Prof. Adams said she understood that N.U.in is an older program and Global Scholars is a little newer. She suggested that an amendment might make this more durable to the introduction of new program in the future or changes to the pathway programs.

Amended resolution:

WHEREAS over the last three (3) years there has been an increase in faculty dependent admissions to pathway programs, which suggests that benefited faculty/staff will not have full access to the tuition benefit, and Northeastern's commitment to global experience

BE IT RESOLVED that the University extend 100% tuition remission for UG ~~N.U.in and Global Scholars~~ to pathway programs.

Prof. Lahr moved to accept the amendment.

Prof. Moore seconded amendment.

Prof. Landmark called for a vote on the amended resolution #2.

The vote on the amended resolution PASSED: 34-1-4.

C. Prof. Ingemi read the following resolution:

REVISED RESOLUTION #2:

WHEREAS over the last three (3) years there has been an increase in faculty dependent contract admissions, which suggests that benefited faculty/staff will not have full access to the tuition benefit, and Mills College and most competitor institutions offer tuition exchange

BE IT RESOLVED that within the next three (3) years the University form a Benefits Human Resources Task Force to explore options to apply for tuition exchange or other scholarship to cover at least one-third (1/3) of Northeastern's tuition at other accredited institutions. Additionally, explore options to create a pathway for scholarships to increase tuition coverage for Dialogues of Civilization and traditional study abroad programs.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Viola asked how much strength this resolution had. Could it be ignored.

Prof. Lahr of the Senate Agenda Com. said what the committee is doing here is ensuring there's an opportunity to investigate this topic with the rigor that it requires. And it's really within the Senate's ability to ensure that this investigation goes forward. The Senate has the authority to do it. She added what the Senate doesn't have the authority to do is insist that it be done right now, without the appropriate investigation. What the senate is doing is giving ourselves authority to do the investigation and come up with the appropriate conclusions and then make an appropriate final resolution.

Prof. Viola asked if the 1/3 was in line with what other institutions offer? For example, compared to Mills?

Prof. Lahr said that Mills College used to offer a type of tuition exchange. She said prior to the merger, there were many Mills faculty who were not able to take advantage of the tuition exchange because it was a limited pool system with other colleges in the area. It wasn't something that was automatic and not all faculty were able to take advantage of it. It had different percentages depending on where you were, where you wanted to go or where you wanted your child to go.

She said the committee will need to take out that comment from the resolution. Mills College at Northeastern now has the same benefits as all other colleges in the university system.

Prof. Ingemi said at the other competitor institutions that the committee looked at, 1/3 was the minimum tuition coverage.

Prof. Viola asked if the average was about half?

Prof. Ingemi said she would say that the average is about half.

Prof. Viola said to him 1/3 looks a little low. He said he would prefer 1/2 to 1/3. He would prefer they are closer to the average offered by other institutions.

Prof. Diani said given concerns from faculty and staff about the increase in the contracts and the decrease in direct admits, three years seems like a long time to form this committee and explore options.

She asked Prof. Ingemi to talk about how the committee came up with the timeframe. She also suggested a friendly amendment would be to shorten that a bit.

Prof. Ingemi said the committee thought 3 three years seemed reasonable because it takes a long time to collect some of this data and do the appropriate analysis. But she added the committee would be open to a friendly amendment to reduce the timeframe.

Prof. Toledano Laredo said he agreed 3 years seemed like a long time. He asked what would be a reasonable reduction in the timeframe? He asked if a year seemed more reasonable.

Prof. Ingemi said they could recommend a year. She wasn't sure as to how quickly such a committee could be formed and staffed.

Toledano Laredo said that because of all the work the committee has done, a committee wouldn't be starting from scratch. They could build on EAPC's work.

He also asked for a definition of a tuition exchange? Does that mean that if the child of a Northeastern faculty or employee wants to go to a college that Northeastern does not have an exchange agreement with, then that tuition will not be covered at all?

Prof. Ingemi said how other institutions use it in their policy is that students can apply. They say they use the term tuition exchange as in like you're using your Northeastern benefit at another accredited institution. The term scholarship might be a little bit more limiting.

She said that was what they had at Mills College before the merger. It was a scholarship that was a limited pool of funds that students had to apply for, and depending on where they went, they got a particular amount of money. She said that is how those two terms can be different.

Prof. Toledano Laredo said so tuition exchange does not imply that Northeastern has to have a preexisting exchange agreement with that institution. As long as the institution is an accredited institution, this would apply.

Prof. Ingemi said correct.

Prof. Toledano Laredo said he understood that Northeastern charges X to students who come into Northeastern and part of that X is an actual cost, and the rest is revenue for Northeastern. He said he understood that Northeastern would therefore not want to give 100% of that to another institution, but rather than 1/3, would it be possible and/or reasonable to peg this ratio to the actual cost of a student at Northeastern?

Prof. Ingemi said she thought that could be a reasonable ask. She added she doesn't know what that value is.

Prof. Toledano Laredo said he could imagine that the university may not be particularly inclined to disclose what that margin is. And so maybe Prof. Viola's suggestion is safer that the remission is pegged at half and then make do with it. The 1/3 must be way under the actual cost of a student spending a year at Northeastern.

Prof. Ingemi said the committee went with 1/3 because that seemed to be at least the very minimum that other institutions would cover. She said she thinks on average other institutions

cover 50% of their tuition at other institutions. She said she believes the committee would be willing to increase it.

Prof. Toledano Laredo said particularly if Northeastern wants to position itself as a leadership institution he thinks the least the university should do is strike the average.

Prof. Louise Walker agreed with 50% and said this was also a matter of attracting faculty. In terms of the timeline and thinking about colleagues who have children in high school, she is inclined to suggest a short timeline. She suggested American Thanksgiving as a deadline. She said she thinks this idea that this benefit has been shrinking is very compelling.

Prof. Walker also asked Prof. Ingemi to review how the benefit is shrinking.

Prof. Ingemi referenced a slide from the 2022_2023 EAPC report that shows that there's an increasing admit rate for contract admissions. Contract admissions mean that the dependent has to go to another institution for a full year and maintain a GPA of 3.5 before they come to Northeastern. The admission rate for faculty dependents is still relatively high, so that's a good thing.

But the committee is seeing this shift from a decline in the fall admissions such that students are either going to a pathway program or they are being put on contract admissions. So faculty are having to pay for their children to either do the N.U.in program or be at another institution for a full year. So they don't end up getting full access to the benefit.

Prof. Ingemi added the committee looked at how many dependent applicants there were and what the acceptance rate was. She said she imagined that with the growing number of faculty, we're going to see the number of applicants increase. The five-year data suggests that faculty dependents are still getting accepted to Northeastern at a high rate. But there is a decline in the fall admissions.

Prof. Wang asked Prof. Ingemi to elaborate on Dialogues of Civilization.

Prof. Ingemi, said currently Dialogues of Civilization and study abroad are not covered under the tuition remission policy. If students want to take advantage of these programs, faculty have to pay for it.

The committee is hoping that the university will, create some pathways so that students can get some either scholarship or other tuition coverage for these programs as well. In their resolution, the committee suggested 1/3 coverage for these programs but the committee would be open to another suggestion.

Prof. Krishnamoorthy asked is it correct that if the child of a faculty or staff member comes in through N.U.in the entire first semester that they spend abroad, the entire tuition – at list price -- is borne by the faculty or staff member?

Prof. Ingemi said that was correct.

Prof. Krishnamoorthy said if a faculty member's child chooses to go to another institution that seat is presumably taken up by someone else who is perhaps a paying person. And so why wouldn't the scholarship that we ask for be at the rate of the net tuition that comes into Northeastern by having that spot taken by another student who is presumably going to be paying?

He said he understood that not every student who comes to the university pays the average tuition rate. But why can't that be the net price that we get on a per student basis? Wouldn't that be a reasonable ask?

He said rather than saying 1/3 or half, getting some understanding on what exactly is the marginal cost associated with the student is much harder than saying we just go with the average tuition price, net tuition that comes into the university by another student taking the place of a student of a faculty or staff member who goes someplace else.

Prof. Krishnamoorthy also suggested a shorter timeframe – Dec. 31st of 2024 and get the work started right away.

Prof. Ingemi said that re: the tuition suggestion, the committee-based recommendations on what other institutions do. But if net tuition makes sense, then faculty should ask for it.

Prof. West said figuring out the details should be part of the task force's job.

He said the senate could resolve that the task force be formed quickly in this calendar year, even if it doesn't report back for a year and a half or something.

Regarding the tuition remission amount, he said that 1/3 seemed reasonable but it could say ideally more. He suggested the senate might not want to put too much into this resolution because that will come out in the details of the task force.

Prof. Viola said maybe they should drop the 1/3. Maybe there would be a specific pool of comparable institutions and for some 1/3 is the baseline and for others it is more like 100%.

Prof. Walker said she disagreed and liked the idea of keeping it to a broad group of accredited institutions simply because this is a benefit that is only benefiting a set of employees who have children and so to further limit it would be taking it in the wrong direction.

Prof. Toledano Laredo said he liked Prof. Krishnamoorthy's suggestion better than his own. He said he thought net costs would actually be a good way to at least peg the initial costs for the mandate that the task force would be working on. He said he didn't think the net cost amount would necessarily have to be disclosed. It can remain words -- *net cost* and year to year the university gives the faculty/staff parents of children whatever the remission amount is. That doesn't need to be disclosed to the public.

He added it is important to mandate the task force with a specific, clear and unambiguous charge.

Prof. Landsmark asked for any amendments to this resolution.

Prof. Walker proposed an amendment to reduce the amount of time for the taskforce to Dec. 31, 2024.

WHEREAS over the last three (3) years there has been an increase in faculty dependent contract admissions, which suggests that benefited faculty/staff will not have full access to the tuition benefit, and Mills College and most competitor institutions offer tuition exchange

BE IT RESOLVED that ~~within the next three (3) years~~ by Dec. 31, 2024 the University form a Benefits Human Resources Task Force to explore options to apply for tuition exchange or other scholarship to cover at least one-third (1/3) of Northeastern's tuition at other

accredited institutions. Additionally, explore options to create a pathway for scholarships to increase tuition coverage for Dialogues of Civilization and traditional study abroad programs.

Prof. Toledano Laredo seconded the amendment.

There was no further discussion on this amendment.

The amendment PASSED 38-1-2.

Additional amendments:

Prof. Lahr asked that in the first paragraph “and Mills College” should be removed because Mills College at Northeastern does not offer tuition exchange.

Prof. Krishnamoorthy proposed striking off “to cover at least 1/3” and just say apply for tuition exchange or other scholarship to cover Northeastern’s tuition at other accredited institutions.

Prof. Toledano seconded these two amendments.

The senators discussed additional revisions and that language was placed in the chat.

Prof. West proposed that the senate accept and vote on that version.

Prof. Henderson seconded the amendment.

WHEREAS over the last three (3) years there has been an increase in faculty dependent contract admissions, which suggests that benefited faculty/staff will not have full access to the tuition benefit, ~~and Mills College~~ and most competitor institutions offer tuition exchange

BE IT RESOLVED that ~~within the next three (3) years~~ by Dec. 31, 2024 the University form a Benefits Human Resources Task Force to explore options to apply for tuition exchange or other scholarship ~~to cover at least one third (1/3) of Northeastern’s tuition~~ at other accredited institutions. Additionally, explore options to create a pathway for scholarships to increase tuition coverage for Dialogues of Civilization and traditional study abroad programs.

Prof. Landsmark called for a vote on the amended resolution #2.

The vote on the amended resolution PASSED 35-1-4.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Prof. Diani read the following:

RESOLUTION # 3:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the [Master of Science in Nursing Leadership](#) in the Bouvé College of Health Sciences as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 7 February, 2024 (16-0-0).

Prof. Diani acknowledged Associate Prof. Sikkema of Nursing who said that the MSN nursing leadership was developed at the request of their partners within the community. It has three different concentrations: the nurse executive, the clinical nurse/educator, and the third for patient safety.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The vote on the to establish the MS in Nursing Leadership PASSED: 34-0-0.

B. Prof. Toledano Laredo read the following:

RESOLUTION #5:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish a new program type [Cross-Disciplinary Science PhD](#) in the College of Science as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 7 February, 2024 (15-0-0).

Prof. Toledano Laredo acknowledged Carla Mattos, Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, and the Associate Dean of PhD Programs and Graduate Affairs in the College of Science. Prof. Mattos gave a brief presentation on the new program type. (The presentation has been posted to the Faculty Senate website.)

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The vote on the to establish a new program type Cross-Disciplinary Science PhD PASSED: 29-0-4.

C. Waleed Meleis, Vice Provost for Graduate Education presented the Report on the University Graduate Curriculum Committee Bylaws.

Vice Provost Meleis reminded the senate that last year the Senate the Senate approved a change in the name of the committee. It used to be called the Graduate Council.

The current name highlights the committee's focus on curriculum, reviewing courses and programs, and the current name is parallel to the name of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

The proposed changes to the UGCC bylaws mostly consist of administrative changes related to the change in the name of the committee and clarifying the focus of the committee on curriculum. The changes to the bylaws were discussed with the Graduate Affairs Committee, which developed graduate academic policies and includes Associate Deans from all colleges and campuses.

The revised bylaws were also reviewed by the Senate's Academic Policy Committee and that committee fully supports the revisions.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Lahr asked Vice Provost Meleis if he could discuss some of the changes made to how the committee functions.

Vice Provost Meleis said they have removed the requirement that three members be re-elected every year because terms are naturally staggered.

This was originally put in place because they wanted to make sure that the whole committee didn't turn over all at once.

Next, they removed the requirement of a formal appointment of a secretary.

The chair arranges for minutes to be taken and publicized so that formal role of the Secretary doesn't seem needed. Program proposals in our current practice are circulated to UGCC, which includes representatives from all colleges. They don't directly circulate program proposals to colleges, so they are aligning the bylaws with the current practice of letting UGCC members serve as the representative of the college.

Those are the administrative changes.

There were no additional questions.

D. Vice Provost Meleis read the following:

RESOLUTION #6:

BE IT RESOLVED That the updated University Graduate Curriculum Committee Bylaws replace the current University Graduate Curriculum Committee Bylaws, as edited, and recommended by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee.

The vote on the updated University Graduate Curriculum Committee Bylaws PASSED: 36-0-0.

E. Prof. Reede presented the report of the Academic Policy Committee.
(The report is posted to the Faculty Senate website.)

Prof. Reede reviewed the charges, committee's resulting work and recommendations.

F. Prof. Alexis read the following:

RESOLUTION #7:

Whereas, the faculty of Northeastern University are integral to the academic and operational success of the institution, contributing through teaching, research, and service; and

Whereas, the current process for determining annual workload distribution and adjustments lacks a standardized approach for active faculty participation, potentially leading to discrepancies in expectations and responsibilities; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of faculty well-being and professional development, which are directly impacted by workload assignments; and

Whereas, it is essential to ensure transparency, fairness, and mutual understanding in the workload determination process to foster a collaborative and supportive academic environment;

Be It Resolved That, the Faculty Senate recommends the following amendments to the Faculty Handbook:

1. Active Participation of Faculty in Their Workload Determination:

- The Faculty Handbook shall be updated to explicitly require that all faculty members, including Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (FTNTTF), actively participate in the determination of their annual workload distribution.
- This participation shall include the opportunity for faculty to discuss and negotiate their workload assignments with department chairs or unit heads, ensuring that workload decisions are made collaboratively.

2. Collaborative Process for Workload Adjustments:

- Any adjustments to a faculty member's workload, whether initial determinations or subsequent modifications, shall be made through a collaborative process involving the faculty member and their unit head.
- The Faculty Handbook shall state clearly that such adjustments are to be discussed and agreed upon with the faculty member before implementation, ensuring mutual agreement and understanding.

Be It Further Resolved That, the Faculty Senate urges the administration to promptly implement these changes to the Faculty Handbook and to ensure that all department chairs and unit heads are fully informed and trained on these updated procedures.

Be It Finally Resolved That, this resolution shall be communicated to the university administration and to all department chairs, by the Provost's Office, with the request for immediate action to update the Faculty Handbook in accordance with these recommendations.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Corley said she was wondering about the negotiation that's happening between the faculty member and the unit head.

She said she was thinking about some of the departments that have multiple programs or courses that might be interdisciplinary. She knows there has been a lot of conversation about required courses for some degrees and programs and making sure that they are covered.

Prof. Corley asked what role do program directors have in this process for helping to discuss what the workload needs are?

Prof. Alexis said when they talk about unit heads it includes program directors, direct supervisors, people who know what the needs of the unit is in any particular year.

But what is important here is that faculty participate in determinations of their workload. It's not something that is made for them without their input.

Prof. Corley said she thought there might be some language needed for those who are teaching courses across different units. So very few courses are just within one program or just within one unit.

She said it is complex but she thinks there needs to be a consideration so it's not just one person within a particular unit making the determination without making sure that there is a true negotiation that's actually happening with the faculty and with the department the program leads.

Prof. Alexis said in this case he believes if you consider someone with a joint appointment right, it would be the same case. The resolution is really not about where courses are originated but rather that faculty are actively involved in the process of the workload determination.

Prof. Landsmark called for a vote on the amended resolution.

The vote on the resolution PASSED: 16-10-3.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Prof. Yingzi Linn
Secretary.