



Northeastern University Faculty Senate

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: Secretary of the Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Minutes, 23 April, 2025

Present: Professors Adams, Alexis, Averett, Bhutta, Bloom, Carr, Chiou, Diani, DiBattista, Di Credico, DiCristina, Eckelman, Godoy-Carter, Hamandi, Herron, Hill, Hodeghatta, Homan, Hurley, Ingemi, Ivanova, Kahn, Kevoe-Feldman, Lahr, Landsmark, Lowrey, Mellette, Molnar, Parameswaran, Rappaport, Rawson, Rejtar, Shrivastava, Sivak, Spencer, Stefanik, Strange, Tjiptowidjojo, Toledano Laredo, Triest, Viola, Walker J., Walker L., West.

Administrators: Madigan, De Cremer, Dyal-Chand, Gallagher, Isaacs, Jackson, Tsai.

Absent: (Professors):

Absent: (Administrators):

Call To Order: 11:45 a.m.

I. **SAC REPORT:**

(The SAC report has been posted on the senate website.)

Professor Heidi Kevoe-Feldman reviewed the results of the Senate Agenda Com. (SAC) election for AY 2025_2026.

- Professor Dee Spencer, DMSB, will serve as Senate Chair
- Professor Heidi Kevoe-Feldman, CAMD, will serve as SAC Secretary
- The members at large will include:
 - Professor Adeel Bhutta, Khoury
 - Professor Michelle Carr, CAMD
 - Professor Darcelle Lahr, MCNU
 - Professor Cecelia Musselman, CSSH

Professor Laney Strange announced the recipients of the first Faculty Senate Distinguished Service Award which acknowledges exceptional contributions to shared governance through outstanding service in the Faculty Senate. The selection committee consisted of Professors Adeel Bhutta, Veronica Godoy-Carter, Clareese Hill, Justin Mellette, and Laney Strange. The 2025 winner was Professor Darcelle Lahr and Professor Dee Spencer was awarded Honorable Mention.

II. **PROVOST REPORT:**

Provost Madigan noted this was his last senate meeting as Provost. He thanked the SAC chairs that he has worked with including Professors Deniz Erdogan, Mike Gonyeau, Ted Landsmark and Heidi Kevoe-Feldman and noted it was an honor to work with such dedicated people.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

III. NEW BUSINESS:

A. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE.

(The committee's report has been posted to the Senate Website.)

Professor Walker noted the committee report compares Northeastern's approach to free speech and demonstrations with the latest recommendations from AAUP. Northeastern's policy and practice on free expression does not align with AAUP standards. The topic needs broader discussion than could be covered in this year's short timeframe.

There is also a misalignment between Northeastern and the AAUP policies on demonstrations. The committee also believes this topic deserves further discussion. The committee made recommendations to improve NU's current approach.

Because NU's policy on free expression is defined by civility and respect, but NU has no agreed upon definition of civility and respect, the committee recommends that next year's Academic Freedom Committee be charged to establish best practices for moments when someone at NU is considering putting a limitation on free expression.

The report includes 25 recommendations that go much deeper than the report's resolutions.

B. RESOLUTION OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE

Professor Jack Thomas read the following:

RESOLUTION #1:

WHEREAS the Academic Freedom Committee provides a valuable service to the university by helping it live up its "responsibility to foster a community that protects and supports free expression";

WHEREAS the Academic Freedom Committee was created in February 2025 and submitted its report in April 2025, the committee's work should continue next year;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Freedom Committee be reconstituted for AY 2025- 26.

Faculty Handbook, Module on Academic Freedom, Statement on Free Expression (April 2025).

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 34-1-1.

C. RESOLUTION OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE

Professor Jack Thomas read the following:

RESOLUTION #2:

WHEREAS the Statement on Free Expression benefits the university community by articulating Northeastern University's approach to free expression as bounded by respect and civility;

WHEREAS the final sentence is sufficiently broad that it might lead to undue restrictions on free expression;

BE IT RESOLVED that the sentence be edited as follows, and sent for review to the

Office of General Counsel, (open to friendly amendments for editing):

“This statement on free expression is neither intended to contravene Northeastern’s long-standing policy regarding academic freedom, nor imply acceptance of discrimination on the basis of protected categories or other forms of communication or action that violate *already-established, formal university policy.*”

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 32-2-2.

D. RESOLUTION OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE.

Professor Jack Thomas read the following:

RESOLUTION #3:

WHEREAS policy 617 recognizes both U.S. and U.K. labour law exceptions to the policy on demonstrations;

WHEREAS Northeastern University has network campuses in Canada to which policy 617 would be applied;

BE IT RESOLVED that Faculty Senate suggest, to the Office of General Counsel and the Policy Oversight Committee, that the language of policy 617 be amended to name the Canada Labour Code alongside other noted labour law exceptions.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 34-0-0.

E. RESOLUTION OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE.

Professor Jack Thomas read the following:

RESOLUTION #4:

WHEREAS it is NUPD policy to confirm identity of persons on campus by requesting masks be removed for identification;

WHEREAS doxxing (a relatively new practice of publicly revealing private or threatens to chill free expression;

WHEREAS the new practice of online targeted harassment (aka doxxing) can endanger the physical safety of community members;

WHEREAS anti-doxxing services exist;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate ask HRM to investigate the possibility of adding a new “anti-doxxing” voluntary benefit for the November 2025 open enrolment benefits season.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 32-0-3.

F. RESOLUTION OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE.

Professor Jack Thomas read the following:

RESOLUTION #5:

WHEREAS Northeastern University has a “long-established and pervasive collegial decision-making process” that is key to the University’s excellence;

WHEREAS shared governance depends on collegial collaboration between faculty and administrators;

WHEREAS the committee found room to improve shared governance;

BE IT RESOLVED that next year the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance be run.

As described in a “friend of the court” brief submitted to the Supreme Court by Northeastern University (with The Johns Hopkins University, New York University, and The George Washington University): *National Labor Relations Board, Petitioner, v. Yeshiva University. Yeshiva University Faculty Association, Petitioner, v. Yeshiva University., 444 U.S. 672 (1980). Amicus Brief.* 17 July 1979, pg. 2.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 34-0-0.

G. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF D’AMORE MCKIM.

Professor Spencer read the following:

RESOLUTION #6:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Business Administration in [Business Analytics](#) in the D’Amore McKim School of Business as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 2 April 2025 (16-0-0) .

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 33-0-1.

H. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS, MEDIA & DESIGN.

Professor Carr read the following:

RESOLUTION #7:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Bachelor of Fine Arts in [Film and Media Production](#) in the College of Arts, Media & Design as approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee 6 November 2024 (17-0-0) .

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The resolution PASSED: 34-1-1.

I. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REACTIVATION OF A PROGRAM IN THE BOUVÉ COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES.

Professor Spencer read the following:

RESOLUTION #8:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University reactivate the Master of Science in [Health Data Analytics, MS-Online](#) in the Bouvé College Of Health Sciences as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 2 April 2025 (16-0-0) .

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Professor Spitulnik said the program had been inactivated a number of years ago because of low enrollment. However, after an extensive marketing study it has been determined there is now a strong need to have this available.

The resolution PASSED: 34-0-0.

J. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REACTIVATION OF A PROGRAM IN THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST.

Professor Heidi Kevoe-Feldman read the following:

RESOLUTION #9:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University reactivate the Master of Science in [Artificial Intelligence, MS-Align](#) in the Office of the Provost as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 2 April 2025 (15-0-0) .

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Professor Amit Shesh, Teaching Professor and Assist. Dean of Masters Programs for Khoury College, said that the MS in AI is currently being converted into a University Interdisciplinary Program (UIP).

Vice Provost of Grad. Education, Waleed Meleis, noted that the University Interdisciplinary Program (UIP) is a framework for developing and running multi-college graduate programs and it is relatively new.

The UIP programs are jointly managed by participating colleges. Through a program committee that they appoint, colleges provide academic oversight for the program. This includes determining what courses should be offered; the content of the courses; determining who should teach the courses and handling admissions.

Students are admitted to a home college. Advising and program support come from that college and they get their degree from the home college.

The colleges play a primary role in managing academic oversight and the student experience behind the scenes. The programs have an administrative home, the Office of the Provost, for convenience.

This new model has been very popular with colleges. It has enabled a good amount of interdisciplinary collaboration. There are now more than 10 UIP programs.

V.P. Meleis said that program committees are appointed by the deans.

Regarding revenue, courses continue to be owned by and taught by colleges and following the hybrid budget model, revenue continues to flow to the colleges. There is no revenue going to the Provost Office. The Provost's Office role is to serve as a neutral convener of colleges and can ensure that the rules are followed and everyone is an equal participant.

The resolution PASSED: 27-3-4.

K. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROGRAM IN THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST.

Professor Kevoe-Feldman read the following:

RESOLUTION #10:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Master of Science in [Product Management](#) in the Office of the Provost as approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee

19 March 2025 (15-0-0) .

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Professor Bolick said there are 4 colleges involved: CAMD, CPS, DMSB and COE. Each offers a unique concentration within the MS in Product Management as well as core foundational courses. Once students are admitted and they choose a concentration, whichever college owns the concentration becomes their home. The degree also has a custom concentration option. Any student choosing this option would fall within CPS purview.

The resolution PASSED: 25-6-4.

- Before proceeding to the next agenda item, Professor Louise Walker asked Provost Madigan to encourage President Aoun to sign the recent letter entitled *A Call for Constructive Engagement*, published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Provost Madigan said the University had signed it.

L. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

(The committee report and presentation are posted to the Senate website.)

Committee chair, Professor Alexis, reviewed the committee's two charges involving the evaluation of administrators/unit heads who work closely with faculty and he described the committees assessment methodology.

M. RESOLUTION OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.

Professor Alexis read the following:

RESOLUTION #11:

WHEREAS, effective leadership within academic units influences faculty morale, productivity, and retention, thereby affecting institutional stability and success;

WHEREAS, faculty perspectives are a valuable resource for improving administrative leadership, promoting collaboration, and addressing workplace challenges;

WHEREAS, Resolution 23 (4/24/19; approved 5/7/19) affirmed the value of incorporating faculty feedback in the evaluation of administrative appointees whose actions significantly affect faculty;

WHEREAS, the institution currently lacks a consistent process for faculty to provide structured feedback on many administrators to whom they report;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate's Fall 2024 survey identified widespread concerns regarding transparency, fear of retaliation, and the lack of formal mechanisms for leadership evaluation;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate charge the Academic Policy Committee (APC) to collaborate with faculty governance bodies in each college to develop and implement a confidential, standardized process for collecting annual faculty feedback on administrative appointees not already reviewed through the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC), including senior associate deans, associate deans, unit heads (as defined by each college), and other administrators with significant oversight of faculty;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that each college shall administer the survey annually, with results provided to the administrator's supervisor and shared with faculty within the respective college.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

- Professor Lahr moved to add the words "impact and" to the *Be It Resolved* portion of the resolution.
- Professor Kevoe-Feldman seconded the motion. There were no objections.

The revised section now reads:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate charge the Academic Policy Committee (APC) to collaborate with faculty governance bodies in each college to develop and implement a confidential, standardized process for collecting annual faculty feedback on administrative appointees not already reviewed through the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC), including senior associate deans, associate deans, unit heads (as defined by each college), and other administrators with significant **impact and** oversight of faculty;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that each college shall administer the survey annually, with results provided to the administrator's supervisor and shared with faculty within the respective college.

The resolution PASSED: 29-2-1.

N. REPORT OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE

(The committee report and presentation are posted to the senate website.)

Committee chair, Professor Dransfield, said that, with respect to Charge 3 (reviewing language in the Handbook and the Grievance procedure) the committee ran out of time and the Office of General Counsel did not have time to review their proposals. As a result, the committee made a number of recommendations that they will forward the Handbook Committee for next year. *(There are detailed notes in the appendix of their report.)*

The committee also made recommendations regarding how often an administrator should be reviewed beyond their first 5 year term.

Professor Dransfield thanked Andrew Curtain, Sr. Counsel, Intellectual Property, for all his help over the last two years on the committee's work around intellectual property.

O. **FACULTY HANDBOOK RESOLUTION.**

Professor Dransfield read the following:

RESOLUTION #12:

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 faculty are 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 resides solely with the faculty member who creates them; and

WHEREAS definitions of Pedagogical Works were not included in the Faculty Handbook

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Handbook module on "Instructional Media" should be deleted and replaced with the following module, "Pedagogical Works":

1. Definitions

a. **Original Work of Authorship** refers to works of authorship that fall within the Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*

b. **Pedagogical Work** means teaching material(s), which are not Directed Works, created by faculty primarily for instruction of university students, and include, but are not limited to, syllabi, curricula, exams, sample exam answers, course materials, lecture notes, slide decks, individual illustrations, video clips, audio clips, class exercises, class assignments, case studies, recorded lectures, and recorded classes.

c. **Directed Work** means any Original Work of Authorship agreed upon in writing between the university and faculty author(s)/creator(s), the creation of which is (i) based on a specific request by the university and (ii) which is supported by Significant Use of University Administered Resources.

d. **Significant Use of University Administered Resources** means the use of university facilities, equipment, funds, personnel, and other resources that exceeds what is customarily and currently provided to similarly situated colleagues of an author in the author's department or to similarly situated students enrolled in the same course or college. The following examples are intended for guidance purposes only and do not exclude other uses that may be considered significant:

(i) Use of specialized services or facilities such as equipment, production facilities, service laboratories, studios, specialized computing resources or facilities, wherein fees normally required for access or use are waived.

(ii) Use of financial or other support, including reduction in levels of teaching, service, or other typical university activities (e.g. course load, student advising responsibilities, department meetings, office hours, administrative responsibilities) for the creation of an Original Work of Authorship that exceeds the typical supplemental pay and offloading from regular duties.

(iii) Use of university personnel (including secretarial, clerical, and administrative staff) and research assistants beyond the level customarily provided to all university faculty and departments.

(iv) Use of university proprietary property that serves as a significant basis for the resulting Original Work of Authorship.

(v) The university shall not consider use of facilities, equipment, funds, personnel and other resources to be significant if the university makes them generally available to the university community, provided that such use is not in excess of the amount normally provided.

2. Use of Pedagogical Works

The decision to use Pedagogical Works in any form resides with the individual faculty member responsible for the instructional sequences under consideration and the faculty member's department.

3. Objectives and Content

The objectives and content of Pedagogical Works for courses and programs are the responsibility of the faculty member developing the instructional sequences and the faculty member's department. Suggestions, criticisms, and major revisions may be proposed by university faculty or staff members outside of the faculty member's department, but only in an advisory capacity.

4. University Support for Pedagogical Works and Directed Works

The University may withhold or, after reasonable notice, withdraw its support from the development, production, or implementation of an instructional method, device, or system whose design its authorized officials consider inadequate to achieve the proposed objectives or to carry the proposed content.

5. Academic Credit

Decisions concerning the award of academic credit (how much, if any) for courses offered by means of various Pedagogical Works are the responsibility of the faculty

of the College in which the students are enrolled.

6. Authorship and Attribution

Appropriate authorship or other credits should be given to any faculty or staff member who substantially assists the development or production of Pedagogical Works.

7. Ownership of Pedagogical Works

In accordance with US Copyright laws, ownership of Pedagogical Works which are not Directed Works resides with the faculty author(s), who hereby grant to the University a non-exclusive, limited, royalty-free, non-transferrable, and non- sublicensable license for reasonable academic use for the not-for-profit educational purposes of the University during the author's employment by the University, and, for up to six months after the author(s) separation from the university, of the following Pedagogical Works: syllabi, curricula, and class assignments. Reasonable academic use includes permission from the author(s) to use such course materials, but not to publish or commercialize them. The author(s) hereby grant to the University a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, non- transferrable, and non-sublicensable license to keep copies of Pedagogical Works in any format for archiving purposes only.

8. Ownership of Directed Works

Unless otherwise stated by written agreement, Directed Works developed with Significant Use of University Administered Resources are the property of the university. A written agreement must be executed between the University and the cooperating faculty before the development of the Directed Work. The purpose of such agreements should be to facilitate the free flow of ideas and information and the maximum utilization of such Directed Works. The agreement should address the following where relevant:

- the portion of the normal academic load of the faculty member to be committed to the project;
- authorship or other credits;
- arrangements for the sale, lease and gratuitous lending of the media;
- royalty payments from net income derived from the marketing of the media;
- provisions for subsequent use, revision, or withdrawal of the media; and
- provisions for arbitration of unresolved issues.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Professor Averett asked: If a faculty member develops a class and shares materials with colleagues who are hired to teach sections of that class, when that faculty member leaves Northeastern, would s/he own the PI? What is the policy in that case?

Professor Dransfield said: It was his understanding that any faculty member who creates intellectual property could share it, but it still belongs to the faculty member who created it. The university can no longer use that intellectual property after six months of your separation from the university.

The resolution PASSED: 32-0-2.

P. REPORT OF SHARED GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE.

(The committee final report is posted to the senate website.)

Professor Homan reviewed the first committee charge that included working with the Faculty Handbook Committee to review the Northeastern University compensation module. The committee made various recommendations of changes to the Faculty Handbook that could be voted on in the Fall 2025 once the Office of General Counsel has reviewed and approved the language.

The second committee charge was to survey faculty on the effects of current faculty hiring processes and procedures to determine if those procedures are causing academic inefficiencies, inconsistencies, deficiencies in faculty diversity, and/or decreases in faculty morale. The committee made a number of recommendations for faculty hiring as well.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- Professor Walker asked about extra compensation and summer salary.
- Professor Homan said that the committee did not address this. This could be an issue for next year's committee.

NEW BUSINESS:

Professor Rabinovitch (not a non-senator) presented the following motion for discussion. His motion was sponsored by two senators (Professor Landsmark and Professor Walker).

Professor Rabinovich read the following:

Be it resolved that the University leadership, through the Office of the President, publicly commits to the following principles: to protect targeted members of the University community, especially but not exclusively noncitizens of the United States and transgender community members; to protect, by litigation if necessary, academic freedom and institutional independence as core values of the University and its mission.

Senate Parliamentarian Jonathan Kahn clarified that the senate was not voting on the merits of the resolution, but rather the option to add the resolution as a formal agenda item for the first senate meeting in Fall 2025.

The motion PASSED: 29-1-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Professor Dee Spencer