



Present: Professors Alexis, Auguste, Averett, Bhutta, Bloom, Carr, Chiou, Daynard, Desnoyers, DiBattista, Di Credico, Godoy-Carter, Hamandi, Hill, Hinerman, Hodeghatta, Homan, Ingemi, Kevoe-Feldman, Lahr, Lamin, Lorette, Lykourinou, Maheswaran, McGivney, Musselman, Muzny, Orr-Skirvin, Passas, Rejtar, Shrivastava, Sivak, Sobral-Campos, Spencer, Stefanik, Tjiptowidjojo, Walker J., Walker L., Young-Hong.

Administrators: Winkelstein, Alshawabkeh, Auclair, Dyal-Chand, Isaacs, Jackson, Tsai.

Absent: (Professors): Bai, Eckelman, Hand, Ivanova, Parameswaran, Rawson.

Absent: (Administrators):

Call To Order: 11:45 a.m.

I. The minutes for the 10_22_25 Senate meetings were approved.

II. **SAC REPORT** (The SAC report has been posed to the Senate website.)

Senate Chair Dee Spencer, DMSB, reviewed the meeting agenda and speaking protocols.

- Point of clarification: The proposed resolution for the procedural guidelines in the appointment and evaluation of the university administrators is presented for feedback, not for voting today.

III. **PROVOST REPORT**

Provost Winkelstein

- Christie Chung, Mills Collage at Oakland, will be the new Provost at Palo Alto University.
- I have met with the Financial Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate to work on their charges together.
- Renovations and construction of 840 Columbus Avenue; building will have 1200 student beds and is set to open Fall 2028
- Upcoming dialogues on AI in Higher Education, titled "Rethinking Assessment Across Disciplines in the AI Age," a virtual panel discussion on Thursday, November 13th, 2025, 12-1pm EST.

IV. **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

No questions for the Provost.

V. **PRESENTATION**

WALEED MELEIS, VICE PROVOST for GRADUATE EDUCATION

Report on creating a new framework for managing interdisciplinary, multicultural graduate programs.

- Focus programs on real-world issues that span our disciplinary and administrative boundaries; Goal to develop a process to build, deploy, and manage multi-college graduate programs.
 - Example: Robotics is jointly managed by COS and Khoury.

- UIP helps NU market interdisciplinary programs with a single-entry funnel, then students can branch out into any participating college.
- Presentation posted on the senate website: lists existing and new UIP programs

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Vice Provost Meleis: The college presents proposals for new concentrations. The provost's office ensures the courses are appropriate for the college, concentration, and program mission.

Recruitment and marketing: we connect program committees with recruitment teams to sell the programs. Faculty are key partners.

The program committee consists of faculty appointed by colleges that have complete academic oversight of the programs, including defining curriculum and academic policies. All colleges are equally represented.

There is no change in how courses are administered. All the courses are still owned by colleges and departments.

The concentrations live in the colleges, and the provost office is an administrative facilitator.

Two of these programs are grad certificates. There are no plans to use this framework for PhD's. However, there is an interdisciplinary PhD. Sara Wadia-Fascetti, Vice Provost for the PhD Network has developed a complementary approach that works for the PhD.

VI. PRESENTATION

DIANE LEVIN, OMBUDS REPORT

There are two Ombuds offices. Diane Levin supports university faculty and staff across the global network. Dr. Kimberly Wang supports graduate students on all campuses worldwide.

Communication with the offices is confidential. The Ombuds offices are independent of all other university offices and functions.

The Ombuds has assisted 3000 employees and addressed 6200 concerns. The average number of visitors to the office is 400 annually, 31% faculty, 60% staff.

The annual report outlines the trends of the top concerns faculty and staff.

Top Faculty Concerns:

- University values, ethics, and standards (48% of faculty)
 - Standards of conduct and policies
 - How durable are our values, including inclusion and belonging
 - Are members upholding ethical conduct and following policy
- Organizational climate and leadership (45% of faculty)
 - What is NU looking for in a leader
 - How do we assess people
 - How do we help people adopt more effective habits of mind as leaders
- Evaluative relationships: relationship between unit head and faculty (36% of faculty)

- Expectations around performance, evaluations, and improvement

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Diane Levin: I track issues across 9 categories – from benefits to physical environmental issues. Persistent themes involve organizational climate and leadership, with a focus on our values as a university and our community. There are concerns about the relationship between unit heads and faculty, which is the center of gravity for where the concerns are.

I do not keep identifying records to track outcomes. I help people find solutions that work for them, and sometimes I find out the outcome, and sometimes I do not.

Because of confidentiality, I cannot share specific information with the administration. The faculty senate is my partner in problem solving. The question might be to ask leadership directly what data might be the most compelling? What information might people need in order to take action? We need to ask ourselves how we can keep faith with one another and make us reliable partners. That's what I keep hearing.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

Faculty Handbook RESOLUTION (PROFESSOR DEE SPENCER): TITLE: Resolution to Amend the Procedural Guidelines in the Appointment and Evaluation of University Administrators, *for discussion only*.

RESOLUTION (PROFESSOR DEE SPENCER):

TITLE: Resolution to Amend the Procedural Guidelines in the Appointment and Evaluation of University Administrators

WHEREAS, annual evaluations of university administrators enhance institutional effectiveness by transforming assessment from a single high-stakes event into transparent, ongoing evaluation that identifies leadership strengths and challenges, ensures timely intervention to address concerns, recognizes effective practices, and supports continuous improvement and accountability throughout an administrator's term; and

WHEREAS, making administrative evaluations available to both supervisors and faculty serves institutional interests by ensuring accountability, validating the evaluation process, informing future leadership decisions, and maintaining transparency in shared governance, even when an administrator is departing; and

WHEREAS, Northeastern University department chairs and equivalents (e.g., Directors and Group Chairs) and deans are currently evaluated during years three and five, only;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the section of the Northeastern University Faculty Handbook entitled "Procedural Guidelines in the Appointment and Evaluation of University Administrators" is hereby amended as follows (strikethrough indicates deleted text; underline indicates new text):

Section D. Administrator Evaluation Process

1. Department chairs and equivalents (e.g., Directors and Group Chairs) and deans will be appointed for a term of no less than three years and no more than five years. Under normal circumstances, the term is five years and is eligible for renewal. Each administrator shall be evaluated annually in accordance with the following provisions.
 - A. The Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC) of the Faculty Senate shall conduct a review of the administrator. A review will occur in October of the third year of the first five-year term, Additionally, administrators shall be reviewed early in and in October of the last year of their five-year term. When term length is less than five years (e.g., three-year term), the administrator will be reviewed in October of the last year of the term.
 - B. A College Administrator Review Committee (CARC) shall be established in each college for the purpose of conducting administrator reviews as specified herein.

The CARC shall be comprised of five (5) to seven (7) faculty members elected by the faculty of the college, with the specific number determined by a majority vote of the faculty. For colleges with fewer than 60 faculty members, the CARC shall be comprised of three (3) to five (5) faculty members elected by the faculty of the college, with the specific number determined by a majority vote of the faculty.

Members shall serve staggered two-year terms to ensure continuity, with terms expiring such that no more than four (4) members' terms expire in the same year. The CARC shall elect a Chair from among its members annually. Faculty members serving in administrative positions are ineligible to serve on the CARC.
 - C. The CARC in the administrator's respective college shall conduct the review of the administrator in October of the second and fourth years of the administrator's first term.
 - D. Reappointed administrators shall be evaluated annually during all subsequent terms. The AEOC shall conduct reviews in October of the third and fifth years of each subsequent term. The administrator's CARC shall conduct reviews in October of the first, second and fourth years of each subsequent term.
 2. A. For evaluations conducted by the AEOC, tThe provost or the provost's designee shall initiate administrator evaluations and, except as noted in 2B (below), shall have the discretion to determine the manner in which the review is conducted, who is involved, and the scope of the review.
 - B. Once the provost or provost's designee commences an administrator evaluation, or at the discretion of the Senate Agenda Committee, **the Administrator Evaluation**

Oversight Committee (AEOC) of the Faculty Senate will select an administrator review team composed of two or three full-time faculty members who will survey the full-time

faculty served by the administrator being evaluated. The survey will address the administrator's leadership in matters of concern to the faculty. The administrator review team will compile input from its survey, in a manner that both aggregates and anonymizes the input, and submit the report to the AEOC for editorial review. The report will objectively compile what the faculty have reported without qualitative judgments that may be negated by information that the administrator review team does not have available. The AEOC will edit the report to expunge identifying references to the originator of specific comments and of personal references. Specifically, if there are matters in the report that the AEOC believes are of a highly personal or intimate nature, or that harass, threaten, defame, or slander the administrator, or make invidious reference to the administrator's race, religion, national origin, ethnicity, age, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, veteran status, genetic makeup, or disability ("improper comments"), the AEOC will edit the report in a manner that omits these matters or deals with them in an unobjectionable manner.

The AEOC will then send the report to the administrator being reviewed and to their supervisor. The administrator will have five business days to review the report in conjunction with their supervisor and request deletions of improper comments. The AEOC will consider these requests, with the legal assistance of an attorney from the Office of General Counsel, and will then make the appropriately redacted version available at the Faculty Senate Office, as specified below. The administrator review team's report will become part of the evaluation being prepared by the provost or provost's designee or will be submitted directly to the provost or the provost's designee.

In all cases, regardless of whether the administrator seeks to remain in the administrative position, a **A** copy of the final version of the report shall be made available for review to all full-time faculty members within the unit, using a university-supported system that assures distribution only to the appropriate recipients.

If the AEOC has edited or deleted any materials, on its own or in response to a request from the administrator, that the AEOC believes raise questions of the propriety of the administrator's behavior, the AEOC will so inform the administrator's supervisor in order to permit the supervisor to initiate an appropriate investigation into these questions.

C. For evaluations conducted by the CARC, the CARC shall use the survey instrument utilized by the AEOC, which may be adapted or supplemented by the CARC to address college-specific considerations. The CARC shall compile the evaluation input in aggregated and anonymized form, and submit the report following the editorial review and distribution process as specified in 2B (above) for AEOC

evaluations. The CARC shall provide a report and recommendations to the Senate Agenda Committee, who shall share the report with the provost.

3. For evaluations conducted by the AEOC, ~~t~~The Senate Agenda Committee, in consultation with the provost, will appoint an AEOC to implement the evaluation procedures. Its members will be chosen from the university at large, to be composed of three faculty members and two administrators. The AEOC will:
 - a. develop evaluation instruments in consultation with the Senate Agenda Committee
 - b. appoint the faculty for each evaluation team, as described in section 2.B above;
 - c. schedule the sequencing of evaluations for individuals in units and provide each team with a reporting deadline;
 - d. review all reports from the administrator review teams, analyze the results for institutional patterns, and provide a report and recommendations to the Senate Agenda Committee, to the provost or appropriate vice president, and to the President;
 - e. suggest changes in the procedures and/or evaluation instruments, as deemed necessary.

4. Evaluation of the Provost

The provost shall be ~~evaluated on the same schedule as other administrators (1, above),~~ in October of the third and fifth years of each term or less if requested by the president, and ~~be under the general oversight of~~ shall be evaluated exclusively by the AEOC. The

report arising from the evaluation, once reviewed by the AEOC and expunged of identifying references to the originator of a specific comment(s) and of improper comments, shall be sent to the provost and to the president. The provost will have five business days to review the report in conjunction with the president and request deletions of improper comments. The AEOC will consider any such requests, with the legal assistance of an attorney from the Office of the General Counsel, and regardless of whether the Provost seeks to remain in the administrative position, will then make a copy of the appropriately redacted version available for review by all full-time members of the faculty, using a university-supported system that assures distribution only to the appropriate recipients,

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Professor Bala Maheswaran (COE): We should consider specifying a rank distribution, a maximum percentage of expiring terms (rather than a number), and have the CARCs send the results directly to recipients and copy SAC, to reduce SAC burden .

Professor Alessandra Di Credico (COS): A colleague is concerned that this will be too much work and there is no point in evaluating an administrator who is stepping down.

Dean Jared Auclair (CPS): What problem are you trying to solve? More evaluations will dilute the meaning of the evaluations. We will be swamped with excess work.

Professor Jacques Alexis (CPS): I appreciate the intention of increasing accountability in the process. I do not see the mention of the administrators identified by Resolution 41.

Professor Spencer: Resolution 41 was passed last year. SAC wants to work with the APC to combine the evaluation process of the administrators referenced in Resolution 41 with the administrators currently evaluated by the AEOC.

Dean Carmen Sceppa (Bouve): Annual evaluations may reduce an administrator's agency to make changes.

Associate Dean Margarita DiVall (Bouve): It is a lot of work to construct and administer these surveys. This should not become the responsibility of the Associate Deans and the college staff. Allow the college to decide how they want to incorporate evaluations of department chairs and deans into that process.

The meeting adjourned at 1:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Professor Heidi Kevoe-Feldman