



TO: All Full-time Faculty Members
FROM: Faculty Senate Agenda Committee
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting

The fifteenth meeting of the sixty-fifth Faculty Senate will be:

Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 --- **AMENDED AS OF 4_21_26**
Time: 11:45 AM to 3:30 p.m. ET – OR THE CLOSE OF BUSINESS

- UPDATES:**
- * **UPDATED LANGUAGE FOR TRACE RESOLUTION.**
 - * **UPDATED LANGUAGE FOR APC RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH COLLEGE-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEES.**
 - * **SHARED GOVERNANCE UPDATED REPORT.**
 - * **INCLUSION OF FAC REPORT / RESOLUTIONS.**

VIRTUAL MEETING via Teams

Please note, the meeting will be recorded for the purpose of taking notes. All Senators and Appointed Administrators have been sent an invite.

**We ask all participants to start the meeting muted.
For other faculty who wish to participate, please click on the link below.**

Supporting curriculum documentation is attached AND embedded in curriculum program proposal name. Click on program name. You will be brought to Courseleaf.

I. CALL TO ORDER.

APPROVAL OF 4_8_26 MINUTES.

II. REPORTS

- A. SAC REPORT (PROFESSOR DEE SPENCER, DMSB).**
- B. PROVOST'S REPORT (PROVOST BETH WINKELSTEIN).**
- C. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.**
- D. SENATE DISTINGUISHED SERVICES AWARD.**
- E. CURRICULUM ITEM.**

- 1. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS MEDIA AND DESIGN (PROFESSOR SIVAK).**

RESOLUTION #1:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the [Master of Science in Design](#), MS in the College of Arts, Media and Design approved by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee 25 March, 2026 (13-2-4).

III. PRESENTATION(S):

- A. SENATE AGENDA COMMITTEE.**
ADEEL BHUTTA, KHOURY.

MICHELLE CARR, CAMD.
PETER DESNOYERS, KHOURY.
HEIDI KEVOE-FELDMAN, CAMD – SENATE SECRETARY.
CECELIA MUSSELMAN, CSSH.
DEE SPENCER, DMSB – CHAIR.

RESOLUTION: ANNUAL FACULTY FEEDBACK ON UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS.

RESOLUTION # 2:

WHEREAS, ongoing faculty input on administrative leadership supports institutional effectiveness and shared governance; and

WHEREAS, providing faculty with a structured opportunity to share feedback on administrative leadership fosters a culture of mutual respect, strengthens collegial collaboration, and supports faculty morale by affirming that their professional experience and perspectives meaningfully inform institutional decision-making; and
WHEREAS, the Provost has committed to establishing a visible and consistent mechanism through which faculty voices are heard confidentially and anonymously in the evaluation of administrators;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Office of the Provost shall set up and manage, on an annual basis, a confidential and anonymous feedback process through which full-time faculty provide input on their college dean. The Office of the Provost shall determine the instrument and administration method and shall carefully review and incorporate the feedback as appropriate in its evaluation of each dean.
2. The Office of the Provost shall assist each college dean in setting up and managing, on an annual basis, a confidential and anonymous feedback process through which full-time faculty provide input on department chairs (or their equivalent), and associate deans. The Office of the Provost shall develop a standardized instrument for use across all colleges to ensure consistency.
3. The Office of the Provost shall confirm to the Senate Agenda Committee by December 1 of each academic year that the processes described in sections 1 and 2 have begun.
4. In any year in which the AEOC conducts a formal evaluation of an administrator, the Office of the Provost shall not conduct a separate faculty feedback process for that administrator

B. UPDATE FROM THE TRACE COMMITTEE:

AMY BRYZGEL, CAMD.
MIKE GONYEAU, BCHS.
STEVE LUSTIG, COE, CHAIR.
TALIA VESTRI, CSSH.
SUSAN WANG, MCNU.
JOANNA WEAVER, COS.

RESOLUTION TRACE SURVEY RESOLUTION.

RESOLUTION #3.

WHEREAS: Resolution 24 (passed 25-0-0, 4/1/2020; Provost approved 4/10/2020) states: BE IT RESOLVED that usage of Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) surveys such as TRACE in merit, tenure, and/or promotion considerations must involve (a) analysis of multiple SET queries and (b) utilization of multiple measures of the distribution of the responses (such as median or mode) rather than only the average of responses, and

WHEREAS: Resolution 25 (passed 44-0-0, 3/26/2025; Provost approved 5/5/2025) states: BE IT RESOLVED that TRACE survey results be used as one component in more comprehensive assessment of teaching effectiveness in faculty merit, promotion, and tenure processes that includes peer evaluations and instructors' teaching reflections, and

WHEREAS: The Provost's office requires on TRACE survey a summative instrument for assessing "teaching effectiveness", and the query "The instruction was effective at helping students learn in this course" being answered as either "Almost always effective (more than 80% of the time), or Usually effective (about 60–80% of the time), or Sometimes effective (about 40–59% of the time), or Rarely effective (about 20–39% of the time), or Almost never effective (less than 20% of the time)" is single-construct and psychometrically valid, is answerable by students' observation, focuses on the instructor's actions, contains an internal Rubric for each response choice, and is considered fair across all teaching styles and course formats, and

WHEREAS: The global Northeastern University faculty and the Student Government have provided valuable and legitimate feedback for revising the TRACE survey instrument, and

WHEREAS: The TRACE survey revision reminds students to focus on course material, student learning, instructor actions, instruction instead of instructors' personal qualities, and emphasizes precise questions with actionable feedback for faculty, as recommended by the TRACE Committee,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the TRACE survey be revised to the structure and content presented below.

Please evaluate this class based on *its content, your engagement with the material, your learning of intended course materials*, and the *instructor's actions*, rather than any unrelated attributes. Given the intended use of the TRACE to enhance teaching, we welcome student comments that are thoughtful, professional, constructive, and considerate. Your answers are anonymous and confidential.

Student reflection

1. How often did you attend this class?

- 80-100% of class meetings
- 60-80% of class meetings
- 40-60% of class meetings
- 20-40% of class meetings
- 1-20% of class meetings
- There were no class meetings to attend

2. The number of hours per week I usually devoted to this course outside scheduled class meeting times is

- More than 10
- 8-10
- 5-7
- 3-4
- 0-2

3. What could I have done to make this course better for myself?

Course-related questions

4. The syllabus clearly described what I was expected to learn and how the course would be conducted

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- I am not familiar with the contents of the syllabus

5. The required and additional course materials were helpful for my learning in this course.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Learning-related questions

6. Class sessions (in person or online, or any other type of class meeting) were helpful for learning.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree

- Strongly Disagree
- There were no class sessions

7. I understood what I should learn from the course.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Instructor-related questions

8. The instructor consistently explained how students would be assessed in the course.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

9. The instructor helped students identify ways to learn the course material.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

10. The instructor created opportunities for students to be engaged in the course.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

11. The instructor clearly communicated ideas and information.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

12. The instruction was effective at helping students learn in this course.

- Almost always effective (more than 80% of the time)
- Usually effective (about 60-80% of the time)
- Sometimes effective (about 40-59% of the time)
- Rarely effective (about 20-39% of the time)
- Almost never effective (less than 20% of the time)

13. What did the instructor do well?

14. What could be improved about the course?

C. **ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE.**

JACQUES ALEXIS, CPS – CHAIR.

CAITLIN BRADLEY, BCHS.

DEB FRANKO, SR. VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, EX OFFICIO MEMBER.

SETH HUTCHINSON, KHOURY.

KRISTEN MATHIEU GONZALEZ, BCHS – CO CHAIR.

JORDAN THERIAULT-BROWN, COS.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE FACULTY HANDBOOK LANGUAGE ON FACULTY WORKLOAD.

RESOLUTION #4.

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate approved APC Resolution #13 of 2024, which was subsequently approved by the Office of the Provost on May 3, 2024, calling for clarification and standardization of faculty participation in annual workload determination and adjustment; and

WHEREAS the Academic Policy Committee has developed proposed Faculty Handbook language to implement the intent of Resolution #13 of 2024, in collaboration with the Faculty Handbook Committee; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook Committee reviewed and approved the proposed language;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate approves the following revised Faculty Handbook language addressing faculty participation in workload determination and adjustment:

All full-time faculty members participate in some combination of instructional; research; scholarship; and creative and service activities that have been established to encourage the general development of Northeastern University students. Given that academic units vary in their contributions to the University mission, components of the workload policy will vary from one department or unit to another. However, each academic unit must have a comprehensive workload policy in accordance with criteria jointly approved by the University's provost and the Faculty Senate. Further, full-time faculty will have the opportunity to discuss their workload assignments with their department chair or unit head before implementation. Initial workload assignments and any subsequent modifications shall be discussed with the faculty member by the chair or unit head through a collaborative process intended to promote mutual understanding and address questions or concerns regarding the assignment. Each unit's workload policy must be approved by a vote of the full-time faculty of the academic unit and be approved by the College dean and the provost. Faculty workloads are administered by the appropriate academic unit head and or college deans.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Handbook Committee, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, is directed to incorporate the approved language into the Faculty Handbook and communicate the update to academic unit leaders.

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH COLLEGE-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY FEEDBACK.

RESOLUTION #5.

WHEREAS Faculty Senate Resolution #41 (2025), approved by the Office of the Provost, directs the development and implementation of a confidential and standardized annual process for collecting faculty feedback on administrative appointees who are not reviewed through the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC); and

WHEREAS Resolution #41 requires that this process be administered annually within each college and that evaluation results be shared with the administrator's supervisor and with full-time faculty within the respective college; and

WHEREAS regular faculty feedback on academic administrators promotes transparency, accountability, and effective shared governance within the university; and

WHEREAS effective implementation of Resolution #41 requires a clearly defined faculty governance structure at the college level to administer and oversee the evaluation process;

Be it resolved that each college shall establish a College-Level Administrator Review Committee responsible for administering and overseeing the annual faculty feedback process required under Faculty Senate Resolution #41 for administrators who are not evaluated through the Administrator Evaluation Oversight Committee (AEOC);

Be it further resolved that administrators subject to this process shall include Senior Associate Deans of Academic Affairs, Senior Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs, Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs, Senior Associate Deans for Academic Programs, Associate Deans of Graduate Programs, Associate Deans of Undergraduate Programs, Associate Deans of Research and Innovation, Associate Deans of Curricular Development, Associate Deans of Graduate Education, Unit Heads, and Group Chairs, or equivalent administrative roles whose responsibilities include significant oversight of faculty;

Be it further resolved that the College-Level Administrator Review Committee shall consist of five (5) to seven (7) full-time faculty members elected by the full-time 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 maintain continuity. Faculty holding administrative appointments shall be ineligible to serve on the Committee; and

Be it further resolved that the Committee shall administer an annual confidential survey of full-time faculty within the college to collect feedback regarding the leadership and administrative performance of the administrators subject to this process. The Committee shall use the evaluation instrument recommended in the Academic Policy Committee's 2025–2026 Final Report as the baseline instrument. Colleges may adapt or supplement the instrument to address college-specific governance structures or administrative responsibilities, provided that the core evaluation dimensions remain intact; and

Be it further resolved that the Committee shall compile the evaluation results in aggregated and anonymized form and prepare a summary report. The report shall be transmitted to the administrator's supervisor and the college dean, shared with the full-time faculty of the college, and provided to the Senate Agenda Committee for institutional awareness and oversight.

D. SHARED GOVERNANCE.

LAUREL AHNERT, CAMD.

JOHN, BAI, DMSB.

TIM DRANSFIELD, COS.

FELIX MUZNY, KHOURY.

ROGER SPARKS, MCNU.

YIYUAN SUN, BCHS.

RESOLUTION: FACULTY SENATE STATEMENT ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FACULTY-INITIATED NO-CONFIDENCE PROCEDURES.

RESOLUTION #6:

WHEREAS, shared governance depends on the ability of faculty to express collective judgment regarding administrative leadership when circumstances warrant; and

WHEREAS, existing administrator evaluation processes are periodic, administrative in nature, and do not provide a formal, faculty-initiated mechanism to express a loss of confidence and do not distinguish between procedures applicable to unit-level administrators (including deans and below) and those applicable to senior administrators, reflecting differences in scope and institutional impact; and

WHEREAS, the absence of clearly defined procedures for no-confidence votes may lead to inconsistent practices, lack of transparency, and unnecessary escalation of governance concerns; and

WHEREAS, institutions of higher education commonly maintain formal no-confidence procedures to address extraordinary situations involving breakdowns in trust, leadership, or institutional functioning; and

WHEREAS, the establishment of a general framework for no-confidence procedures promotes fairness, clarity, due process, and institutional stability;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the establishment of the following formal, faculty-driven no-confidence process as a component of shared governance for unit-level administrators:

A. Unit-Level Administrators (Dean and Below)

The unit-level process is designed to address situations in which leadership within a school, department, or administrative unit is perceived to impair the functioning, trust, or integrity of that unit.

Initiation Phase:

- A petition must be supported by at least 30% of eligible voting faculty within the unit.
- The petition is submitted through a secure, confidential, and verifiable system administered by the Faculty Senate Office.
- The Senate Office verifies eligibility and threshold compliance within a defined timeline (typically within five business days).

Notification and Meeting:

- Upon verification, all eligible faculty are notified in writing.
- A special faculty meeting is scheduled within a defined window (14–30 days).
- The full resolution text and supporting materials are distributed in advance.
- The initiating faculty present the resolution.
- The administrator is provided an opportunity to respond.

Deliberation and Voting:

- A quorum requires at least 50% participation of eligible faculty.
- Voting is conducted via a secure, confidential ballot administered by the Senate Office.
- Approval requires a two-thirds majority of votes cast.

Certification and Communication:

- Results are certified within five business days.
- A formal report is distributed to faculty, the administrator, the administrator's supervisor, and the Provost.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the establishment of the following formal, faculty-driven no-confidence process for senior administrators:

Initiation:

- A petition may be initiated through:
 - (i) a majority vote of the Senate Agenda Committee,
 - (ii) 30% of Faculty Senate membership, or
 - (iii) 25% of the full faculty electorate.
- The petition must include a clear statement of concerns and supporting rationale.

Review Process:

- An Ad Hoc Review Committee is established to gather information, solicit input, and ensure procedural fairness.
- The administrator receives formal notice and may submit a written response and address the Senate.

Voting:

- Voting is conducted by secure ballot across the full faculty electorate.
- A quorum of at least 50% participation is required.
- Approval requires a majority of votes cast.

Outcome:

- Results are transmitted to the President and/or Board of Trustees.
- A formal written response is required within 30 days outlining any actions or further review.

HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.

PETER DESNOYERS, KHOURY.

COSTAS PANAGOPOULOS, CSSH.

OYINDA OYELARAN, COS – CO-CHAIR.

MARKETA REJTAR, BCHS – CHAIR.

KRISTIN STANKARD, BCHS.

LANEY STRANGE, KHOURY.

**RESOLUTION: FACULTY HANDBOOK GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE PROCESS, TIMELINE,
AND EXCEPTIONS TO TIMELINE AND RELATED UPDATES.**

RESOLUTION #7.

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook's timeline for the Full-time Faculty Grievance Procedure is cumbersome, and the section is in need of improved flow and clarity.

WHEREAS The Faculty Handbook does not specifically address how to manage grievances that are submitted when faculty are not on contract or they are on an approved leave.

WHEREAS The role of the ad hoc Mediation Committee appears clear; however, there is an opportunity to improve contextual wording for better clarity and flow.

WHEREAS Human Resources (HR) Department involvement in the grievance process is not explicitly mentioned in the FH, but its possibility can be inferred. FH should be inclusive but not limiting in who should be included in the grievance proceedings, and such an opportunity and support should be offered fairly to both sides.

WHEREAS The Senate Agenda Committee liaison is not specifically mentioned in the Full-time Faculty Grievance Procedure of the FH.

WHEREAS Faculty-related grievances filed specifically against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost, are infrequent; they may happen, and as such, the FH should have a process in place for such instances, ensuring accountability at all levels of the University.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT The Full-time Faculty Grievance Procedure in the Faculty Handbook should have four distinct subsections: (1) Definitions and Eligibility, (2) Grievance Process and Details, (3) Typical Grievance Process Timeline, and (4) Grievance Process Timeline Exceptions, and shall be updated and amended as follows:

Full-time¹ Faculty Grievance Procedure²

From time to time within the University community, disputes may arise between a faculty member and a department chair (or equivalent), Dean, Provost, or other administrator in which there are allegations of inequitable treatment, violation of academic freedom, or violation of University policy or procedures in some action that affects the faculty member. Administrators should work carefully to avoid such situations and, should they occur, make every effort to resolve them before they become formal grievances. Similarly, faculty should understand that mediating a formal grievance will involve a major investment of their colleagues' time, and should use the procedure only to resolve important issues. When such a dispute arises, it is important that the parties work in good faith to resolve the situation informally, as quickly as possible. The aggrieved faculty member should attempt to meet with the person whose action is the focus of the dispute in order to discuss and resolve the situation. If resolution is not achieved, they should attempt to meet first with the Dean and, if the Dean is unable to resolve the dispute, then with the Provost (or Provost's representative) to make them aware of the situation and discuss paths to resolution. If, after making these attempts at informal resolution, the faculty member is not satisfied, they may proceed formally within the regular grievance procedure, including the option for Early Provostial Review.³

1. Definitions and Eligibility

a. Definition of "Grievance" A grievance is defined as a complaint by a faculty member that they:

1. had been subject to a violation, misinterpretation or inequitable application of the provisions of the Faculty Handbook or other published University or unit policies or procedures; or
2. had otherwise been treated unfairly or inequitably.

b. Eligibility and Applicability This procedure is available to all full-time faculty. This grievance procedure does not apply with respect to tenure or early tenure decisions, nor does it apply to a Dismissal Proceeding or any final action pursuant to it. If a grievant makes a claim of discriminatory acts prohibited by law or by University policy, the grievance shall first be pursued through the Office of University

Equity and Compliance and its procedures. When this has been completed, any aspects of the grievance which remain unresolved may then be brought to the grievance procedure.

2. Grievance Process and Details

a. Step One: Filing a Grievance

1. A formal grievance is filed in writing with the Senate Agenda Committee (SAC). Copies of the grievance will be sent to the Department Chair (or equivalent), Dean, Provost, and (if not one of these) the person whose action occasioned the grievance. SAC may appoint a Senate Agenda Committee member to serve as a Liaison for each grievance. Normally, the SAC Secretary shall serve as the liaison to the grievance committee. Another SAC member shall be appointed as the liaison to the grievance committee when the SAC Secretary is unable to serve in this role, for example, due to a conflict of interest.

2. In a formal grievance, the grievant will state the exact nature of the grievance, against whom it is filed, and the remedy sought. At this point, they may request resolution through the Early Provostial Review Option (see 4.e).

3. When a grievance is filed specifically against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost, another party must replace the role of the Provost's Office within the typical grievance procedure (see 2.e for the process).

b. Step Two: Mediation by an ad hoc Faculty Committee

1. The Senate Agenda Committee shall appoint an ad hoc Mediation Committee composed of three faculty members, with at least one member from the same faculty category.⁴ In appointing this Committee, the Senate Agenda Committee will normally appoint faculty members not involved with the grievant or their department.

2. The ad hoc Mediation Committee shall be neutral and impartial as it attempts to mediate the dispute. During this phase of the procedure, the committee may suggest ways to resolve the dispute, but the Committee shall make no formal findings with respect to the grievance other than to determine whether the grievance falls within the definition of a grievance, and/or whether it is insubstantial or frivolous. The ad hoc Mediation Committee shall conduct the meetings in Steps Two and Three.

3. At any meeting where the grievant is present, the grievant may be accompanied by a member or members of the Northeastern University community.

4. After an initial meeting with the grievant, the ad hoc Mediation Committee may at any point, by majority vote, determine whether the grievance meets a threshold for mediation: that it is neither insubstantial nor frivolous and falls within the definition of a grievance.

i. If the Committee rules that the entire grievance does not meet this threshold, it shall so inform the grievant, the other relevant parties, the Provost (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), and the Senate Agenda Committee.

ii. If the Committee rules that only some of the issues raised in the grievance do not meet this threshold, it shall so inform the grievant, the other relevant parties, the Provost (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the

Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), and the Senate Agenda Committee, also stipulating the issues which remain to be mediated. In this circumstance, mediation will proceed with respect to the remaining issues. Neither mediation nor arbitration will remain available for the issues deemed non-grievable.

5. As the mediation process continues, if the Committee deems it advisable, it may require the attendance of the person whose action occasioned the grievance and any other persons who might be of aid in resolving the grievance, including but not limited to the Director of the Office for University Equity and Compliance, or the Director of the Disability Resource Center.

6. If mediation is unsuccessful without the participation of the Dean, the Committee may require the attendance of the Dean for at least one meeting to attempt to reach a resolution.

7. If the grievant wishes to pursue the grievance at the end of Step Two, the Chair of the ad hoc Mediation Committee shall arrange a meeting with the Provost or their designee (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), the grievant, and the ad hoc Mediation Committee for the purpose of resolving the grievance. If the ad hoc Mediation Committee considers it advisable, it may request the attendance of and/or input by the party whose action occasioned the grievance and/or other involved individuals, who may help resolve the grievance. The grievant may be accompanied by a member or members of the Northeastern University community.

8. If, after this meeting, no resolution has yet been reached, the ad hoc Mediation Committee may submit to the parties a proposed resolution to the grievance.

9. Unless the grievance has been resolved, withdrawn or otherwise terminated, the ad hoc Mediation Committee shall make no formal findings or report before the end of Step Two.

c. Step Three: Request for Arbitration

1. When determining, by a majority vote, if the grievance shall be arbitrated, the ad hoc Mediation Committee will not determine whether or not the grievance shall be upheld, but only whether the grievance shall be arbitrated. The ad hoc Mediation Committee shall determine if (a) the claim falls within the definition of a grievance, b) the remaining issues beyond any settlement currently offered by the Provost (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), are neither clearly insubstantial nor frivolous, and (c) the remedy sought is within the power of an arbitrator. If these conditions are met, the ad hoc Mediation Committee shall decide in favor of arbitration.

2. If the ad hoc Mediation Committee decides that the grievance does not meet the criteria for arbitration, the grievance is closed.

3. If the ad hoc Mediation Committee believes that the grievance has revealed needed improvements in policies, practices, or procedures in the University, it shall recommend such changes to the Senate by forwarding such recommendations to the Senate Agenda Committee or to the appropriate supervisory unit.

4. If the ad hoc Mediation Committee decides that the grievance shall be arbitrated, the Committee will instruct the Provost's Office to institute arbitration proceedings.

d. Step Four: Arbitration

1. If the grievance is to be arbitrated, the arbitrator shall be chosen from a list of arbitrators maintained by the American Arbitration Association, or a comparable arbitration agency acceptable to the grievant and the University. The arbitrator must be qualified for academic arbitration by virtue of current or previous service as a faculty member or academic administrator of a college or a university. The conduct of the proceedings shall be governed by the rules of the American Arbitration Association.

2. The decision of the arbitrator, within the scope of their jurisdiction, shall be final and binding on the parties to the dispute and the University; however, the arbitrator shall be without power to:

- i. make a decision which requires the commission of an act prohibited by law,
- ii. substitute their judgment on the professional qualifications of a faculty member for the judgment of the relevant academic committee, or
- iii. add to, subtract from, or modify provisions of the Faculty Handbook or other relevant University policies and procedures.

3. The costs of the services of the arbitrator or arbitrator's associate shall be borne as follows:

- i. If the arbitrator upholds the grievance (whether or not the remedy sought by the grievant is granted), these costs will be borne by the University.
- ii. If the arbitrator denies the grievance, the grievant will pay 1/3 of the fees of the American Arbitration Association (or comparable arbitration agency acceptable to the grievant and the University) and its arbitrator, and the University shall bear the remainder of such costs.
- iii. Each party will pay for its own expenses, services, and fees other than the costs of the American Arbitration Association (or comparable arbitration agency acceptable to the grievant and the University) and the arbitrator.
- iv. To assure that the conditions of section (b) can be met, the grievant will place into a non-interest bearing escrow account in the Northeastern University Federal Credit Union, a sum equal to one-half of the American Arbitration Association (or comparable arbitration agency acceptable to the grievant and the University) processing fee plus one-half of one day's arbitrator's fee. Specific instructions for establishment of the escrow account are set by the Senate Agenda Committee and are available in the Faculty Senate office. The escrow account will be controlled by the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee. Upon completion of the arbitration, with the signature of the Agenda Committee Chair and a copy of the arbitrator's decision, the deposited funds will be returned to the grievant if the grievance is upheld or transferred to the University if the grievance is denied. If the arbitrator reaches a split decision on a multi-element grievance, the arbitrator will determine the proportional distribution of the AAA/Arbitrator costs and the distribution of the deposited funds.

4. Copies of the arbitration decision shall be sent to the grievant, the Provost (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), and the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee.

e. Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost

1. If a matter rises to the level of a grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost, then it is the responsibility of the Elected Senators as the representatives of the whole faculty body to officiate the grievance process (to decrease the possibility of appointing biased parties).
2. The Senate Agenda Committee (SAC) shall serve as the Mediation Committee.
3. A three-member Elected Senator Grievance Subcommittee shall be appointed after a nomination and vote by the Elected Senators.
4. Each Elected Senator Grievance Subcommittee member shall be from a different College, and none shall be from the grievant's College(s).
5. SAC members are not eligible to serve on the Elected Senator Grievance Subcommittee, but they retain voting rights in the nomination process.
6. The remainder of the process is the same as for 2.a-d.

f. General Provisions

1. No outside counsel (for the grievant or any other party to the grievance) may be present in any of the Step Two mediation meetings. However, all parties may be represented by counsel in arbitration proceedings.
2. The University shall make available to the grievant relevant materials pertaining to the case. However, documents developed in tenure and promotion proceedings with the understanding that they are confidential do not have to be made available to the grievant.⁵
3. The Senate Agenda Committee will, upon request, provide the grievant and/or the person whose action occasioned the grievance with the names of faculty members or others who may be of assistance in preparation and presentation of their case in the grievance procedure.
4. It is important that testimony and deliberations, which take place under this procedure, shall be kept confidential by the parties and by those involved in the resolution of the grievance.
5. If at any point the grievant determines to withdraw the grievance, they shall do so in writing to the Senate Agenda Committee.
6. If, during the course of a grievance, the grievant's University employment terminates for any reason, the grievance shall be discontinued, except that when the grievance involves non-renewal of contract, the grievant may request, in writing to the Senate Agenda Committee, that the grievance be continued.

3. Typical Grievance Process Timeline

a. Step One: Filing a Grievance

1. A grievance is filed within 3 months after the faculty member became aware of the grievable event. During this period, the grievant attempts to resolve the matter informally.

b. Step Two: Mediation by an ad hoc Faculty Committee

1. As soon as possible after Step One has completed, the Senate Agenda Committee shall appoint an ad hoc Mediation Committee, which shall conduct the meetings in Steps Two and Three.
2. As soon as reasonably possible after the establishment of the ad hoc Mediation Committee, its Chair shall arrange for one or more meetings with the relevant parties in an effort to resolve the grievance.
3. The ad hoc Mediation Committee may at any point during Step Two, by majority vote, determine whether the grievance meets a threshold for mediation. Unless the grievance has been resolved, withdrawn or otherwise terminated, the Committee shall make no other formal findings or report before the end of Step Two (see 2.b.9).
4. If no resolution has been formalized within 10 working days of the last Step Two meeting, or if the ad hoc Mediation Committee feels that no resolution is forthcoming, and if the grievant wishes to pursue the grievance, the Chair of the ad hoc Mediation Committee shall arrange a meeting with the Provost or their designee (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), the grievant, and the ad hoc Mediation Committee for the purpose of resolving the grievance.

c. Step Three: Request for Arbitration

1. If the grievance is not resolved in Step Two, the grievant may file a written request for arbitration to the Chair of the ad hoc Mediation Committee by the end of 30 working days after the Step Two disposition and/or meeting, or the transmittal of the Committee's proposed resolution.
2. The ad hoc Mediation Committee will, within 10 working days after receipt of the request for arbitration, decide by a majority vote if the grievance shall be arbitrated.

d. Step Four: Arbitration

1. If the grievance is to be arbitrated, the ad hoc Mediation Committee will notify the Provost and the grievant, as per section 3.c.2.
2. Within 15 calendar days after the notification of the Provost, the Provost (or their designee) shall meet with the grievant for the purpose of explaining the process of filing a demand for arbitration with the American Arbitration Association.
3. The University must file such a demand within 15 calendar days after this meeting, as long as the escrow requirement has been met, or within 5 days after University Counsel receives notice that the grievant has met the escrow requirement, whichever comes later.

4. Grievance Process Timeline Exceptions

The time limits specified may be extended by mutual agreement if it is difficult to form an ad hoc Mediation Committee. Consent to the agreement shall not be unreasonably withheld.

If a grievance is submitted when the faculty grievant is not on contract, or they are on an approved leave, the timeframe for Step Two and subsequent steps should proceed as written in the Grievance Procedure unless the faculty grievant is unable to fulfill such a commitment. In such a case, the faculty grievant shall provide a written statement to the Senate Agenda Committee, and the Grievance Procedure should be paused (except for the formation of the ad hoc Mediation Committee) and resumed when the faculty grievant is back, but no longer than 15 weeks.

A grievant shall have 2 weeks to respond after each grievance step. If they fail to respond by the end of 2 weeks, the grievance will be considered waived. An involuntary delay such as illness shall not be construed as waiving the grievance.

If, in the course of processing the grievance, there is a dispute over whether a grievance has been waived, the parties will continue to follow the procedure, and if the grievant proceeds to arbitration, the arbitrator will decide whether or not the grievance has been waived.

a. Step One Timeline Exceptions

1. The grievant may request resolution through the Early Provostial Review Option at the time that they submit their grievance to the Senate Agenda Committee (see 4.e).
2. The time limit for filing a grievance, as specified, may be extended beyond 3 months with a written agreement of the Provost (or another party in cases of Grievance against the Provost, an administrator within the Provost's Office, or the Office of the Provost), the grievant, and the Senate Agenda Committee grievance officer.

b. Step Two Timeline Exceptions

1. In the event that informal steps to resolve the situation are ongoing, the grievant may request, in writing, that the Senate Agenda Committee automatically grant a postponement for initiating Step Two for an additional 2 months. At any time that the grievant is dissatisfied with the progress of informal steps, they may, in writing, rescind this request and resume the normal grievance process.
2. Because it is difficult to form an ad hoc Mediation Committee during the summer months, the clock for Steps Two and Three will normally be suspended during summer terms.
3. The inability of a member of the ad hoc Mediation Committee to attend meetings during Steps Two and Three shall in no way change any prescribed time limits.

c. Step Three Timeline Exceptions

1. If the grievant does not file a request for arbitration within 30 working days after the Step Two disposition and/or meeting, or the transmittal of the Committee's proposed resolution, then the grievance is closed.
2. If the grievant files a request for arbitration and the ad hoc Mediation Committee decides that the grievance does not meet the criteria for arbitration, the grievance is closed.

d. Step Four Timeline Exceptions

1. If the grievant has not met the escrow requirement within 90 calendar days of the demand for arbitration, the grievance will be deemed to have been withdrawn.

e. Early Provostial Review Option

1. At the time a grievance is filed as defined above, the grievant may request this option of early review by the Provost. In this event, the timeliness provisions for further steps of the Regular Grievance Procedure are suspended until the grievant receives written notice of the results of this optional procedure.

2. The grievant and a representative of the Senate Agenda Committee will confer with a representative of the Provost within 10 working days. If the Provost's representative recognizes merit in the grievance, they shall so notify the Provost. Otherwise, they shall inform the grievant in writing that the request for Early Provostial Review is denied.

3. If the Provost recognizes merit in the grievance, the Provost shall delegate a representative to work with the appropriate Dean or Chair toward correcting the defective procedures. This process, which may involve any steps up to and including a full reconsideration of the original decision upon which the grievance is based, utilizing corrected procedures, should be completed within 2 weeks. At that time, the grievant will be informed of their status by the Dean or Chair.

4. Whatever the outcome of this Early Provostial Review procedure, the grievant shall still have access to the standard faculty grievance procedure.

For other circumstances under which a grievance may be terminated or continued outside the normal timeline, see Section 2.f, including written withdrawal of a grievance (2.f.5) and the effect of employment termination on a pending grievance (2.f.6).

1. Full-time faculty includes the two categories – Tenured/Tenure-track faculty and Non-Tenure-track faculty. For a description of the positions covered in each category, see the General University Faculty and Bylaws.

2. Passed by the Faculty Senate 2/15/17; passed by the Board of Trustees 4/14/17. Approved by the Faculty Senate on 11/2/1992 and by the Board of Trustees on 6/11/1993. Amended by the Faculty Senate on 6/7/1994 and approved by the Board of Trustees on 6/10/1994. The original Faculty Grievance Procedure on which this is based was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1973. Current language approved by the Faculty Senate on 2/15/2017 and approved by the Board of Trustees on 4/14/2017.

3. See section 4.e below for Early Provostial Review.

4. See footnote 1 for the two faculty categories.

5. In an arbitration decision dated November 11, 1974, the following guideline relating to confidentiality was established: "Documents developed in the tenure procedure involving ... the understanding and expectation that they were confidential do not have to be made available to [the grievant] by the University. Included in such documents are letters of recommendation, evaluation forms, and the minutes of the Promotion and Tenure Committee ..."

F. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.
DEBRA COPELAND, BCHS. RICHARD
HERRON, DMSB.
APOO KOTICHA, DMSB.
SRINIVAS SRIDHAR, COS.
JOSHUA STEFANIK, BCHS.
JOHN WIHBEY, CAMD.

RESOLUTION # 8.

Be it resolved that the merit raise be 4.7%.

RESOLUTION # 9.

Be it further resolved that there be a one-time equity pool of 14.1% across Northeastern University to match our salaries to our closest match-mates in Boston.

RESOLUTION # 10.

Be it further resolved that each college dean complete an analysis of faculty salaries (using BU and BC data, in addition to other UDS, AAUP and other college-specific salary data sets) so that this

one-time 14.1% equity pool be appropriately allocated across Northeastern University and appropriate allocated to individual faculty members.

RESOLUTION # 11.

Be it further resolved that, after the one-time equity raise above, each college dean complete an analysis of faculty salaries (using UDS, AAUP and other college-specific salary data sets) one year in advance of their college's equity cycle. This analysis should be shared with the faculty of that college as well as the FAC to enable this committee to address the standing charge ("2. This Committee shall prepare annual recommendations for the improvement of faculty salaries and fringe benefits."). This will enable a more transparent process for a faculty member to understand the equity process and will afford faculty members advance notice to prepare an equity adjustment, when warranted.

RESOLUTION # 12.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT next year's FAC confirm that the changes being implemented with regard to the retirement plan satisfy the 9 resolutions in the 2022-2023 FAC report that were passed by the Senate and approved by the Provost.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 267 662 002 681 3

Passcode: cb9vJ674

Dial in by phone

[+1 689-223-3627,,761393078#](#) United States, Orlando

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 761 393 078#

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

