



Northeastern University Faculty Senate

TO: Faculty Senate.

SUBJECT: 4_22_2026 Senate Minutes.

Present: Professors Alexis, Auguste, Bai, Bhutta, Bloom, Bormann, Chiou, Desnoyers, DiBattista, Eckelman, Hamandi, Hand, Hill, Hinerman, Hodeghatta, Homan, Ivanova, Kahn, Lamin, Lorette, Lykourinou, Magowan, Maheswaran, McGivney, Musselman, Muzny, Orr-Skirvin, Passas, Sivak, Sobral-Campos, Spahr, Spencer, Stefanik, Un, Walker L., Young-Hong.

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

Absent: (Professors): Carr, Dicredico, Godoy-Carter, Ingemi, Kevoe-Feldman, Orr-Skirvin, Parameswaran, Shrivastava, Tjiptowidjojo, Walker J.

Absent: (Administrators):

Call To Order: 11:45 a.m.

- I. The minutes for the April 8, 2026 Senate meeting were approved.
- II. **SAC REPORT** (The SAC report has been posted to the Senate website.)
Senate Chair Spencer, DMSB, noted a change to the order of committee presentations in the agenda putting FAC before the Faculty Handbook presentation. There were no objections to this change.
 - SAC has met twice as a committee since the last Senate meeting; SAC hosted one elected senators meeting and met once with the Provost.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

There were no questions.

III. PROVOST REPORT

Provost Winkelstein expressed appreciation to outgoing senators and SAC members.

She also announced:

- Upcoming commencement ceremonies:
College ceremonies: Leader Bank Pavilion.
University commencement: Fenway Park.
- Faculty hiring (tenure-track and non-tenure track) is progressing well.
- Upcoming NECHE site visit (May 18–19) for non-credit credential review.
- Academic plan working groups have completed reports and synthesis underway.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Senators expressed concerns about health benefits changes, including increased prescription drug costs, issues with Express Scripts and surgical cost coverage changes that increase out-of-pocket burden. There

were also concerns around ITS system reliability, including outages affecting teaching and research. Overall, faculty expressed a need for improved faculty–administration communication.

Provost Winkelstein acknowledged concerns and committed to relaying feedback to HR and all relevant units.

IV. SENATE DISTINGUISHED SERVICES AWARD

Prof. Cecelia Musselman, CSSH, noted this award is for exceptional contributions in shared governance through outstanding service in the Faculty Senate. This year the selection committee unanimously selected two winners.

- Louise Walker, CSSH, – Recognized for leadership in academic freedom and shared governance.
- Dee Spencer, DMSB, – Recognized for strengthening faculty–administration collaboration and Senate leadership.

Additional nominees were acknowledged.

V. ACADEMIC PROPOSAL: UNIVERSITY GRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROGRAM IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS MEDIA AND DESIGN.

Prof. Mark Sivak, CAMD, noted this is a consolidation of two existing programs, one in Experience Design and the other in Information Design and Data Visualization. This program consolidation matches the MFA in Design and CAMD's BFA in Design. This program targets both recent grads and mid-career professionals that are seeking to advance competencies in Design Research, Design Strategy, and Practice to fill the increasing demand and job openings that are in this area.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

RESOLUTION #1:

Prof. Spencer moved the proposal and read the following:

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).

Prof. Musselman, CSSH, seconded.

The vote PASSED: 38-0-0.

VI. PRESENTATIONS

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 – SENATE CHAIR.

Prof. Spencer, DMSB, noted that SAC met with elected senators earlier in the year to propose putting forward a resolution that establishes a confidential, anonymous annual feedback process for faculty on the deans, associate deans and chairs. While there was some concern from the administration about overloading the administrative offices, Provost Winkelstein spent a significant amount of time working with SAC on a resolution.

RESOLUTION #2:

RESOLUTION: ANNUAL FACULTY FEEDBACK ON UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS.

Prof. Spencer read the following:

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 fulltime 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

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Faculty had questions regarding confidentiality of the process and the rollout timeline.

Prof. Spencer noted that SAC will work with the Provost Office to ensure confidentiality. She also noted once the Provost approves the resolution, it will go into effect fall 2026 academic year.

She noted that the Provost has the right to dictate all of the AEOC methods and this resolution is consistent with that. The real benefit of this process is now the deans and faculty don't feel like they have the extra work since the Provost has agreed to take on all of this work through the Provost office.

The vote PASSED: 42-0-0.

B. UPDATE FROM TRACE COMMITTEE

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

(TRACE Committee report is posted to the senate website.)

Prof. Steve Lustig, COE, noted this was a follow-up presentation from the committee's presentation on 3_25_26. Since March, the committee met with Provost Winkelstein and had discussions with SAC about scientifically valid survey construction. The new resolution reflects the survey that was passed last year unanimously with 44 votes. It also reflects feedback from the Global Faculty Survey from last fall and valuable feedback from the Student Government Association and is a result of the Provost and the committee's commitment to collaborate and compromise.

Key Changes to the resolution include:

- Focus on instructional practices rather than instructor traits.
- Removal of ambiguous questions.
- Addition of a summative question on instructional effectiveness.
- Improved clarity and response scales.

RESOLUTION #3:

Prof. Lustig read the following:

TRACE SURVEY RESOLUTION:

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 attached 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. 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 or online sessions 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?

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Lykourino, COS, seconded the motion

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Spencer recommended a friendly amendment regarding Q1 "How often did you attend this class?" She would move to change the upper limits of the intervals to, say, 79%, 59%, and 39%, so there's no overlap with intervals.

Prof. Lustig agreed and there were no objections.

Q1 now reads as follows:

1. How often did you attend this class?

- 80-100% of class meetings
- 60-79% of class meetings
- 40-59% of class meetings
- 20-39% of class meetings
- 0-19% of class meetings
- There were no class meetings to attend.

Prof. DiBattista, COS, asked if there was a way to make Question 12 stand out? Could it be put on its own page?

Prof. Lustig said this was a valuable suggestion and the committee would mention this to the TRACE vendor when the committee meets with them in May.

Prof. Yiyuan, SON, noted she was reading the questions through an asynchronized online perspective. She proposed friendly amendments for questions 2 & 6 to add a reference to online sessions and modules.

Prof. Lustig agreed and there were no objections.

The questions now read:

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

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

6. Class sessions or modules (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

Another friendly amendment from Professors Louise Walker, CSSH, and Godoy-Carter, COS, was to remove the phrase "Given the intended use of the TRACE to enhance teaching," from the preamble before question 1.

The committee agreed with the suggestion and there were no objections.

Prof. Ivanova, CSSH, emphasized the importance of creating institutional language that would go with the TRACE survey that indicates how the importance of the evaluation and why the university values this and how it matters. Particularly, for faculty who are teaching online.

Discussion ended.

The vote PASSED: 33-1-2.

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.

(The APC final report and presentation can be found on the senate website.)

Prof. Jordan Theriault-Brown, COS, explained APC worked with OGC and the Faculty Handbook Committee on the text for the Faculty Workload resolution.

The resolution addresses the need for greater transparency, consistency, and faculty participation in determination, and an adjustment of annual faculty workload assignments. The resolution ensures workload policies are unit-specific and formally approved and faculty have an opportunity for collaborative discussion with unit heads prior to assignment.

RESOLUTION #4.

Prof. Theriault-Brown read the following:

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.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Sun, BCHS, suggested a friendly amendment replacing the word "will" with "shall" in the following sentence.

Further, full-time faculty ~~will~~ **shall** have the opportunity to discuss their workload assignments with their department chair or unit head before implementation.

There were no objections and the amendment was accepted.

The resolution now read:

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 shall 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.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Musselman, CSSH, seconded the motion.

The vote PASSED: 34-0-1.

APC continued its presentation with Prof. Hutchinson, Khoury, reviewing the committees second charge that reviewed the survey findings included in the 2023-2024 APC Final Report and contacting each Northeastern college to determine whether the suggested recommendations made at that time had been implemented.

As a result of this work, APC recommended each college should update its workload policies to reflect the principles articulated in Resolution 13 and the updated language in the Faculty Handbook regarding faculty participation in workload determination and adjustment. (The full list of recommendations can be found on the APC presentation on the senate website.)

RESOLUTION #5:

Prof. Alexis moved the motion and read the following:

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

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.

Prof. Walker, CSSH, seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Spencer, DMSB, noted that in SAC's negotiations with the provost they went beyond the deans and the chairs and their equivalents, and now their Faculty Feedback on Administrators resolution includes associate deans.

SAC's resolution also addresses "equivalents" including group chairs. Prof. Spencer noted the APC resolution now seems unnecessary, and asked Prof. Alexis if he would be comfortable withdrawing the APC resolution.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, noted as a point of consideration that the SAC resolution doesn't have a feedback mechanism. The provost or dean doesn't have to share anything with the faculty, which this resolution includes.

Sr. Vice Provost Franko noted in terms of providing feedback to the faculty there were privacy considerations that were discussed in relation to the SAC resolution.

Prof. Spencer offered another option which was tabling the APC resolution to see how the Provost Office does with the evaluations next year.

Prof. Alexis and the APC members agreed to this option.

Prof. Spencer moved to postpone this resolution for future discussion after the senate reviews the effectiveness of the Provost evaluation methods.

Prof. Alexis seconded.

There were no objections.

Prof. Spencer declared the motion was approved by unanimous consent.

At this time, Prof. Spencer noted that the senate voted on the SAC resolution without a second. As a result, the senate needed to vote to ratify the vote for SAC's resolution.

The vote PASSED: 35-2-4.

D. SHARED GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE.

LAUREL AHNERT, CAMD.

JOHN, BAI, DMSB.

TIM DRANSFIELD, COS.

FELIX MUZNY, KHOURY.

ROGER SPARKS, MCNU.

YIYUAN SUN, BCHS.

(The Shared Governance Final report is posted to the Senate website.)

Prof. Bai, DMSB, reviewed the background for the proposed resolution of a formal, faculty-initiated no-confidence procedure as part of the shared governance framework. It's meant to provide a clear, transparent, and orderly mechanism for faculty to express collective judgment when circumstances warrant.

The committee looked carefully at how other universities structure these processes, particularly how they distinguish between unit level administrator and senior leadership. The committee also spent a great deal of time in internal discussion and deliberation to think through thresholds, timelines, participation, and procedural safeguards to ensure fairness and due process.

The committee shared their proposal with the Provost Office, which subsequently consulted with the OGC. While the proposal did not advance through that route, the exchange helped refine and clarify the structure. The committee also worked closely with SAC on the proposal that is designed to be structured, but at the same time flexible, transparent, but fair, and to provide clear guardrails while preserving faculty voice.

Prof. Bai moved the motion.

Prof. Musselman seconded the motion.

RESOLUTION #6:

Prof. Bain read the following:

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

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 (including the President, the Chancellor, the Provost and other members of the executive level administrators reporting directly to the President, the Chancellor, or the Provost).

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.

QUESTION AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, clarified that the committee's charge was to create language to add to the Faculty Handbook. Handbook changes need to go through the OGC. The committee ran out of time and so now this is a Statement of the Faculty Senate not a change to the Handbook. If the Senate wants to pick this up next year, they can work with the appropriate stakeholders to finish this off.

A suggestion was made to clarify in the proposal what is meant as "faculty electorate." Concerns were expressed about the ambiguity and broadness of senior administrators particularly about applying the proposal to unit level administrators and how far down the organizational structure of the process might go.

A friendly amendment was made to add clarifying language to the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED section:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the establishment of the following formal, faculty-driven no-confidence process for senior administrators (including the President, the Chancellor, the Provost and other members of the executive level administrators reporting directly to the President, the Chancellor, or the Provost).

Prof. Spencer noted it seemed many faculty were interested in fine-tuning this proposal next year.

The final resolution read:

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 (including the President, the Chancellor, the Provost and other members of the executive level administrators reporting directly to the President, the Chancellor, or the Provost).

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.

The vote **PASSED**: 20-10-3.

E. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

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

(The Financial Affairs Com. Final report is posted to the senate website.)

Prof. Koticha, DMSB, presented the committee's resolutions related to faculty compensation and financial policy.

Prof. Koticha read the following:

RESOLUTION # 8.

Be it resolved that the merit raise be 4.7%.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Lykourino, COS, seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Koticha said this year there will be a serious issue with inflation with the Iran war and everything that's happening to energy prices. Inflation is going to hit all commodities. If you look at the economic reports, the range of inflation predictions are pretty high in the order of 4 plus percent. FAC recommends a merit raise of 4.7% with the idea that at least it will keep faculty ahead of inflation for this year.

There was no further discussion.

The vote PASSED: 26-4-0.

Prof. Koticha, DMSB, read the following:

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.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Frank, COS, seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Prof. Koticha said FAC realized in the past they were trying to use the merit increase to catch faculty up with Northeastern's match mates. Northeastern faculty have consistently lagged behind our match mates across the United States. But to catch up, it should really be an equity issue.

FAC feels the reason the equity process hasn't been working is due to a lack of information and transparency about this process.

Prof. Walker, CSSH, said she thinks the amount of monies that are put into the pool for equity whenever a college is up for equity are woefully inadequate to address the equity concerns in any given college. She thinks it would be good to include this equity process in our Faculty Handbook.

Faculty discussed possibly adding language to specify where the equity funding would come from but decided to keep the resolution as is.

There was no further discussion.

The vote PASSED: 24-3-0.

Prof. Koticha read the following:

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.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Godoy Carter, COS, seconded the motion.

In response to a question about frequency, Prof. Koticha said this is a one time for all colleges across Northeastern.

There was no further discussion.

The vote PASSED: 24-3-0.

Prof. Koticha read the following:

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.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Chiou, DMSB, seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The vote PASSED: 23-2-0.

Prof. Koticha read the following:

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.

Prof. Bhutta, Khoury, moved the motion.

Prof. Walker, CSSH, seconded the motion.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

There were no questions.

The vote PASSED: 24-1-1.

FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE.

PETER DESNOYERS, KHOURY.

COSTAS PANAGOPOULOS, CSSH.

OYINDA OYELARAN, COS – CO-CHAIR.

MARKETA REJTAR, BCHS – CHAIR.

KRISTIN STANKARD, BCHS.

LANEY STRANGE, KHOURY.

Prof. Laney Strange, Khoury, noted the committee has been working with the Provost Office and OGC to review revisions to the Grievance Procedure in the Faculty Handbook. The committee did not have sufficient time to finalize the revisions this semester. Prof. Strange reviewed the committee's work regarding:

- Ongoing revisions to:
 - **Grievance procedures**
 - **Senate eligibility criteria**
 - Overall update process improvements to updating the Faculty Handbook

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Faculty suggested inviting HR to present in Fall regarding benefits changes and continued faculty concerns regarding faculty welfare and institutional transparency

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.