Present: (Professors) Adams, Alshawabkeh, Aroian, Aslam, Bansil, Board, Cokely, Daynard, Fitzgerald, Fountain, Gaffney, Herman, Katula, Lefkovitz, McDonough, Peterfreund, Poriss, Rappaport, Sceppa, Sherman, Stepanyants, Strauss, Yang, Zgarrick

(Administrators) Aubry, Costa, Courtney, Director, Finklestein, Fulmer, Gibson, Loeffelholz, Poiger, Ronkin,

Absent: Professors Basagni, Fox, Lee, Muftu, Nelson, Ondrechen

The Senate was convened at 11:47 AM

The minutes of 27 March were accepted as posted.

I. Professor Daynard reported that the SAC met twice in regular session since the last Senate meeting, once with the Provost and once with the senior leadership team.

A faculty grievance committee has been staffed and charged.

The following Senate resolutions have been approved by the Provost:
- Senate endorsement of a smoke-free campus
- Revision of the Administrator Evaluation process
- Suspension of the MS in Regulator Science of Biopharmaceuticals and revision of the MS in Biotechnology

Professor Daynard noted that the long agenda should not preclude discussion.

II. Provost Director reminded the Senate of the upcoming academic honors convocation on 18 April at 3:00 PM and urged Senators to attend.

III. Professor Loeffelholz read the following and it was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed Graduate Council Bylaw modifications as approved by the Graduate Council on 20 March 2013. (9-0-0)**

Vice Provost Bernstein was recognized and spoke to the continuing process of updating.

Professor Strauss noted her concern regarding the approval path which stipulates approval by the Dean in consultation with the Provost which could preclude consideration by the Graduate Council due to budgetary matters. The Professor’s opinion is that proposals
should be considered despite the budget. Dean Fulmer confirmed that should a college have no funding, the program proposal would be postponed prior to going to the Graduate Council. Professor Strauss agreed but specified that should the dean approve a program, the Provost should not prevent it from proceeding. Dean Gibson noted that consultation with the Provost, in such cases, could allow a proposal to proceed.

Professor Herman expressed concern that section 3 does not include Graduate Council review of current or proposed programs. Associate Dean Onan was recognized and stated that the Provost’s Office had instituted a new process that was contradictory to the current Bylaws and so the Committee endeavored to express the new process. Provost Director added that new programs could, in the past, be reviewed by the Senate without budgeting and marketing information and the process enables those issues to be explored prior to Senate review.

Professor Gaffney called attention to the Preamble which states that the Graduate Council is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and yet the procedures appear to avoid faculty input. He proposed a friendly amendment that provisions for an annual report include a report to the Senate on “enrollment data from each of the universities grad programs including actual enrollments and enrollment targets.” Following brief discussion, this was accepted.

Professor Herman noted that the issue of program reviews is one of governance. The document does not clearly present processes for review of new proposals or for current program reviews. Dean Gibson disagreed, noting that the department and college-based process is exhaustive and need not be described in the Graduate Council Bylaws.

Professor Adams requested that a summary of changes or a ‘track changes’ document be provided whereupon Vice Provost Bernstein said that the changes constitute a major reorganization which cannot be easily documented.

Professor Herman reiterated that the issue of governance is not addressed and that there should be a specific process in place between the program reviews at the department/college level and the Graduate Council. Does the Graduate Council receive those reports? Can it make inquiries and decisions on those reports?

Professor Strauss proposed a friendly amendment to remove “preliminary” and add “and secondly”. Therefore, section III.A., Process, as amended, is:

Permission to proceed with a new graduate program proposal must first be granted by the relevant College Dean and secondly by the Provost.

The friendly amendment was accepted.

In response to Professor Gaffney, Vice Provost Bernstein reported that the Graduate Council has been focused on new programs but it remains within the Council’s domain to review current programs and the Council could coordinate with the colleges.

Professor Kruger was recognized and agreed with Professor Herman on the ambiguity of the role of the Graduate Council in the review of graduate programs. The second paragraph of the Mission Statement highlights the ambiguity and the matter should be clarified.
Professor Kruger then distributed a document which addressed three concerns with proposed amendments. Following his explanations, Professor Strauss moved to submit the recommendations as friendly amendments. Professor Herman seconded and moved that the proposals be considered seriatim. There was no objection. Motion was then made and seconded to reconsider the resolution at such time that the Committee could review the amendments. There was no objection and so the Graduate Council Bylaws Review Committee withdrew to consider whether the proposed amendments could be considered “friendly”.

IV. Professor Board read the following and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the current Faculty Handbook module entitled “Academic Freedom” be replaced with the language recommended by the 2011-2012 Faculty Handbook Review Committee.

Professor Peterfreund made a friendly amendment to replace “where” with “when” in the last paragraph. This was accepted.

Professor Gaffney noted that the Senate passed a resolution in April of 2010 that included wording from the AAUP Red Book on economic security and expressed concern that the wording was not included in this proposal. Professors Daynard and Herman explained that the wording in question was part of the Tenure module and that Academic Freedom is a separate module altogether. Professor Herman noted that areas of the Faculty Handbook were separated when it was modularized. Professor Daynard stated that the Senate Agenda Committee has discussed the Tenure module but that no amendments are ready for Senate review.

VOTE to replace the current “Academic Freedom” module in the Faculty Handbook with the updated version, as amended: Passed, 32-0-1.

V. The Graduate Council Bylaws Review Committee reentered to announce the following:

Proposed amendment #3 is considered “friendly”, that is: replace “College approval of the final proposal to establish a new graduate program is required using a College-approved process” on page 6, section III.C., College Approval of Final Program Proposal, with “College approval of the final proposal to establish a new graduate program is required using a College faculty-approved process.”

Proposed amendment #2 is not completely aligned with the current process and so the Committee withholds pronouncement pending further input from the Provost.

Proposed amendment #1 [section IV.C.2.] could be accepted as “friendly” by deletion of the examples and addition of “research”.

Professor Kruger was recognized and noted that the addition of “research” [in proposed amendment #1] could exclude many eligible faculty, especially in Bouvé. Professor Zgarrick agreed and spoke against the addition. Professor Peterfreund proposed changing “research” to “appropriate”, noting that appropriateness would be defined by the unit. This was seconded.
Professor Bansil spoke against the amendment stating that it does not sufficiently define the chair of a dissertation committee. Vice Provost Loeffelholz proposed the addition of “…holds an appropriate doctorate and …”. Section IV.C.2., Ph.D. Dissertation Committees, as amended, reads:

The chair of the dissertation committee will be a full-time tenured or tenure-track member of the faculty of Northeastern University and will hold an appropriate doctorate. A research faculty member may chair a dissertation committee if he or she holds an appropriate doctorate and has received the approval to do so from the tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the unit(s) in which his or her appointment resides.

The Graduate Bylaws Review Committee did not accept this amendment as friendly and a vote ensued.

VOTE to accept the amendment to Section IV.C.2., Ph.D. Dissertation Committees: PASSED, 28-4-0.

Provost Director inquired whether proposed amendment #2 [insertion of a deleted sentence] is intended to establish guidelines for proposals of new programs only. Professor Kruger confirmed as there is an entire section on approval.

Professor Herman spoke in favor as the proposal reinserts a role for Graduate Council. Professor Peterfreund noted that the Bylaws contain a process for amendment in order to quickly repair deficiencies and urged the Senate not to proceed with review of minor areas of concern.

The Graduate Bylaws Review Committee accepted proposed amendment #2 as friendly. The following shall be inserted as section II.C.2. prior to the current II.C.2., Amendments to the Bylaws:

The Graduate Council will establish guidelines for the proposal of new programs.

VOTE to accept the Graduate Council Bylaws as amended: PASSED 31-1-1.

VI. Professor Herman read the following and it was seconded:

BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the MS in Security and Resilience Studies in the College of Social Sciences and Humanities as approved by the Graduate Council on 27 February 2013. (5-0-3)

Dean Poiger spoke in favor noting the unique quality of the program. She then recognized Professor Orenstein who explained that the proposal addresses a core area of research focus at Northeastern, competes with programs at Georgetown University and MIT, and expects to attract top students by addressing needs not currently addressed by other programs. Kostas Institute co-Director Flynn added that the program will educate the next generation of leaders in security issues.

Professor Alshawabkeh noted the absence of engineering courses and Professor Orenstein reported that a core course is being developed in conjunction with COE as part of the introductory sequence. Co-Director Flynn noted that more work is planned on courses prior
to the program launch in fall of 2014. Professor Alshawabkeh asked whether there could be a technical degree resulting from this proposal and was informed that it is not being discussed at this time but could be considered should COE be interested. Associate Dean Wadia-Fascetti and Dean Finkelstein confirmed that COE and CCIS had met extensively with movers of the proposal and are each discussing potential related programs.

Professor Daynard called for cloture and, as there was objection, a vote ensued. VOTE to close discussion: PASSED, 30-3-0.

**VOTE to establish the MS in Security and Resilience Studies: PASSED, 32-0-1.**

A motion to adjourn was proposed and seconded. The Senate adjourned at 1:35 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Richard A. Daynard, Chair,
Faculty Senate Agenda Committee