TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Mary Jo Ondrechen, Secretary, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Minutes, 24 April 2013

Present: (Professors) Adams, Aroian, Aslam, Bansil, Cokely, Daynard, Fitzgerald, Fountain, Fox, Gaffney, Garcia, Herman, Lee, Lefkovitz, Muftu, Nelson, Ondrechen, Peterfreund, Poriss, Rappaport, Sceppa, Sherman, Stepanyants, Strauss, Yang, Zgarrick

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

Absent: Professors Alshawabkeh, Basagni, Board, Katula, and Dean Aubry

The Senate convened at 11:00 AM

I. The minutes of 10 April were approved as posted.

II. SAC report by Professor Daynard.

Senators elected to the 2013-2014 Senate Agenda Committee are as follows:
Chair: Professor Daynard
Secretary: Professor Ondrechen
Members: Professors Aslam, Lefkovitz, Rappaport, Strasser

SAC met twice in regular session since the last senate meeting.

The SAC has been asked to convene a search committee for a chair of the Department of Economics. Staffing is underway.

The SAC will also staff an ad hoc committee for interdisciplinary tenure procedures to establish a smooth procedure that allows the candidate appropriate guidance and provides appropriate recommendation on tenure.

The University Appeals Committee for Tenure has been staffed for the 2013 tenure appeals process as follows:

**Elected members:**
Professor Susan Asai (CAMD-Music)
Professor John Devlin (BCHS-Pharmacy)
Professor Rashmi Dyal-Chand (Law)
Professor Judith Hall (COS-Psychology)
Professor Tim Hoff (DMSB-Management)
Professor Viera Proulx (CCIS)
Professor Susan Setta (CSSH-Philosophy)
Professor Milica Stojanovic (COE-ECE)

**Appointed members:**
Professor Joseph Ayers (COS-Marine & Environmental Studies)
Professor Dale Herbeck (CAMD-Communication Studies)
Professor Maura Iversen (BCHS-PT)
Professor Sinan Muftu (COE-MIE)
Professor John Portz (CSSH-Political Science)

The Committee to Assess the Role of Full-time, Non-tenure-track Faculty has submitted a report for review by SAC although not in time for this Senate meeting. SAC is sensitive to the great concern among non-tenure-track faculty members on this matter.

The Financial Affairs Committee will continue their work over the summer in comparing NU with matchmate institutions and examining the proportion of budget allocated to instruction versus administration. The Committee continues to work with the Provost’s Office.

The Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee is updating various statistics and will provide a final report soon.

The Information Technology Policies Committee will submit a final report soon.

Finally, Professor Ondrechen will be compiling the Senate annual report which will be made available later this summer.

Professor Daynard proceeded to explain the Agenda Committee’s role in reviewing academic proposals submitted by the Graduate Council noting that, when the proposal reaches SAC is should be properly vetted according to both College and Graduate Council bylaws. Procedures for the two doctoral proposals scheduled for discussion today, specifically those that require seven day’s prior notice, were not followed. The Senate must now decide whether that is reason enough to delay approval. It is important that procedures be taken seriously as they are at the heart of faculty governance on academic matters. In the future, procedures must be followed as written.

SAC thanks all those who have served for either the past two or four years. Service on the Faculty Senate is highly valued and instrumental in preserving and upholding NU’s tradition of and commitment to shared governance.

III. Provost Director urged participation in the upcoming Commencement activities.

IV. Questions and discussion.

Professor Peterfreund inquired whether a Vice Chair of SAC was elected. Professor Daynard explained that the tradition of naming the runner up for the Chair position is non-binding. It is an informal role used only when the SAC Chair is unable to attend a meeting. He will, therefore, name that person.

Professor Zgarrick was relieved to hear that the Committee on non-tenure-track faculty had submitted a report for review and emphasized the importance of the matter among the very large number of these faculty members across campus. He inquired about the procedure for the summer months as regards the work of the Committee. Professor Daynard noted
that a recent resolution has provided for the roll-over of membership when a Senate committee must continue their work.

V. Professor Aroian read the following and it was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Bachelor of Science in Rehabilitation Studies in the Bouvé College of Health Sciences as approved by the UUCC on 14 February 2013.**

Clinical Professor Alycia Markowski was recognized and explained that the proposal is a student-centered exit degree program designed as changes to the curriculum provided later introduction to the program. Presently the only option is to stay until the end of the fifth year. The proposal will accommodate six to eight students who will then get an NU degree.

**VOTE to establish the Bachelor of Science in Rehabilitation Studies: PASSED, 34-0-0.**

VI. Professor Fountain read the following and it was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the BS in Architectural Studies in the College of Arts, Media and Design as approved by the UUCC on 29 March 2013.**

Professor Thrush was recognized and explained that the proposal offers a second route for undergraduate architecture students who are currently focused on a degree for a professional license. It responds to the growing number of students interested in studying other subjects at the University.

Professor Peterfreund, noting the potential international focus, inquired about the lack of a foreign language requirement. Professor Thrush responded that students spend a semester in Berlin and study German and that including language is a good addition.

**VOTE to establish the BS in Architectural Studies: PASSED, 33-0-0.**

VII. Professor Bansil read the following and it was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Ph.D. in Network Science as an interdisciplinary program in the College of Computer and Information Science, Bouvé College of Health Sciences, the College of Science, and the College of Social Sciences and Humanities as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 April 2013.**

Professor Vespignani was recognized and spoke to the increasing demand for trained professionals who are able to advance network science and its theory. The proposal is as Inclusive as possible and is modeled after CCIS degrees. The interdisciplinary environment allows different tracks to be taken among the Colleges and creates interest. The proposal is an important opportunity for the University; there is no Ph.D. in Network Science in the US or the world.

Professor Barabasi was recognized and spoke in favor of the program noting the enthusiasm amongst faculty and the high degree of interest.
Professor Peterfreund spoke in support, noting however that the interdisciplinary nature poses risks as well as opportunities. Many such programs have been approved but have not succeeded. The proposers must work toward successful placement of PhD graduates.

Professor Strauss inquired whether support for students has been procured. Professor Vespignani was not able to answer but offered his opinion that faculty can sustain the students. Dean Poiger clarified that the Colleges are committed to providing funding for Ph.D. students and Dean Gibson confirmed that initial support for eight students is needed each year for success. Professor Vespignani added that the program will be looking for students whose employers are willing to pay for the program. And finally, Dean Finkelstein added that once students are admitted, they will be supported.

Professor Kruger was recognized and expressed enthusiasm. He also echoed earlier comments concerning the importance of process in approving programs. If administrators may decide which bylaws are followed, all mutual agreements are in doubt and erosion of trust between faculty and administrators occurs. There should be no disenfranchisement in shared governance and unified commitment to follow agreed-upon procedures.

Professor Gaffney also expressed enthusiasm about the program but decried the lack of effort to invite participation by relevant and interested departments, including mathematics. He proceeded to describe a foreshortened process within the College of Science that did not allow proper time for input. The department graduate coordinator felt pressured to vote and the process initially bypassed the College Council. After the Senate Agenda Committee found it improper and requested a vote, the proposal was hurriedly voted upon. The process was not reasonable.

Dean Gibson agreed that procedural errors were made within the College and apologized. The College Council met this past Monday to decide how to proceed. They heard the concerns of faculty and voted to defeat a motion to table.

Professor Fox, addressing Professor Gaffney’s concerns on statistics, noted that many universities have both statistics (applied math) and math departments which do not conflict and asked if the proposal would be delayed a year if questions were to be addressed. Dean Gibson averred that an opportunity would be missed and that focus on detail can delay the proposal.

Professor Strauss proposed a motion to defer to time certain (early September) to resolve programmatic issues. This was seconded. The Parliamentarian then explained that because the motion would span two academic years, it would depend upon the good will of the Senate Agenda Committee and the 2013-14 Senate. A debatable ‘sense of the Senate’ motion was then made and seconded.

Dean Finkelstein spoke against the motion for the same reasons noting that CCIS voted unanimously and has invested much time and effort.

Professor Peterfreund also spoke against the motion noting that all Ph.D. programs are works in progress. He expressed trust in the academic common sense of the proposers to make necessary adjustments. On the issue of delay, a program cannot be advertised until it has completed the approval process; therefore, even assuming that advertising can be prepared by the end of September, the proposal is delayed a full year.
Professor Strauss spoke for the motion in order that thoughtful consideration may ensue.

Dean Gibson spoke against the motion and added that the Mathematics Department has been encouraged to hire in the area of applied mathematics.

A call for cloture was made and, as opposition was voiced, a vote ensued.

VOTE for cloture: FAILED, 17-14-0.

It was noted that the next Board of Trustees meeting [at which this proposal could be voted upon should it be deferred] is on 11 October.

Professor Gaffney noted that the documentation shows little mention of mathematics other than underlying principles and reiterated his preference to defer.

Dean Fulmer called for cloture on all motions. This was not seconded and Professor Daynard expressed the need to allow debate and not force the rhythm of the Senate. The matter is one of process and faculty wishes to be heard.

Professor Herman noted that, on the one hand, it is important that this first-in-the-nation program be approved as quickly as possible for the next round of admissions. On the other hand, if the proposal passes without a reckoning of procedural issues, a precedent is being created. The University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) and the Graduate Council should ensure that College procedures are followed as a part of their intake process.

Professor Adams suggested an email ballot by the Senate following improvements of the proposal. Professor Daynard was not in favor of this.

Professor Sceppa, while not in favor of deferment, echoed Professor Herman’s concerns. Procedures must be followed and not doing so sets a dangerous precedent.

Professor Ondrechen agreed adding that an eleventh hour meeting of a College Council is not proper vetting of any proposal. It is wrong and, while she is not willing to postpone the program, measures to curtail circumvention of procedures must be undertaken.

A call for cloture was made and seconded; there was no opposition.

VOTE for a ‘sense of the Senate’ motion to defer final consideration until September: FAILED, 4-27-1.

Professor Herman then proposed a motion to amend the resolution to include a ‘sense of the Senate’ that the UUCC and Graduate Council intake processes ensure that all procedures have been followed. Professor Strauss seconded.

Following brief discussion on the appropriateness of attaching such an amendment to the academic proposal under debate, Professor Herman moved to divide the question; Professor Sceppa seconded.

VOTE to divide the motion for approval of the academic program and the motion to amend with a ‘sense of the Senate’ on procedure: PASSED, 30-0-0.
The motion to approve the Ph.D. in Network Science returned to the floor for debate.

Following brief discussion and a failed friendly amendment to approve the program subject to further discussion with other departments, a call for cloture was made but not seconded.

Professor Rappaport then proposed a friendly amendment to subject the proposal to further discussion with other departments. Dean Finkelstein assured the Senate that there will be further discussions as more departments wish to become engaged. He proposed that the resolution be passed “with the understanding that” further discussion will take place rather than “subject to” further discussion. This was not accepted and cloture was again called for. There being no objection, a vote ensued.

**VOTE to establish the Ph.D. in Network Science: PASSED, 31-1-0.**

VIII. The motion made by Professor Herman regarding procedures for the UUCC and the Graduate Council to establish intake procedures that all College procedures are followed was returned for debate.

Professor Strauss expressed concerns about implementation of such a motion citing materials from the Ph.D. in Network Science. Dean Gibson noted the importance of an in-person vote rather than a vote by default after two weeks. Vice Provost Ronkin, chair of the UUCC, pointed out the difficulties of oversight given so many levels of responsibility.

Professor Daynard spoke in favor and averred that responsibility must be taken at every level. SAC was forced to gather bylaws from BCHS and COS. Whoever is administrating UUCC and Graduate Council should review College bylaws/constitutions to ensure compliance with the routing form. The alternative is that SAC undertake compliance which could cause delays.

Professor Strauss suggested a requirement that discussion be held when considering new programs in addition to sending proposals by email two weeks prior to a meeting of the Graduate Council. Professor Ondrechen agreed that a live meeting with discussion should take place.

Dean Fulmer objected to a requirement for an in-person vote.

Professor Peterfreund noted that the Graduate Council and the UUCC are subcommittees of the Senate and that, if the motion is passed, the Senate will contact both committees and request that these proposals be appended.

**VOTE that the Faculty Senate direct both the UUCC and the Graduate Council to ensure compliance with College bylaws/constitutions by all academic proposals prior to submission to the Senate Agenda Committee as an intake step in their procedures: PASSED, 25-1-3.**

IX. Professor Ondrechen read the following and it was seconded:

**BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the Doctor of Philosophy in Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology in the College of Science as approved by the Graduate Council on 10 April 2013.**
Professor Bracken was recognized and explained that broad global change greatly impacts coastlines. The proposed program is at the intersection of these areas and pertains as well to sustainability.

Professor Peterfreund questioned the credit count noting that Graduate Council Bylaws provide for a minimum of thirty hours; the competitiveness of the proposal in comparison to others cited; and the proposal to train independent scientists as opposed to graduates who proceed to universities that focus in those areas. Finally, the course offerings are, for the most part, in biology yet the biology department was not robustly included in proposal.

Professor Bracken responded that the courses will be taught in large part by the Marine and Environmental Sciences Department (MES) which indeed changes the rubric. The educational objective is to train independent research scientists for many arenas. Professor Peterfreund requested that this be clarified prior to advertising the program. Professor Bracken also stated that the stated credit hours are modeled on other programs being offered.

Professor Bergman of the Biology department was recognized and explained that Dean Gibson has divided the Department by transferring faculty without discussion or a vote, as part of a self-study which recommended strategic change. Given the circumstances it would be reasonable to assume that the chair of Biology would be kept informed. The proposal was not handled in a collegial manner within the College and such things are occurring more frequently. The Senate now must weigh the merits of the proposal under pressure and with haste. Professor Bergman encouraged the Senate to return the proposal for review and discussion among COS departments.

Dean Gibson conceded the absence of good dialogue. He noted that Earth and Environmental Science (EES) and Marine Science voluntarily embraced the merging of their departments but that splitting Biology to sustain the Marine Biology program has caused acrimony. The Dean expressed disappointment that the chair of Biology was not aware but added that extensive discussion had taken place within the College which recommended that that proposal proceed.

The Senate recognized Professor Vollmer, Director of MES, who explained that delay will prevent new faculty from taking on graduate students which has repercussions for their professional development and that division over the split departments has clouded the issues.

Professor Strauss countered that students in Marine Science have been successfully mentored in the Biology Department for many years and may continue until the [MES] graduate program is offered rendering Professor Vollmer’s objection invalid. The process for approval of the proposal was flawed in that the College Graduate Council did not have sufficient time for consideration. At the same time, exclusion of the Biology Department caused surprise and dismay. Professor Strauss proposed that the proposal be remanded to the College for further discussion.

Dean Gibson stated the standard process was followed and, while it may be flawed, there was no fundamental objection to the program going forward. The Dean met face to face with the College Council which was aware of all the issues and voted to move the proposal forward. He averred that it is inappropriate for the Senate to question College process.
Professor Ondrechen declared that the College Council members met at the eleventh hour and were forced to decide between proper vetting and moving forward. This is not a questioning of College process; it is a questioning of an improperly implemented College process. Despite the program being worthy, this type of circumvention of proper process must stop. Dean Gibson pledged that such failure to follow process will not happen again.

Professor Detrich, MES/Biology, reported that the emergency meeting of the College Council provided a good outcome as no major flaws in proposal were noted. While there is obviously considerable frustration and anger over process that occurred, there has been considerable discussion over the last eight to nine months among the chairs and faculty may pose questions at any time concerning upcoming proposals. A vote to disapprove is obstructionist at this point.

Professor Wendy Smith, interim chair of Biology, was recognized and reported that while she was aware of the proposal she was never given the opportunity to read it, despite having asked the Dean for it. There was lack of communication between the affected departments as well as among the graduate coordinators and their departments concerning substantive parts of the program.

A call for cloture was made and seconded with no objection.

**VOTE to establish Doctor of Philosophy in Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology: PASSED, 19-6-4**

X. Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded:

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the report of the 2012-13 Library Policy Oversight Committee.**

Associate Dean Sarah Hooke-Lee, Chair of the Library Policy Oversight Committee, introduced the survey on general sentiments from faculty on library services and recommended providing it to University Library staff. She reported that the survey showed no significant issues. The Open Access section proposes to create forward momentum and encouraged scholarly articles be submitted to IRIS. It also proposed ceding to the University the right to collect all articles but also recognized that certain journals are circumspect about doing this. The report recommends a process to restrict Open Access according to journal policy and that this recommendation be pursued next year by the Academic Policy Committee.

The University Libraries have some monies set aside for faculty to publish in Open Access which are administered by the Libraries. It is hoped that this will serve to cut journal costs. Junior faculty members are encouraged to publish in Open Access without it being viewed as trivial in terms of tenure review. The Committee recommends that language be added to the Faculty Handbook that publications in repository should be given due consideration for tenure review. This will provide more serious consideration for Open Access which has not had support even as it becomes more important.

The report also addresses information management skills and notes that the University Library is working with the IS department to coordinate a more unified help desk policy. And finally, the report performed a review of library policies.
Professor Bansil noted that the CAMD faculty responded [in the survey] that they are unhappy with library and 44% of COE faculty is not happy with the library website. He asked for the Committee’s response. Associate Dean Hooke-Lee noted that sample was small but was passed along to Library administration. However, the Committee did not consider the survey results dire enough for a full investigation at this point. The survey was sent to tenured and tenure-track faculty and to full-time non-tenure-track faculty. There was less than a ten percent response but the Committee decided not to re-survey the faculty.

**VOTE to accept the report of the Library Policy Oversight Committee:**
**PASSED, 25-0-1.**

The 2012-2013 Faculty Senate adjourned at 1:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Ondrechen, Secretary
Faculty Senate