

Northwestern University  
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
Pancoe Auditorium - Evanston, Wieboldt Hall 421 - Chicago  
May 7, 2014

---

The Faculty Senate met on May 7, 2014 on the Evanston Campus at the Pancoe Auditorium and on the Chicago Campus at 421 Wieboldt. Chair Stephen Eisenman called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM. There were 48 of 79 members in attendance, with 31 attendees in Evanston, 8 in Chicago, and 9 participating off-site. The quorum of fifty-one percent was met. Also in attendance were the immediate past chair and the Northwestern Emeriti Organization representative, both serving as honorary members of the Faculty Senate.

**1. Chair's report/remarks, Stephen Eisenman**

**Executive Meeting, May 20th and Assembly Meeting, June 2<sup>nd</sup>:** Chair Stephen Eisenman announced a meeting of the Executive Committee on May 20; this includes the chairs of all standing committees, the President, Provost, Associate Provost, and Vice President for Business. The purpose is to review current initiatives under a fixed agenda with a view to the Assembly meeting on June 2. Eisenman urged Senate members to be in contact with their departments to encourage their presence at the Assembly meeting. Good attendance signals to the Administration that the Faculty at large supports the Senate.

In response to a question about Senate impact on the Administration, Eisenman gave the example of meetings between Senate representatives and the Central Administration to resolve a case of sexual misconduct by a member of the faculty. Policies and procedures under the requirements of Title IX were explained and are now under further review.

For the most part, the Senate offers views via resolutions, without the power to determine outcomes, the sole exception being the faculty's power to set curriculum and award degrees, where it is the sole authority. For the most part, the Administration welcomes our engagement in other matters via the passage of resolutions. There is a point at the end of every Senate meeting to introduce new business; a better procedure is to write to the Senate Chair before a meeting to suggest new business. Business for the Assembly may be sent to the Chair or to Diana Snyder, the Administrative Coordinator, before the meeting of the Executive Committee.

Potential items for the June 2<sup>nd</sup> Assembly Meeting include the \$3.75B We Will campaign; the ongoing infrastructure projects on campus; the continuing work of the special study committees on salary and benefits and on climate change; the NLRB recommendation on unionization by football players and related questions regarding player safety; Northwestern's response to the Title IX reporting

requirements regarding sexual violence and assaults on campuses; the University's investment in coal and other extractive industries that negatively affect the environment; and the demise of Northwestern's online learning initiative. Other matters may be suggested and will be considered.

**Update on Special Committees: Faculty Salary and Benefits and Climate Change:** The Faculty Salary and Benefits committees now have chairs, and will begin work forthwith. The Special Committee on Climate Change will merge with the Council on Sustainability.

**Meeting with Title IX Committee:** The Title IX Committee has had a productive meeting. Angela Lawson of the Feinberg School of Medicine reported that they had a review of the University's sexual harassment policies. There appears to be room for positive change with regard to sanctions, the conduct of investigations, and the potential for bias regarding student vs. faculty testimony. For example, the department chair or a dean wanting to retain a professor found guilty of a sexual offense may seek to reduce a sanction. Eisenman noted that more clearly defined sanctions are a likely objective for offenses falling under the Jurisdiction of Title IX, which at present is fraught with problems. Jeanne Herrick of the Writing Program asked if the panel would include people with more expert knowledge of sexual improprieties. Eisenman replied that a Title IX panel would have access to sufficient information, though details have not yet been determined.

**Website Commentary:** With regard to his website commentary on football unionization, Eisenman remarked that any member of the faculty could write a considered reply. Carol Simpson Stern said that at the last Senate meeting it was suggested that Bob Gundlach, the University's Faculty Athletics Representative, graduating Wildcat running back Kain Colter, and Athletics Director James Phillips be invited to speak about the unionization proposal. She asked if those people will come to speak with us and answer our questions. Eisenman promised an update when this agenda item comes up.

## **2. Vice Chair 2015 Nominations**

Susan Lee was the sole nominee for Vice Chair of the Senate, there being no additional nominations from the floor. Election is scheduled for the next Senate meeting.

## **3. Committee Reports and Motions**

**Benefits:** Among committee reports, Benefits Committee Chair Donna Jurdy reported that interim faculty teaching more than three courses are eligible for benefits. Higher level "gold Plated" plans will have to be adjusted downward in 2018. There is also a big change in retirement income, but not for the next two years. This year there is the possibility of increasing supplemental life insurance without new evidence of insurability.

**Budget:** Eisenman reported that the Chair of the Budget Committee is not yet determined. Its role is to work with the Central Administration Budget Planning Office to determine appropriations for the

coming year. The budget thus determined is a legal, factual document in every respect. Past administrations have shown their willingness to engage in shared governance on budget matters. He asked interested Senate members to communicate their willingness to serve. This committee normally has quarterly meetings.

**Educational Affairs:** Susan Lee reported for the Educational Affairs Committee. She asked members to consult their colleagues on faculty engagement in residential life. Service in this area is regularly paid little attention in merit review; some schools do not recognize this work at all. With the building of new undergraduate housing, faculty involvement in living-learning communities is an object of administrative emphasis. Some guidelines are needed to help faculty decide whether their involvement in residential life is worth their time. A Senate vote on such guidelines should therefore come from consultation with the faculty at large. Eisenman added that these guidelines may also come before the Faculty Handbook Committee. This and other service such as Senate membership should be covered by the new Handbook.

A second issue is the new curricular requirement across the institution for courses in social inequality and diversity. The Educational Affairs Committee unanimously endorsed the proposed curriculum that has very specific guidelines for new courses, learning expectations, and the preparation of graduate students to participate in delivery. Lee also serves on the academic working group for the Diversity Council. A report on the status of preparations found that several provisions are now being ignored by some of the schools. For example, in some instances no process has been established for review of the new courses to make sure that the learning outcomes match what had been articulated; graduate students are not receiving any particular training or preparation. Eisenman remarked that this requirement was not only voted by the Senate; it was the initiative of a University-wide committee, endorsed by the Senate.

**Faculty Rights and Responsibilities:** Marcia Bosits, chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, reported that her committee is set to consider questions of computer security, including whether the Administration or IT is able to read faculty emails. Another question regards a no-pornography rule and the policing of legal internet content.

**Governance:** Carol Simpson Stern reported on the Governance Committee. The committee formerly named UFRPTDAP (University Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Dismissal Appeals Panel) required a name change; Stern has suggested it be re-named the Faculty Appeals Committee to distinguish between the standing committee and the particular ad hoc panels that addressed actual cases. However, the language in the Faculty Handbook is at odds with such a change, and the new name should be Faculty Appeals Panel. The Senate action needed is to endorse this name adjustment. This was approved by Senate consensus. The Appeals Panel, which has an Executive Committee, is the panel that initially receives an appeal by a faculty member of an adverse administrative action. The panel,

constituted of twenty-five representatives elected (rather than appointed) in the schools, designates a committee of five Faculty Senate members who will hear the appeal as an ad hoc appeal panel.

**Non-tenure Eligible:** Heather Colburn, chair of the Non-Tenure-Eligible Committee, reported having no response thus far on publication of 2013–14 NTE salary data. Her committee will also consider needed revisions in the 2014–15 Faculty Handbook.

#### **4. Divestment Resolution**

Marcus Moseley, chair of the Social Responsibility Committee, introduced a resolution calling for the SRC to investigate the issue of divestment of Northwestern's endowment in coal production and asking to be periodically informed of the Committee's research and deliberation on this issue. One of the purposes of the motion, Eisenman said, is to learn what other universities are doing with regard to divestment and related actions to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Further discussion emphasized the need to bring pressure to bear on the University to divest and to inform the Senate about progress in this direction. The motion was taken under advisement by the SRC, with the understanding of its support.

#### **5. Discussion of football and sports policy**

Eisenman said he had email and phone exchanges with Eugene Y. Lowe, Assistant to President Schapiro, about issues of health and safety of football players, academic performance of sports teams, concussion protocols, the number of students at Northwestern who have suffered concussions, academic performance, and related matters. Some of his questions were answered, and he drafted a number of follow-up questions. These have been distributed in the Senate packet for the present meeting. John Elson suggested that the Senate appoint a committee to look further into this complex matter. He read the following motion:

It is hereby moved that the President of the Senate appoint a special multidisciplinary committee to gather information and make any appropriate recommendations regarding steps that may be needed to further promote the health, safety, education, and well-being of Northwestern student athletes.

He added several reasons why the Senate should be involved in this matter. One is the football players' almost unanimous vote to have a unionization vote, making it implicit that they feel something is lacking in the present state of their protection and well-being. Another is the forcefulness of the University's move to squash a union vote. The stakes, he added, are very high. The dangers of concussion are extremely serious; there are major lawsuits pending against the NCAA and its member universities to take adequate protective measures. The academic question should also be considered, though Northwestern has an outstanding graduation rate. The local NLRB report that our student-athletes are functionally employees, documents how much time is required of our football players eleven months of the year. A recent book, *The Price of Silence*, shows how much time is required of student athletes at Duke University and suggests the competitive environment that even Northwestern athletes must face. Northwestern coaches and administration face a structural conflict of interest that warrants Senate vigilance. There is also a financial conflict of interest rising from the cost of adequate compensation and health insurance. The multi-million dollar Big Ten enterprise is based on the volunteer efforts of our

students, some of whom have trouble meeting the normal expenses of college life. It falls within the ambit of the faculty to provide a quid pro quo of educational opportunity for our students, he said.

Wesley Roth Burghardt remarked that the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) already performs many of these functions. Ken Seeskin chairs this committee and Faculty Athletics Representative Bob Gundlach attends its quarterly meetings. It includes eight to ten faculty members who provide a substantial faculty voice. Carol Simpson Stern remarked that in her capacity as president of the AAUP she has spent decades looking into these subjects, and argued that the absence of a major scandal suggests the SAAC is doing a pretty good job. She cautioned against formation of another new committee drawn from the Senate membership. Mary Nevin of Pediatrics added from the Chicago campus that there are many issues besides concussion that come up in the context of student athletics. Rather than create a new committee, she said, the Senate should seek to appoint a liaison to the SAAC. Other remarks cautioned against a rush to judgment in such a complex matter.

Elson withdrew his motion, adding that the Senate representative not be appointed by the Administration but by the Senate itself.

## **6. New Business**

Edward Hughes noted that support for the Senate from the Provost's office is an inadequate \$5,000, dramatically less than what is provided in comparable institutions. He suggested an inquiry into the specifics, such as teaching load buyout. Eisenman suggested he put this suggestion into the form of a motion for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned as 7 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Daniel H. Garrison  
Secretary to the Senate