

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES
FACULTY MEETING
COOLIDGE ROOM, BALLOU HALL
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2009**

PAGE

New Business

Revision of GSAS Bylaws.....	1
Proposed New Degree Program: School Psychology.....	20
NEASC Accreditation and Graduate Programs.....	22

Appendices

Bylaws of the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.....	A
Proposal: School Psychology.....	B
Proposal: School Psychology Apendices.....	C

DEAN PEPALL: Good afternoon. I would like to formally open the first Graduate School of Arts and Sciences faculty meeting, and I would like to invite everyone to come up close. Welcome, everyone. This is the first time that we've opened up a Graduate School meeting that isn't nested in the meeting for the faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, so it's very exciting for me to be up here on my own. I'm delighted to have my Secretary of the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences here, who is Jillian Dubman. I think she knows most of you, but if you haven't met Jillian, she is really a person who's invaluable to me right now. I don't know *Robert's Rules*, and I'm really not sure -- and Mark DeVoto isn't here either.

We have a certain amount of business that we want to accomplish this morning, so I would really like to just get right into it and move through the agenda, and then at the end, I'd be happy to talk to you about some of the initiatives that I'm thinking about this year for the Graduate School and open it up to whatever comments, feedback, or suggestions you have for me. Before getting to that point, I'd like to make sure that we have time to discuss the new bylaws, to discuss and vote a new degree, and then to have an update on NEASC accreditation. That's my agenda, although I do see that it's convention to ask for announcements, so because I want to do everything correctly, does anyone have any announcements to the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences?

REVISION OF GSAS BYLAWS

DEAN PEPALL: Okay, well, in that case, let's go to the bylaws, which I hope everyone has a copy of. If not, I'm sure there are copies available. I'd like to give you a little bit of context for these revisions. You'll note in the copy of the bylaws that the last time they were revised was in 1995, so they really are in need of some updating because some very important changes have

happened since 1995. I think the most notable was the creation of the School of Engineering in, I think, May of 2000. Before there was a School of Engineering, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences actually conferred and awarded the degrees to Engineering students who did graduate degrees. When the School of Engineering was created, the School of Engineering began awarding the degrees in Engineering, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences began really serving Arts and Sciences programming and not Engineering. Since 2000, we've seen -- I work very closely with the Associate Dean of Engineering because the student body is connected enough that it makes sense that we really do talk together and work together. The Office of Graduate Studies is sort of the administrative arm of graduate programming in both Engineering and in Arts and Sciences.

As far as programming goes, the School of Engineering decides new degree programs and what direction they want to go, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences acts similarly. So, what we're trying to do here is update the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences to reflect that change. That's one of the major changes; we're defining the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences as being made up of the faculties of two groups: one, the faculty of Liberal Arts and Jackson, which covers all those departments that have graduate and undergraduate programs, and then there's the graduate-only departments, which I'm delighted to see many of here today, which consist of UEP, Education, and Occupational Therapy. Do you prefer Boston School of Occupational Therapy? Those are our graduate-only departments that would not be covered in the LA&J designation. Those groups together comprise the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. That's really the main thrust of Section 1.

When you look at it, you'll say, "There are things that are crossed out." Those are what used to be in the bylaws in 1995 that we're taking out, and what is bolded is what we are putting in. The plain-faced type is what was in the bylaws in 1995 and what's carrying over into the version that we're proposing here. So, that's Section 1.

We've also updated the fact that we're now Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, and the term 'associated schools' was one that -- you know, I feel like I could do a multiple choice test now on Tufts governance. Who knows what an associated school is? An associated school is Engineering, correct? An associated school is Liberal Arts and Jackson, correct? And an associated school is the Graduate School. So, the faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering is made up of those three associated schools. When you see that in the bylaws, that's what it's referring to. In our faculty, it says that there would be the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, which makes sense, and then the president, the provost, and deans of the other associated schools. That would mean, in this context, Dean Sternberg and Dean Abriola, correct? Now that you know what an associated school is, I think you'll find these bylaw meetings a lot more fun. So, Section 1. Are there any questions on Section 1, or any suggestions, thoughts?

PROF. BRATT: Lynne, just one question about the Professor of the Practice item where it says they may not become Lecturers any time after the --

DEAN PEPALL: I'm going to get to that right now. That's Section 2. I was just going to ask if there are any questions on Section 1.

PROF. BRATT: Sorry, okay. I see it's Article 1, but Section 2. My error.

DEAN PEPALL: I think that's a very important question that you're raising, and I'd like to talk about all of the bold that's in Section 2.

PROF. COWEN: Hi, I'm Lenore Cowen. I'm faculty in Computer Science, and I'm here by accident. I got an email, and I'm not sure why I was on the list that said, "Please come vote." I had no idea that --

DEAN PEPALL: Lenore, you are right now currently a member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, because our current bylaws are from 1995, and so we haven't revised them yet. When we revise them, then you won't get those emails anymore.

PROF. COWEN: It's complete news to me that you're taking Engineering out of the Graduate School. I don't think anybody on the faculty of Engineering knows this.

DEAN PEPALL: That would be surprising, I think, only insofar as that when you develop a new degree program -- didn't you just recently do one in Biotechnology?

PROF. COWEN: Yes.

DEAN PEPALL: Was that ever presented to anybody --

PROF. COWEN: I don't know.

DEAN PEPALL: No, it wasn't, because the School of Engineering decides its own business for graduate programming. It awards its own degrees.

PROF. COWEN: I can tell you right now that, possibly with the exception of our department chair, there is not a single member of my faculty who knows this is happening, and certainly I think that we'd want to know that this was happening and decide if we had an opinion on it before this was called for a vote.

DEAN PEPALL: Lenore, actually, we're just discussing them today. We're not voting on the bylaws today.

MS. DUBMAN: The email did go out to AS&E faculty. When I sent out the agenda and the attached bylaw revisions, it went out to all of the AS&E faculty, because as Lynne mentioned, right now --

DEAN PEPALL: That is my faculty.

MS. DUBMAN: -- that is her faculty.

PROF. COWEN: But I don't think it's been discussed in the School of Engineering. I mean, this

might be a good idea, but it makes me nervous, because I feel our Graduate School is small, and you bifurcate -- I mean, I don't even feel that we have a --

DEAN PEPALL: Did you think I was your dean?

PROF. COWEN: Yes. I thought that you're my dean.

DEAN PEPALL: Really? That's unfortunate, because --

PROF. COWEN: Well, I'm in Computer Science, so I can never figure out (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: Because in terms of our committee structure and policy and programs, where we're really deciding the business of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, there are no engineers present. I think that division happened before I arrived. The schools had already taken graduate programming and were academically administering quite independently.

PROF. COWEN: Certainly, if the dean wants this, maybe the faculty needs to yell at her.

DEAN PEPALL: I understand you're learning this for the first time.

PROF. COWEN: I'm learning this for the first time.

DEAN PEPALL: I feel like I'm telling her that her parents are splitting, and you had to come to a meeting to find out about it.

PROF. COWEN: That's how I feel, too.

DEAN PEPALL: I think we're already split.

PROF. COWEN: But if we don't know, then that's really bad, right?

DEAN PEPALL: Somebody should tell the children, yes.

PROF. ROTHBAUM: Could this be an issue about Computer Science and not about Engineering?

DEAN PEPALL: I don't think so. Computer Science degrees at the graduate level are clearly in the School of Engineering, and they do not have an Arts and Science component. At the undergraduate level, this may be a discussion that could take place, but I think at the graduate level it's pretty clear. I don't decide anything about the criteria for academic progress or standing in the School of Engineering regarding degrees there, so it's really been a change that has evolved since 2000, when the School of Engineering was created.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLUMB: I'm a faculty member in the School of Engineering, and actually it has been quite some time now that the School of Engineering and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences have been pretty separate. There's a separate budget, and I'm surprised that it's not really common knowledge that there's a separate graduate program in the School of Engineering

and a separate graduate program in Arts and Sciences.

DEAN PEPALL: Yes. So it's probably something that some know and some don't, depending on their meetings.

PROF. HOWE: Is it safe to assume that there are no graduate programs or degrees that straddle the two schools?

DEAN PEPALL: No, we do have some combined degree programs, notably -- oh, no. I'm not sure if we have combined. I've got to get the terminology. We have a joint program that UEP and Civil and Environmental Engineering awards, correct?

PROFESSOR JACOBS: A dual degree and a joint degree, yes.

DEAN PEPALL: I think the new terminology now is 'combined degree' when it's dual and 'joint' when just one degree is conferred. So, UEP does have programming. I do not believe that we have any other department that has a joint or combined degree.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Chemistry and Biotech, I believe, have an actual joint program, so it's a Biotech degree, but it's conferred through Chemistry.

DEAN PEPALL: In the Chemistry Department, at the graduate level, do you have any joint programs with Engineering, or a dual degree, which we now call combined degree programs, where a student would get a degree in Engineering and in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences? Do you know?

PROF. UTZ: We have a joint Ph.D. program in Chemistry/Biotechnology that is administered jointly with the Engineering Department. I believe it's an Arts and Sciences degree. Certainly Engineering faculty participate, however.

DEAN PEPALL: We would not want to exclude that kind of programming. It makes a great deal of sense for our programming to be collaborative and interdisciplinary. The structure that we are proposing administratively should not be interpreted as an attempt to make that more difficult, and so there's language there that allows, I think that's in Clause B, where if you are involved in graduate studies that have a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences link, you're invited -- you know, you can be a part of this faculty. We certainly don't want to preclude that from happening.

PROF. HOWE: I don't know if I should share it, but the president seems to be urging, as is the provost, that there be more interaction between the schools, and this seems to be working at cross purposes to that if you are severing most of the Engineering graduate programs from A&S.

DEAN PEPALL: That would be an unfortunate interpretation, I think, because we would really like to develop programming across schools. I see a lot of potential with the Nutrition School and in some of our departments in Arts and Sciences. But, it's how to functionally do it in a governance structure so that people go to the right meetings and get the right information and get the job done. I think this really captures how we're currently doing it, and that's not to say that

we don't meet with Engineering and talk about programmatic changes all the time. If Biology came up and said, "I want to develop a program with Biomedical Engineering," we would celebrate it, encourage it, and figure out how to make it work within the structure. So, I wouldn't want to interpret that way, and if you feel that it does, then I'd like to know how we can allow for that. But on the other hand, it doesn't really make sense for the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences to be doing their business in Arts, Sciences, and Engineering when a great many of the faculty there are not engaged in that discussion.

MS. DUBMAN: Dean Abriola has actually made that comment, that when we voted Graduate School of Arts and Sciences degrees at AS&E, why are we voting in their --

DEAN PEPALL: --or why we discussed the Masters of Science in Economics. Like, why was that degree being discussed and voted at an AS&E meeting when it's a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences degree in A&S? Fair enough. And so this would, in fact, make that clearer.

PROF. COWEN: Couldn't we change the bylaws to do those things (inaudible) and stay officially together as the Graduate School? I mean, I agree, I don't think that people should have to sit through meetings that are irrelevant to them, but certainly the bylaws could be changed to say that these things could be voted in some meetings. Maybe it's practically the same. I don't know the history or anything else, but symbolically, it sure feels terrible.

DEAN PEPALL: All I can say to that is there's no formula across research universities of how graduate education and how the Graduate School sits. It sits in various places in various ways, and I think you just really want to make it work for the institution that you're at. I think that what we're doing here has the ability to incorporate the concerns that you have, because we still meet as a faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering. But in terms of just getting the work done, and there's a lot of work to be done right now, I want to assure you that I do meet with the Associate Dean of Engineering frequently because our student body, as our undergraduates, considers itself to be AS&E, and a lot of the services and the support that they're given are done at AS&E level. So, it's in no way that we're trying to alter that community, but just trying and work to get the job of administering these programs done. But when it comes to developing new degrees and conferring them, that's the business of the school, really.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLUMB: I'm sure that there will be no problem with collaboration between GSAS and the School of Engineering, but the main point that I would like to clarify would be whether engineers will have a voting say in GSAS.

DEAN PEPALL: No, not unless they fall into Clause B, those other persons appointed or elected full-time to instruct or direct studies of students enrolled in degree programs offered by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLUMB: So if we have a minor --

DEAN PEPALL: Well, that wouldn't be the Graduate School. That's not a Graduate School issue, really, if it's a minor, so that would be at the faculty -- so it would be more if we had a graduate program that was joint between the two schools, and the degree looked as though could be awarded by GSAS. But let's say there's a component of Engineering in it, then of course, I

think it makes sense that the faculty who are involved and have a stake in that program are represented in our faculty, and I would not want to exclude that --

PROF. CRONIN-GOLUMB: ...and would have voting rights?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes, all the people who are faculty are voting, with professorial rank or -- not visiting.

MS. DUBMAN: They can't have a modified title.

DEAN PEPALL: Yes, a non-modified title; I think doing that is better than making it all. I think it simplifies. Any other questions about Section 1 before I move on to Section 2?

PROF. FUHRMAN: The point is that the changes that you're making here actually reflect what's been ongoing policy?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

PROF. FUHRMAN: We're not actually creating something new here, just changing the bylaws?

DEAN PEPALL: To reflect how things are currently done. And I think when you do that, though -- I am mindful that they don't get revised very often, so when we do it, it should work not just this year, it should work for the future as well. With that in mind, I don't think we want to just capture the present moment and then find, oh gosh, how silly we were in not anticipating. So I'm hopeful that this allows for participation of other schools in our programming, where relevant. For example, had we proceeded with the joint Ph.D. in Economics with Fletcher and Arts and Sciences, we would have wanted to include those faculty who are directing graduate studies to be faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLUMB: So, if we had joint programs, then we would have voting rights?

DEAN PEPALL: I don't think it says that automatically. I think you have to be appointed, but I think that would be the reason for getting an appointment.

Okay, now let's go to Section 2. So Section 2, you'll notice there's a lot of bold in Section 2. All that was in Section 2 of our bylaws before was just the one sentence at the bottom, and what we wanted to do here, since we are an associated school in the faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, we would like to have the same kind of titles and language that we use in LA&J, because most of our faculty is in LA&J.

What we did is we took from the bylaws, the Liberal Arts and Jackson bylaws, the language that refers to titles in Section 2 and imported them here. Having done that, I may say that this is probably a part of the bylaws in each one of the associated schools that is under construction. In working through the faculty handbook for Arts and Sciences, we realized that we really need to think very clearly about these titles and then get our bylaws updated to reflect what we think makes sense for the university. And so I've taken them and just put them right in here. Most of them are common across the associated schools, except for the Professor of the Practice, which is

different between Engineering and LA&J and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. In the structure that I have, I have LA&J and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and then Engineering. Those are the three associated schools in the faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering. When we look at titles, it would make sense to have some comparability across the associated schools. So, I have imported the titles and the language used in LA&J to the GSAS bylaws. Does that make sense to everyone? Having said that, I'd like to say that many of them are under revision, and one I'm actually going to suggest a revision to today, and I can move to that right away. I did see a hand go up.

PROF. FUHRMAN: I'm not sure I understand why each of these ends with a clause about 'not eligible for tenure on the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences'. Does the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences grant tenure?

MS. DUBMAN: It should actually probably be 'Arts, Sciences, and Engineering'.

DEAN PEPALL: It did say in the LA&J bylaws, of which I have a copy, it says 'not tenure in Liberal Arts and Jackson'. But that can't be used here, because that doesn't include the graduate-only departments. So, the Graduate School faculty encompasses that; I'm covering the two associated schools with that. Do you see what I'm saying?

PROF. FUHRMAN: Okay, it gets very murky. One has the sense that I might be tenured in LA&J, but not in the Graduate –

DEAN PEPALL: Well, it's only really relevant for the graduate-only departments.

PROF. COWEN: I'm going to be murky yet again. I'm (inaudible) adjunct appointment --

DEAN PEPALL: This is excellent. We planted -- that's why you came to this meeting, you knew that we wanted somebody to raise that question.

PROF. COWEN: I would hate for somebody to say that I will therefore not get tenure in the School of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering since I have tenure in the Computer Sciences. Let me say one final thing, and I hope this is also a plant. I would think that the title of 'adjunct' serves Tufts very poorly --

DEAN PEPALL: I couldn't agree more.

PROF. COWEN: -- and the reason is that in almost every other major university that I'm aware of, 'adjunct' means non-tenured temporary faculty, and I am totally hoping that the entirety of Tufts goes to a different word, such as 'courtesy appointment', which is more common for joint appointments or secondary appointments.

DEAN PEPALL: I feel like I want to call on Vickie, because she's really done a dissertation on this. Vickie, could you speak to this issue?

DEAN SULLIVAN: One of the problems is precisely what Lynne is addressing, which is a

practice is one thing, and that the bylaws and the various rules that we follow are different. One thing that I've noticed in looking at and reviewing the *Faculty Handbook* is when people say, "I'm a professor of Classics, and I'm adjunct in History," that's a very common formulation, right? It's incorrect. Our bylaws do not specify that. Our bylaws say 'an adjunct appointment is someone whose primary appointment is outside the school'.

DEAN PEPALL: Actually, Liz Canny made an amendment, which I consider a friendly one. We would say 'outside the faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering'. So anyone within Arts, Sciences, and Engineering that has an appointment in a different department -- not tenure there, but an appointment -- we would like to use the term 'secondary appointment'.

DEAN SULLIVAN: And those are on the books.

DEAN PEPALL: That's what we're going to do. We're going to clean it all up.

DEAN SULLIVAN: And there are secondary -- should I go on, or should I just shut up?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes, now we're happy. Should I finish the adjunct? The friendly amendment from Liz Canny is, instead of saying 'faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences', sentences describing adjunct will now say 'faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering'. So, the term 'adjunct' will only be across schools and not within Arts, Sciences, and Engineering. If you have an appointment in another department, it would be a secondary -- you'll have a primary appointment in the department in which you have tenure, or you're tenure track, and then a secondary appointment in another department. If, however, you have tenure in both places, I believe it might -- no, we don't talk about that.

PROF. JACOBS: We don't have tenure in both places.

DEAN PEPALL: We don't have tenure in both places.

DEAN SULLIVAN: I recently spoke to Liz Canny about this, who knows all things --

DEAN PEPALL: You're one of my graduate-only, but you're in Child Development.

PROF. JACOBS: One of my departments is graduate-only, one of the departments is not.

DEAN PEPALL: This is why this is somewhat of a work in progress, but the understanding is we want to make this useful. This is not, again, an attempt to make life difficult, but really to facilitate the kinds of collaborations that we want.

PROF. DUNN: Lynne, you're going to strike the language about holding tenure on the faculty of GSAS in all the sections, right?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

MS. DUBMAN: AS&E for all of them.

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

PROF. BRATT: Is it now time for me to ask my question?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes, please.

PROF. BRATT: In the last bold paragraph, the last sentence is 'Professors of the Practice may not become Lecturers at any time after the end of their five years.' I think I remember some of the discussions in AS&E about the Professor of Practice and the desire for folks not to convert those positions into full-time positions afterwards. For the Graduate School, I am certainly sympathetic with these positions not continuing as full-time positions, but it seems a bit counter to our mission to prevent the opportunity for a Professor of Practice to continue teaching as a Lecturer, teaching one course a semester or something like that. We have a person right now who's a Professor of Practice. We're delighted to have him. I hate to think of the possibility that after he finishes his five years that we can never have him teach a course again once he goes back to being a practitioner. So, I would love that to change.

DEAN SULLIVAN: Let me address this. This comes from the bylaws actually, of Jackson and the College of Liberal Arts, and that's the way it's stated now. I think the way it was written was with the understanding that 'Lecturer' meant 'full-time Lecturer', and I think that we regard that as a friendly amendment, because I think -- part of the reason, and it's an academic reason, is that the Professors of the Practice have a very serious endeavor outside the academy, and we want it temporary so that they continue that. We don't want it longer than five years. But that doesn't mean they can't go back to their practice in the creative enterprise and still inform that and bring that back on a part-time basis. My understanding is that we certainly would be open to amending that to reflect the spirit of what we intended, so it may not be a full-time lecturer.

DEAN PEPALL: Could we include that now and just put 'full-time,' they may not become full-time lecturers right now?

PROF. BRATT: If it's appropriate, I would make the motion that we amend that to be --

MS. DUBMAN: Do you need to do the LA&J bylaws first?

DEAN PEPALL: No, because this is for the graduate-only departments, correct?

MS. DUBMAN: That's true.

DEAN PEPALL: The graduate-only departments are being covered by this.

PROF. BRATT: I would like to make that friendly amendment, in friendship and --

DEAN PEPALL: Yes, and I'm accepting it in good spirit.

PROF. BIANCHONI: Just a point of clarification to the research category, there are no restrictions on teaching?

DEAN PEPALL: A research professor or a research associate professor, research assistant professor are people who are here at the university to do research and are not engaged in teaching, and they are typically funding their positions through external funding. So that's the use of that term.

DEAN SULLIVAN: And they can teach a course or two, but their primary role is research, and they're externally funded.

PROF. HOWE: Does the final paragraph not in bold, 'voters of the faculty may not vote in deliberations of this faculty,' still hold?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

PROF. HOWE: Because I understand that Engineering is considering changing something regarding Professor of the Practice and they're voting --

DEAN PEPALL: Right. That's when the associated schools would start to have different practices, and so right now, this would be the bylaw governing this faculty.

PROF. HOWE: (Inaudible) because they got appointed by somebody in Engineering they couldn't vote, or they wouldn't be appointed because they couldn't vote.

DEAN PEPALL: So, the people who are visiting practice, adjunct, or research --

PROF. HOWE: No, I'm just talking about practice.

DEAN PEPALL: I understand what you're saying.

PROF. HOWE: Do you have an answer?

DEAN PEPALL: No, I don't. The question being put forth is, there's a Professor of the Practice in Engineering that has voting rights, let's say in the School of Engineering. That's not yet the case, but let's suppose. Suppose that person's involved in programming at the graduate level and is appointed to be a member of this faculty. I think in making that appointment, you could then determine whether or not they have voting, because they're coming in that way and not as a Professor of the Practice in GSAS. Do you see what I'm saying? That would be a way of handling it, because they're not a Professor of the Practice in the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Science. They're a Professor of the Practice in Engineering, which has a different bylaw governing their voting rights. If they're appointed into the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences under Section 1, Clause B, then they could have voting rights. It would appear to me that if they're appointed to the faculty under B that they would be voting members of the faculty.

PROF. HOWE: Sometimes called (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: Yes, but those are the things that make life interesting. That's currently what it says right now. If you think there should be greater clarity on the last sentence --

MS. DUBMAN: Nothing in Engineering has gone to the trustees, either, yet.

PROF. HOWE: I'm anticipating it.

DEAN PEPALL: Well, I think it would be somewhat premature for us to anticipate a change and put it in our bylaws at this point. I think there might be a way of handling it, in any case.

PROF. BRIZUELA: Again, that last sentence that's not bold, has that historically been true?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

PROF. BRIZUELA: So, if I was told by research professors that they had struck a special deal with a previous dean, I should question that, right?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes. Anything that's not bold or crossed out is from 1995 and older, so it's nothing new.

We'll move on now to Article 2. Not much has changed, except updating that it's no longer the faculty of Arts and Sciences, but the faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, basically describing the function of what the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences does. I think the more important changes that I would like to discuss here come in the definition of the Standing Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Committee on Policy and Programs. That's where we've made some changes to reflect, hopefully, what is the current practice of those committees. The Executive Committee, we didn't change the number, five or more. We changed somewhat the nature of the appointment, because in a sense, we don't really appoint them annually. They tend to serve, and so now we're just clarifying, a term of five years. I said '...by the dean with cooperation from the Committee on Committees'. This is a committee where if people, in the solicitation of faculty preferences, say they want to serve on the Executive Committee, I would welcome having that information and using it in making those appointments. I think it's useful to have a role of the Committee on Committees. However, I think the Graduate School has very different kinds of issues than the other committees; in particular this committee looks at time-to-degree issues, which are very important and specific to graduate education. I think it's useful that when we do our business that we have faculty there who understand the kinds of issues that are being raised at the Executive Committee. So I think the way we've phrased it captures that, I hope.

You can see in the old version, it said that the committee had responsibility for admitting students. It really doesn't. The Executive Committee is not involved with admissions. However, standards of admissions are very important, and that could be an issue that the Executive Committee would be willing to think about and try and decide whether or not we can define ballpark measures of standards of admission, and criteria for award of scholarship.

Now that we're changing the tuition structure, particularly in the doctoral programs, when

awarding scholarships, I think we should award it when students are in good standing, and we probably shouldn't award it when students are not in good standing. It's kind of ironic trying to withdraw a student who just got 100% tuition scholarship.

So, these are issues that I would like to discuss with the Executive Committee, and I think it's very useful for me to have their input on these kinds of policies. The one that we spend the most time talking about is extensions of time-to-degree and leaves of absence and transfer of credit. That would, I think, really take up the bulk of our meeting time. This year, however, we're going to try and take on the challenge of thinking more clearly about academic progress in a graduate program. We understand completely that there's a great degree of heterogeneity in the graduate programs that are housed in the Graduate School of Arts and Science, so this language would be very general, but I think we really want to think of what message we're giving the student and how we direct the student as to how they can get feedback on their academic standing and where, at the department level, how departments ascertain academic progress. We're taking that piece on this year in the Executive Committee.

And then we changed the English to make it a little bit -- instead of saying 'to be not inconsistent,' we just thought why not say 'to be consistent'.

Krzysztof, who's a member of the Executive Committee.

PROF. SLIWA: It seems to me that it's a major shift in power from the committee to the dean, and I'm just wondering (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: I don't have an institutional memory to 1995 for the Graduate School, but I would say -- and who is here -- the Graduate School, as far as anybody could remember, and I think I went back to Bob Guertin -- the Executive Committee never did admissions. That's probably going back to the eighties.

PROF. SLIWA: There's a shift from having responsibility of just any recommendation (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: In terms of admissions and scholarship awards, departments have a great degree of autonomy in figuring out what their admission standards are, and since I have some input on the scholarship budget side, working with me on the award of tuition scholarship and other kinds of financial aid.

In practice, the Executive Committee has never -- I imagine you would find it odd if the Executive Committee told you what tuition scholarship you could award in the Physics Department, or who to admit. I mean, it's not been a practice. As far as I can tell -- and I did go back and ask whether in Bob Guertin's day, the Executive Committee did any of this kind of stuff.

PROF. SLIWA: (Inaudible)

DEAN PEPALL: When I say that the bylaws -- they were last revised in 1995, but I suspect that

in 1995 the bylaws did not reflect the practice in 1995, either. I don't think there's been a lot of attention to following the bylaws. Does that make sense to you?

PROF. SLIWA: I want to say that this is a major shift of power from the faculty to the dean, and (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: I think that it's a not unreasonable shift, and that's probably why -- isn't that why you want deans? It's sort of an unworkable structure for a graduate school of our size. I cannot see how the Executive Committee could do those tasks, unless it was their full-time charge to do that. I think that's why people hire deans, to do that kind of stuff. I mean, part of it is to work with departments and enforce the general policies. I think the Executive Committee should have the criteria and the policies, but how it's actually enforced, it's not practical how it was written before.

PROF. SLIWA: The way it is right now, I think the committee makes the recommendation to the dean, and the dean obviously has to approve it or deny it. It's a different thing (inaudible) the committee has (inaudible) a say right now. After the new revision, it has no say at all.

DEAN PEPALL: I would suggest that the Executive Committee has not assumed that responsibility, probably. Maybe this was what the Executive Committee did in 1890 when they first started two Ph.D. programs, one in Biology and one in Chemistry. Maybe then, when they didn't have a dean. There wasn't a dean of the Graduate School, so somebody had to be doing it. But I really do think that there is no Executive Committee that has been assuming that responsibility, and I don't see how -- you know, yes, it's true that we're changing it, but I think we're changing the practice to something that actually favors graduate programming, is better for graduate programming.

DEAN SULLIVAN: Well, for me, there are two ways to look at this. There's faculty representation. If you want faculty representation in the individual policies and practices of the departments to come through the department or to come through an Executive Committee. As it's operating now, the faculty representation comes through the department.

PROF. GROSSMAN: And also, you're not really changing the duties of the committee, you're changing the description of the duties of the committee to more accurately reflect what the committee's been doing for a number of years.

DEAN PEPALL: Yes. We would really probably need to get the history books out to know how the Graduate School was administered before, but I really think that this change -- it doesn't even reflect -- it's not like just recently this has happened.

PROF. FUHRMAN: I noticed that grants-in-aid are no longer mentioned in the new language, and I know that (inaudible) a large committee that reviews the applications for those, but did you mean to exclude that?

DEAN PEPALL: I don't even know -- you mean the Graduate School grants-in-aid that we have at the Graduate School for students?

PROF. FUHRMAN: Yes.

DEAN PEPALL: I'm not even sure that that just wouldn't have meant financial aid of some sort apart from tuition scholarship, you know, stipends. I think the term 'grants-in-aid' is something that FRAC, and now we have our analog at the Graduate School, has adopted as a term, but I rather doubt that that's what was meant. We do have a different committee that decides grants-in-aid for the Graduate School, but it's not a bylaw committee.

PROF. MARRONE: Steve Marrone in History. I have always considered governance questions of constitutionality, so I'm interested in this idea of authority. I was wondering, who actually does have the authority to determine things like policies for admissions? I think that's covered in Article 2. It is the faculty, the faculty has the authority?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

PROF. MARRONE: And the dean will have most of the executive responsibility?

DEAN PEPALL: Right.

PROF. MARRONE: It's an enormous shift, in fact, it may not be a shift at all, to say that the Executive Committee makes recommendations, if what you're saying is true, that the faculty approves such changes. I would be alarmed if the new bylaws didn't say who had the authority to do things, like determine admission policies, or if it said that the dean alone --

DEAN PEPALL: Right, it doesn't.

PROF. MARRONE: (Inaudible) shift in this language, which may be just cosmetic. On the page, it looks like an absolutely enormous transformation, but perhaps it really is just a clarification of the reality. In the end, the faculty does have the authority to set the policies in the Graduate School.

DEAN PEPALL: And I'm happy to have faculty meetings to do that.

I am mindful that I do want to vote on a new degree, so can I turn to Policy and Programs? Quickly just read it through and then make sure that we have time for the School Psychology Degree Program, because that is important. I mean, all of this is important.

The next Standing Committee in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences is Policy and Programs, and it is really a large committee in which representation of all the different programs is quite important. So again, how people are appointed to that committee is somewhat different. Here, what we have done is suggest that the appointments are made with, I think it's chairs -- I'm reading ahead here -- that the chair of the department makes a recommendation of who will serve on this committee.

What does the committee do? The committee really does all the curricula issues, new degrees, what the program of study is in a particular degree program. Any changes in courses,

internships, anything that has to do with curricula changes, that's where it's discussed. Now, there's an overlap to some degree with the Executive Committee, because clearly, you know, I'm thinking this year I'm very interested in TAs and what that means in terms of curricula development. There's a piece of that that's in Policy and Programs. There's also a piece of that that is in the Executive Committee. But Policy and Programs is really where curriculum is developed and decided and voted upon as the first pass. So, for example, the School Psychology new degree was discussed first at Policy and Programs. It was not discussed at the Executive Committee, and next it will be brought to the faculty. Policy and Programs is the good place for vetting new degree programs and new degree requirements, etc.

So, that's trying to capture that. It's a fairly large committee, and we've allowed -- I'm trying to see where it says about the terms. I believe we said three-year terms would be appropriate for this committee, although renewable terms are not excluded. Are there any questions about the Policy and Programs Committee?

PROF. UTZ: I guess two points. The first, on the three-year term, I understand and appreciate the interest in having continuity. To the extent that graduate program directors are the default appointees to this committee, I think that's the way it's worked in the past. Not all departments, I believe, have an automatic three-year term for the graduate program directors, so could you comment on whether you're now expecting graduate program directors to have three-year terms, and is that (inaudible), or how do you see that working out?

DEAN PEPALL: That's an excellent question, Art, because different departments have different conventions with respect to the role and responsibility of the director of Graduate Studies. And of course, in the graduate-only departments, it doesn't even make sense. The chair is sort of the director -- I mean, they're graduate-only, so it's hard to try and figure out how to allow for a certain amount of flexibility, depending upon the kind of graduate programs.

I think in the departments that have doctoral programs, the director of Graduate Studies has a lot of responsibility, and it's a large piece, and I'm not sure whether it makes sense to do it for just one year. From the point of view of the committee, it is really convenient for us, in terms of getting things done, to have people with expertise. So annual appointments don't seem to be as sensible to me as three-year terms. That's why we put that in. I always like the word 'normally,' but in that case--

PROF. UTZ: -- we could be the abnormal.

DEAN PEPALL: Yes.

PROF. UTZ: I think, partly because of what you said, that in a large graduate program, there's a fairly heavy workload associated with being the chair. I think our model tends to be -- there's a group of people who have done this in the past, who rotate it and do it for a year. It's not like they've never seen this before, never done it before. And so, many years, we have someone experienced taken off the mantle, but it prevents someone from having a hit of three consecutive years, responsibilities that are taking away from their teaching and research and mentorship responsibilities. And so I guess I would like to see some -- if possible, it would be great to have

a little more flexibility in that to accommodate that sort of (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: I have a suggestion -- is 'normally' too weak, too feeble?

FACULTY MEMBER: There's nothing to say that somebody with a three-year term can't resign after a year.

PROF. UTZ: That's true. That's fine. Just sort of following up on a prior discussion, in looking at this wording, maybe another way of looking at it is that the prior wording associated words like 'approve' -- 'approve' showed up in conjunction with a committee's responsibilities. And in newer versions, the word 'recommend' is really the only verb associated with the committee's responsibilities.

And so while in Article 2 it explicitly attributes the responsibilities regarding admission and things like that to the faculty, I think the old wording made it a little bit clearer what vehicle the faculty would have in implementing or enforcing those policies, where the new wording is really that these committees become advisory committees to the dean, because the new charge by the bylaws is to recommend actions to the dean. And so that may be part of the question --

DEAN PEPALL: Yes. Well, when it comes to new degree programs, these recommendations are then brought to the faculty, and they're voted on by the faculty, correct?

MS. DUBMAN: Yes.

DEAN PEPALL: So it's not that School Psychology recommends a new degree, and I go, "Yeah, it sounds great, that's fine." It comes to the faculty. It's a vehicle for which I then bring you the business that I think is important -- to the Graduate School, to the faculty. I would like to keep that spirit going without unduly taxing the faculty, reviewing that now we're going to offer this in the summer, you know, very minute kinds of curricula changes that you would not find particularly useful.

PROF. UTZ: I think (inaudible) of approving new programs and curricula issues, there's less of a question. I think the question surrounds things more like admission standards and assessing (inaudible), those sorts of things. And I think historically, that's a precedent that has really rested in the hands of the departments in collaboration with the dean, but at least, I think, going back say, five or ten or fifteen years, my recollection is that those were really things that the dean's office didn't get as involved with. And so I think, again, this is something we all should discuss. I'm not saying it has to be one way or the other.

DEAN PEPALL: Well, this is the point of the meeting.

PROF. UTZ: And that's a concern that I was going to raise.

PROF. SLIWA: (Inaudible) transfer of credits for extensions of time. Right now, the committee votes, and the committee makes a decision. With this, the committee would just make a recommendation. I think that's a major shift of power.

DEAN PEPALL: I have to say, though, that it is the dean that accepts and withdraws students, it's not the Executive Committee.

PROF. SLIWA: No, no. The committee right now takes a vote and decides.

DEAN PEPALL: But ultimately, from the student's point of view, admissions and withdrawals are letters from the dean. It's not through recommendation of a committee. I mean, that's how the Graduate School operates.

PROF. SLIWA: I'm told that this is the role of the Executive Committee. The committee takes a vote, and this decision -- the dean writes a letter, but it is after the vote of the committee. In the new wording, it's the dean that's going to make a decision, which I find to be a major change.

DEAN PEPALL: I think in deliberating a case, we take the opinion of the Executive Committee, and I think the Executive Committee usually is -- there'd be no reason not to accept the Executive -- I have not encountered it. But if you have the Executive Committee deciding these things and in confrontation with the dean, I think we're going to have to really think very carefully about the kinds of people or the representation we have on the Executive Committee, correct?

PROF. SLIWA: (Inaudible) and the new bylaws are changing this, and it's a major change.

DEAN PEPALL: I'm not sure that I actually see it as major. I think it's the way that the dean gets the input of the Executive Committee and acts upon it, right?

PROF. SLIWA: I believe that at this moment, the committee has two issues, extension of time and transfer of credit. The Executive Committee takes a vote, and the decision is -- that's it, and the dean then --

DEAN PEPALL: In your memory on that committee, has there ever been a time that it's been a split vote?

PROF. SLIWA: No, I understand.

DEAN PEPALL: It's just really a discussion.

PROF. SLIWA: (Inaudible) people in the room, the decision can be made. With the new bylaws, it becomes only a recommendation, which is a major weakening of the role of the committee.

DEAN PEPALL: But I was going to say the voting procedure of the committee is not really done in a way that the committee actually holds a vote on each issue. I think they say, "Do we all agree?" And then --

PROF. SLIWA: If we happen to all agree, that's all right, (inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: But you're suggesting that right now the committee votes on and the committee decides, and I'm sort of saying I'm not really sure that that's actually how it's done.

PROF. FUHRMAN: So is it technically important to have it ultimately devolve to the dean, or could we simply change the wording to say that the committee shall have responsibility, with the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, regarding standards of? Is there a reason to make the dean the final resting place of all that responsibility, or would it be a friendly amendment to just change this to be a both committee and a dean decision?

DEAN PEPALL: Together with the dean, make -- I would probably consider that a friendly --

PROF. FUHRMAN: Does that make more sense in terms of not affecting this dramatic change in the responsibilities?

PROF. SLIWA: (Inaudible) for my sake.

FACULTY MEMBER: I think you made the point, and I think people are trying to accommodate you.

PROF. SLIWA: I don't know. It's up to you to decide. It's better than the wording that's there now.

DEAN PEPALL: Which, by the way, was discussed with the Executive Committee, and which Krzysztof supported.

PROF. FUHRMAN: The reason that I would actually honor that sentence of not having the dean be the final arbiter is that this now includes the concept of academic progress, and just from (inaudible) point of view, I would think that it would be very difficult to have that seated in a similar person's decision. That makes me nervous.

DEAN PEPALL: I think I'm going to hold another faculty meeting on this.

PROF. HOWE: The practical difficulty is if it ultimately rests with the dean, the student, if they are not happy with the recommendations, will then come to you --

DEAN PEPALL: Actually, there is an issue at the Graduate School that there isn't a very clear appeal procedure for students. This is something that's causing me a certain amount of headache, because it does involve my decision and I would like to have faculty input and Executive Committee input, but before we can do that, we have to at least have the conversation concerning what academic and good standing is. I think we are very much behind in terms of developing a clear procedure and policy that students can understand and respect. But I'd really like to just sort of put a brake there, because we have a new degree, and then we have accreditation as well.

PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM: SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

DEAN PEPALL: It's really not a new degree. We are going to award an Education Specialist degree in place of a CAGS, which stands for Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study. It's a term that's used in this region. It doesn't have a lot of currency elsewhere, and it's actually been a problem for some students, because a certificate has been somewhat devalued in the academy, and so sometimes funding agencies will not fund people who are enrolled in a certificate program. This is a very well-regarded, well-respected, accredited program in School Psychology, and so we're trying to just update the degree we award to reflect the standards that we have in that particular program.

I would like to call upon the interim director, Steve Luz-Alterman, to present just as briefly as you can, Steve, this proposal, and then I would like to have a quick discussion and vote, if I could.

FACULTY MEMBER: You terminated the discussion about the bylaws, but there will not be a decision on that?

DEAN PEPALL: This was only the first pass. We're not voting on the bylaws today. And I suspect there will be more discussion. Did you not have that sense?

FACULTY MEMBER: I was asking. (Inaudible).

DEAN PEPALL: No, we're not voting on the bylaws today.

MR. LUZ-ALTERMAN: I just want to begin by introducing my co-authors on this proposal for the new degree: Laura Rogers, who's co-faculty in the School of Psychology program, and Silas Pinto. Also authoring was Analucia Schliemann, who's our former chair, and Barbara Brizuela, our current chair.

I want to emphasize what Lynne mentioned. This is not a new degree program in any way. It's not a new degree. The School Psychology program has been functioning in the Department of Education for at least thirty years. So substantially, the program is remaining as it is. The program is a 24-course program, 3-year program. Students receive a Masters degree after thirteen courses, and after an additional eleven courses, which includes a full year of internship, they receive the CAGS.

What we are proposing, as Lynne mentioned, is the change from the CAGS to a degree called the EDS, and the reasons we want to do that are as follows. The level of training in terms of national standards for other programs that award this degree is called the specialist level of training, and that's intended to recognize a rigor in training and field-based practice beyond the Masters degree, but prior to the Doctoral degree. Masters degrees from this perspective are typically viewed as one year, and our program is two years of course work and 1950 hours of supervised field experience, way beyond the requirements of a Masters degree. That's the standard of training at the national level. Secondly, by far, the majority of programs nationally award this degree, the EDS, for equivalent training, and as Lynne mentioned, the CAGS indicates a certain level of recognition in terms of people are familiar with it locally, but when our students go elsewhere, it's very confusing as to what that certificate title actually connotes.

In addition, there is just a lot of variability in certificate programs in terms of the number of courses involved, the level of training and rigor involved in a certificate program, and we would really like our students to graduate with a degree that's recognized in the field that's the standard of training prior to a Doctoral level program.

We actually encountered this difficulty within Tufts when one of our graduates from our certificate program only applied for the LRAP, the Loan Repayment Assistance Program, and the policy of that program is to not offer loan repayment to certificate programs. This was a student who completed two years with us but was not eligible for that support. It's an unusual circumstance, but it certainly could arise again.

Just a brief history of my being here right now. This was presented to our department on April 6, the change in degree, and was unanimously approved. I then went to Graduate Programs and Policy on April sixth, and it was approved in spirit, but I learned then that we had to make a proposal to make this degree change. Vin Manno guided me through that process over the summer. We went back to Graduate Programs and Policy on September fifteenth, and it was unanimously approved at that point by the Graduate Policy and Programs Committee.

DEAN PEPALL: So now we're bringing it to the faculty, and I would like to be able to call a vote on the degree so that we can move it along the process and get it for trustee approval within the year. Is there any discussion on this? I would like to move that the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences award the degree Education Specialist for the program that is currently described by the Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study in the Department of Education.

FACULTY MEMBER: (Inaudible), you can't –

DEAN PEPALL: Would you move that for me? Thank you. The front row people are always important. Could I have a second? Now we have to actually take a vote. I have to remind people that voting members of the faculty of the Graduate School --

MS. DUBMAN: Full-time faculty members with modified titles --

DEAN PEPALL: -- may vote. All those in favor? I can vote, can't I?

MS. DUBMAN: Yes. I have 28.

DEAN PEPALL: All those opposed? Abstentions? I think it's approved. Thank you.

NEASC ACCREDITATION AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEAN PEPALL: And now in our remaining moments, I'd like to call upon Stephanie Topping and Meredith Billings from the Office of Institutional Research, who just want to talk to the faculty briefly about the accreditation process that is sitting in all of our inboxes and mailboxes right now as we move through the semester.

MS. TOPPING: Dawn Terkla asked that I speak to you folks today. We have the NEASC

upcoming accreditation in 2013, and actually she's over at MIT as we speak. She's part of their evaluation team there. They're undergoing the same NEASC accreditation.

NEASC accredits us. They're the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and they accredit us every ten years. The last time they accredited us was in 2003, and they accredit the entire university. We are required to submit an interim report every five years, which we did in January of 2008, and within that report, we received a letter back to President Bacow from the commission stating that they accepted our report. However, they identified three areas that they are looking for us to place a strong emphasis on when we go to write the report in 2012. One of those three areas had to do with assessment of the graduate and professional school programs. They were very happy with what we did at the undergraduate level, but they are looking for us to focus on measuring student achievement and success at the graduate and professional programs. So Dawn and I looked at this letter, and it was a tip-off to us that come 2013, they're going to be looking very closely at the report and seeing whether we are addressing those particular areas.

Last fall, we began meeting with all of the academic deans at all the schools individually and finding out how we could support each of those programs in their efforts. We actually followed up with those academic deans in June to see how their progress was going, and we anticipate that we'll be meeting with them every six months leading up until 2013, so that we are prepared. We don't want to wait until the last minute to collect data, five years' worth of data, because NEASC is looking for longer-term data from that, not just data that year, 2012-13. They're looking for five years' worth of data. We figured, let's get started now, and so we actually, in September, began meeting also with program directors in Arts and Sciences, and we have another meeting scheduled in a couple of weeks.

DEAN PEPALL: Right, so we discussed -- I mean, every program in Arts and Sciences that awards a degree needs to fill out a template that really describes how we're achieving the goals that we've set out in this program, and so it's sort of an assessment kind of template. In order to talk to departments about how their program would do this, we're holding sort of small subgroup meetings. We did one with doctoral programs in Child Development, English, Psychology, and Drama. We'll do another with the Sciences as soon as we can collectively arrange a meeting. Then I'm going to visit the graduate-only departments to talk about those programs, because they often have an accreditation component on their own, so that means it's a little different. And then we're meeting with the Masters programs as well. That's all happening this semester, and it is a very important exercise that we take on, and I think it's actually an opportune time to sort of reflect on what you're trying to achieve at the graduate level.

I'm very mindful of the fact that we're a small research university, and it would be very useful at this time to identify where we can do things differently and better, maybe, than the large ones, so I look for that when we're thinking about what our outcomes are. I'd ask you to be thinking about that, too.

I think it's a useful moment to reflect and think about our goals in graduate programming and what we're trying to accomplish. So that's happening this semester at varying levels of speed. And then the office of the Graduate Studies is doing a major data report on time-to-degree measured from cohorts all the way through after six years, eight years, and ten years for Doctoral

students, and for Masters students, we're just starting that. It will be after three and five years, is that correct, Gretchen? We're going to do two, three, and five?

MS. INMAN: Two, three, and five.

DEAN PEPALL: Because that's our standard time for a Masters degree.

MS. TOPPING: Just to reiterate, the expectation from NEASC is not that we're going to have this all wrapped up and everybody's processes will be improved. It's a work in progress. As long as we show the due diligence that we recognize they highlighted this area -- it wasn't an area of concern, but was an area that they said, "You know what? You did a great job highlighting it for the undergraduate programs. We really want to see it at the graduate and professional levels as well." The expectation from them is that we're showing, demonstrating a strong effort to clearly articulate learning outcomes, collect it, measure students' success, be able to collect that data, and then be able to affect programmatic change and improvement based on these measures. So again, they're not looking for it all to be wrapped up and done, but we'd like to be able to show that effort, and so that's why we're starting out. It may seem very far off, 2013 seems far away, but we actually will begin forming the committees to start the writing of the report, the hundred-page report that gets submitted prior to their site visit. Those committees will start to be formed in January of 2011, so that's not too far off.

DEAN PEPALL: Any questions on that? How about we adjourn? Thank you very much, and stay tuned. We'll be meeting again on November fourth to discuss and perhaps vote on the bylaws, but I will circulate another copy with the revisions as suggested.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Jillian Dubman
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering