

**ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY MEETING
COOLIDGE ROOM, BALLOU HALL
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2005**

	PAGE
New Business.....	1
Value Added by a Tufts Education.....	8
Emerging Priorities.....	9
Announcements.....	18

NEW BUSINESS

DEAN STERNBERG: As most of you know, I'm Bob Sternberg, and I'm the new dean. I wanted to give you a more coherent idea of what my vision for the job is so that you know where I'm coming from. But the main thing I wanted to do is to hear some of your thoughts about what you think I should be doing and what your concerns are. That's the program I had in mind.

If it's okay, what I could do is I could say a little bit about things I had in mind and then get your feedback in terms of your reactions, what I'm particularly concerned about if you were in my position, and what are the things that you think I should be concerned with.

We have a strategic plan that was put together under Susan Ernst's deanship, and we're planning to follow through with that strategic plan. There's also going to be a capital campaign, and we have some priorities for that. We're trying to do all the things that need to be done for Arts & Sciences, but I wasn't going to talk at the level of each specific that we need to get done, but more generally some of the things that I would like to do.

I came here because I was really excited about Tufts as an institution for a number of reasons. One was that I thought that it has really terrific leadership, and I wanted to be part of that team. Another was that I like its balance between being both a college and a university and having those two things interact. The third thing was that the people are just really great and supportive of the environment.

One of the things that I'm hoping to do is to help us as an institution leverage our strengths. I felt when I came here, and some other people at Tufts also feel this way, that Tufts has not always been as strong at leveraging its strength and showing the outside world what it is that we do well as we would ideally like it to be, and I was hoping that that was something that I could contribute to, and there are a few ways that I could contribute to that.

One relates to the whole idea of Tufts being an institution that emphasizes undergraduate education, and that for me was a major consideration in coming here. The work we did and are still doing at Yale is on the teaching/learning process. The place where I think that Tufts could acquire a distinction in being foremost in the United States is in being an institution that meets the needs of all of the diverse learning styles that college kids bring to the table.

When I took undergraduate psychology, I got a C, and the conclusion that I came to was that I didn't have the ability to succeed. And many students who start college just are overwhelmed by it. They don't necessarily learn in the way they're taught, and the result is that they don't achieve the level of success that they ideally could achieve. I don't think it was just something that happened to me.

The problem with that is that people who could be really successful in an occupation, whether it's psychology, history, geology, political science, or whatever, sometimes never get the chance to go into that occupation because they don't do so well in the introductory courses. In other words, they may not be a good memorizer, do well on multiple choice tests, or whatever it is that the introductory course emphasizes; that's not what they do well in.

For example, in my own career, 30 years as a psychology professor, I never had to take multiple choice tests. In the end, how much difference did it make how well I did in introductory psychology? But freshmen don't know that, so they sometimes leave the field.

The kind of thing that I'm interested in is the PACE Center. It will be moving to Tufts within a year, and the kind of work we do is work with instructors around the country and the world at all levels from elementary school through college. We have projects in many countries around the world, including a number in Africa, where we work with professors to try to help people develop their teaching strength.

We're already taking people who are very experienced teachers, and we're saying everyone can be a better teacher. There's no one who ever reaches the end of the line in terms of skill in teaching. That applies to me, and I assume it applies to everyone else. We're always learning how we can teach better.

One of the things we're particularly interested in is helping professors teach to all the different learning styles. Some kids, for example, are primarily memory learners, the ones who do well in SATs, who have high grades. Teachers in high school often think that they're great high school students. They're people who are good if you give them a textbook or a lecture; they can memorize the material, and they do a good job of it.

Some students who are analytical learners, they're good at things like analyzing, comparing and contrasting, evaluating, critiquing, and seeing what's wrong with something. That's a second kind of student that you can teach so that you emphasize those kinds of analytical skills. You might ask them to compare and contrast two theories

or two ideas, to evaluate an essay, or to critique something that somebody wrote or a piece of art. That's a second way of teaching that appeals to a second kind of strength. A third kind of learner is somebody who is a more creative learner, which is what I was when I was younger, one who learns more by project-based learning, who likes to create things. It might be a project, a piece of art, an experiment, or a theory, by someone who likes to invent things, who likes to imagine and suppose. But people who are creative learners don't do that well when they're taught for memory or for analytical thinking, and so teaching part of the time in a creative way enables those learners to capitalize on their strengths.

Then another kind of learner is a practical learner, like myself, who's in business school, who many teachers didn't think was smart, and then it turned out, though, that when he could see the use of what he was learning, he was really good. These are people who are good at applying, using, utilizing, and exploiting what they learn and putting it into practice. They may be very good learners, but they often don't show it in a standard course.

I know this sounds a little abstract, but just to give you an example from our own work, when we worked with Eskimo kids in Alaska, the teachers thought that the kids on average were very stupid, and actually pretty hopeless. These are Eskimo kids that the teachers think are stupid. If you give them an SAT or IQ type test, they actually look pretty stupid. The interesting thing about them is that they had skills for survival, which the teachers don't have, that the kids have developed as a result of the kind of environment in which they grew up.

They actually have a certain set of skills that are very important for practical adaptation. The critical thing that the teachers didn't realize is that they could leverage those skills and take advantage of those practical skills so that the kids could do better in school. But that wasn't the way the teachers were teaching because they hadn't been trained to do that.

We talked about geometry in a way that leveraged their practical skills, in this case with fish racks, and their achievement went up very considerably. We found the same thing in studies around the country. That's just an example.

We get students at Tufts that come from very diverse backgrounds. Because when we're in graduate school we're often not trained to teach to all of these different kinds of students, we may not end up fully leveraging their strengths with the result that they don't achieve at as high levels as they possibly could.

One thing that I'm very interested in working with you on is how we can really become the foremost institution in terms of reaching kids who have different learning styles. There are specific teaching techniques that can be used, and my hope is that we can rejuvenate our teaching center and work with professors and graduate students so that we can make our teaching a national example.

That's something that for me is an important goal because I do think that many kids learn better. Having been in the loser column before in my life, I know what it's like when you feel like you're really enthusiastic about something, in my case, psychology, but you're taught in a way that's decent for some kids, but that doesn't fit you. So you achieve at a low level, and the professor thinks you're dumb.

My professor said to me that there's a famous Sternberg in psychology, and there won't be another one. That's the way the kids are treated, like they're dumb. Having been there myself, one of my great goals is to not let that not happen to any of our students. I think that we're an institution that really cares about teaching. There are many institutions that say they do, but don't do much about it. This is an institution that really is serious about it. I think that we could work on devising and implementing these teaching strategies for very diverse kinds of kids. Sometimes they're kids from under-represented minorities, and they often have to develop creative and practical teaching skills because they come from challenging circumstances. Sometimes they're white middle-class kids and just have different learning styles. There are different kinds of kids.

But if we could reach them in a way that's unique and that sets us apart, I think that's one strength we can leverage and become nationally known for. That's one thing that for me is a mission. I do believe we have teaching techniques that can be used so that this is not just pie-in-the-sky. We have shown and published empirical research that when you teach to these different learning styles, student achievement increases. It's not just theory. We have done the research to show it.

That's one sort of general goal I have, and probably for me the most important one. That goal is for Tufts to create the very best undergraduate education where we're not just stating it in words, but we're actually doing the stuff. That means the best undergraduate education for everyone and not just for traditional learners.

That in turn has a second component to it. That is if we're creating an education for everyone that's the best possible, the second component is to think about how that interfaces with admissions, and I've talked to Lee Coffin and his group about it.

We have a guy that's working with us named Mark Neustadt. He's doing a lot on issues of image. We had a meeting, and he was talking about the spacing of the letters in the name Tufts, and things we can do for image. I think it's really important for us to do that, but I think another approach is to create excellences that we have that truly distinguish us from other schools, so that it's not just image, but that there's also very strong substance behind the image.

With regard to admissions I'm giving you my philosophy, and you may disagree with it. In a few minutes I'll open the conversation, and you can say whatever you want. My view about admissions -- and some of you may know that I used to work in admissions at Yale for a while -- is that the way admissions are done very heavily rewards kids who come from traditional backgrounds, do well on traditional tests, and think in traditional ways. There's nothing wrong with that. Those kids are smart kids, and they should be

rewarded. But what I'm particularly interested in is whether we can think more broadly about the kinds of kids we want to admit.

If I can take two minutes just to say something about my philosophy here. What I think happens in societies is that we create -- I hope this isn't boring. Is it okay? I'll lock the doors from the outside so when people want to leave, they can't. The coffee is actually extra strong to keep you awake.

What I think happens in societies is that for one reason or another, certain people get into positions of power. It's a natural tendency for people who get into positions of power to want others like them to be in positions of power, whoever they are. Historically in this country, the country has given a lot of advantages to people who are well off financially and in social position. If you look, for example, at Harvard or Yale, in the 1960s, the average SATs were 200 points higher than they were in the 1950s. That's a lot, 200 points in ten years, two standard deviations, and the question is, "what happened?"

What happened was that in the 1950s, the main way you got into very high-powered schools was by your last name, what private school you went to, your social position, and who your parents were, and that was accepted. For most of the history of this country, that was accepted as a very reasonable basis for doing admissions. I'm not here to say what a horrible idea that was. That was what people thought was the right way to do it. If you didn't come from a good family, it was looked at you really didn't have the potential to be a leader because of that. A lot of very smart people who happen to come from good families believe that.

What happened in the 1960s is that the system changed. Some people began to say, "Listen, instead of doing it on the basis of your private school and your last name, let's do it on the basis of test scores." The idea was to create greater fairness and equity and use tests like the SAT, and so SAT scores went up. There's nothing wrong with that. But then what started to happen is that people got into positions of power who had high SAT scores. Then they looked for people with high SAT scores or high test scores, and they seriously believed that the leaders of tomorrow should be people who have high test scores. That's essentially what the view in our society is today.

If you were to ask which view is right, it depends on who you ask. If you ask a professor who had high test scores, he might think that, "Well, I make \$100,000 a year, and I get 700s, and I'm pretty hot stuff. I mean, I'm a professor." If you ask someone who's extremely wealthy and who makes a hundred million dollars a year, but dropped out of school, he might say, "You must be kidding. Who is it that contributes money to both political parties and gets legislation passed just for him? Me. That guy is making \$100,000 a year. What legislation was passed for his company? He doesn't even have a company."

It depends who you ask. In different times, in different places, people with different attributes have gotten to the top of society, and they think that those are the attributes that should matter. Sometimes it's been money, sometimes it's been test scores, as it is here

today, sometimes it's been gender, sometimes it's been socially-defined race, and sometimes it's been cast. There are countries today where if you're not the state-approved religion, you can't get to the top. They would say that if you're that religion, the other religion, of course you can't become a leader here.

Now, you might say that that's a bad system, and you shouldn't do it on the basis of religion, because that's not merit. But they would say, "Are you kidding? We're the religion that's chosen by god, and those people are going to go to hell after they die, so what difference does it make if it's a little earlier." Those people in power think it's a very fair system.

You may say, "What does this have to do with admissions at Tufts?" It has a lot to do with admissions at Tufts because I'm going to propose a new system that is fair, and that is that we do admissions by height. I assume you're all laughing because you're seeing the logic of it. The advantage to doing it by height is, first of all, we don't know what intelligence is. Who knows what intelligence is? I don't know what intelligence is, and I study intelligence.

In 1986, I edited a book called What Is Intelligence?. There were 24 authors, all experts in the field. How many definitions were there? 24. People don't know what it is. We know what height is. You might as well understand the concept you're using. A second thing is that we know how to measure it. You could use 24 different rulers, and I'll always be 5'11". Use 24 different tasks on the SAT, everyone has a different score. That's no good. Why not use rulers so at least they're consistent.

A third thing is I'm 5'11" today, I'm going to be 5'11" in a month, and I'm going to be 5'11" next year. It's very reliable over time.

For the fourth advantage let's be honest. You have rich parents thinking that they can buy you courses to do better on the SATs, whereas with height, you can have rich parents to buy you a course, but it doesn't help.

A fifth advantage is that it's much harder to cheat. I don't know if you know this, but a lot of kids cheat. They write the answers on their hands, or they go to the bathroom, and they look at the answers in the toilet. It's very hard to cheat. With height, if someone wears elevator shoes, it's not hard to detect them.

My point is this: That if we were to start as a society using height, as the basis for choosing a leader, as we have already done, and we said to get into Harvard, you have to be 7 feet, Yale 6'11" but good-looking, and for Swedonk it's 1 foot, in 25 years people in positions of power would be people who were tall.

My point is that the world locked into SATs, and we say that the people who are succeeding all have high SATs. To a large extent, that's because they're the people who were given the opportunities to have high SAT's. It would be the same whether it was

height or socially-defined race or gender. If you don't give the people the chance, then they don't succeed.

What I would like to see and what I'm hoping to work on with Lee Coffin's office is to say, "Look, if we encourage greater diversity, then we'll have the teaching mechanisms in place to teach to these kids." What we can show is that by maximizing diversity, we can also maximize academic excellence. I might have mentioned that in our Rainbow Project when we tested for college admissions using measures of creativity and of practical skills, we not only doubled prediction versus the SAT freshman grades, but also decreased ethnical differences by roughly half. What that means is that diversity is not something that's opposed to academic excellence, but that it's part of it.

What I'm hoping is that we can all get admissions and (inaudible) two pieces of a bigger puzzle, that we can admit more diverse students because that's the right thing to do, and because to get a good education you want students who are diverse. Then we can teach in ways that reach all of these diverse kinds of learning. That's what I'm hoping for.

I mentioned briefly at the AS&E meeting that one of the ways to put this all together is if you're trying to develop analytical, creative, and practical thinking skills because you need creative skills to come up with ideas, analytical skills to know if they're good ideas, and practical skills to make those ideas work and to persuade other people.

If we want to develop the leaders of tomorrow, then these are the kind of skills we want to develop. That means teaching in a broader way. Good leaders are people who can come up with good ideas, who know whether they're good ideas, and can persuade others. More importantly, they're leaders, and I think this is part of the whole package. Again, I'm just giving my views, and you may or may not share them. I'm not trying to impose them on you. I'm just saying how I think about it. Good leaders are wise.

They're people who use their intelligence, creativity, and knowledge for a common good, and not just for their own. One of the major missions of Tufts is civic engagement. It's saying to kids, "Look, you're learning not just to improve your own fortune, not just to become rich on Wall Street -- that's all fine -- but what we're about is civic engagement and using what you learn for a common good."

What I would argue is that there's a lot of very smart leaders who fail, who may have gotten into really good schools, and what they have in common is that they're smart, but foolish. Something was missing in their education so that they were educated to be very smart because the college or the business school had this notion that what you're in school for is to learn a lot of stuff and facts, but they never learned how to use what they know in a way that produced a common good.

If you look at failed leaders, what they have in common, I would argue, is that they tend to commit fallacies in their thinking. The fallacies are ones that I call unrealistic optimism; they think, "I'm so smart and so great, I don't have to worry about the consequences of what I do, because it's me, and I know everything will be fine."

A second fallacy they commit is egocentrism. This is where they become leaders and only think about themselves. What they do is not for the common good, it's not for the citizens, and it's for themselves. They become egocentric, as we saw with Enron or Worldcom.

A third fallacy is that they think they're omniscient. They think they know everything, so they don't learn from mistakes. We see the leaders in our political world as well as in our corporate world who just don't work from mistakes, because they don't think they can make them. They become omnipotent, thinking that they can do whatever they want, and feeling that they're invulnerable, and that they can do what they want, and no one can get back at them.

What I see is if we have this kind of admission procedure, this kind of instructional procedure, that if we can pool all the different resources that are available on this campus, and there are so many resources for producing leaders, what it would mean is taking all of our academic work and saying, "Look, when kids do leadership activities, we can give them an academic base for being the great leaders of tomorrow." That's how I think it all fits together in training the leaders of tomorrow.

VALUE ADDED BY A TUFTS EDUCATION

One of the things we've started talking about, and we've had two meetings on this so far, is if we're going to try to do great things in our instruction and in our admissions, then how can we measure whether we're succeeding? In other words, how do we know if we're succeeding? One of the things we're talking about is what's sometimes called the Value-Added Project. Value-Added just means that if you believe, as I do, that Tufts has something unique to provide to students that is really special, then is there some way that we can assess that.

The idea of the Value-Added Project is that when students come in, they would take some assessments, and then when they leave, they would take some other assessments. What we would try to do through good experimental design, working with Dawn Terkla in the Institutional Research office, is to look at what is it that is acquired through a Tufts education.

The reasons we think that it's worth doing this kind of project are, first, that it's helpful in admissions. What we would then be able to tell students who want to come here is what it is that's special about Tufts. We can tell them that we've done this value-added analysis, and there are things you can get here that maybe are things that you really want to achieve. But it would help us in our communication and our marketing to pick potential applicants.

A second thing it could do is tell us what are the things we're doing well and what are the things that we need to improve. What can we be doing better? A third thing it can do is

help us in accreditation if we measure the kinds of skills that accreditors care about, and require us to show what we are accomplishing as an undergraduate program. Then the fourth thing it can do is that as we try to make education better at Tufts and make this truly the best educational institution for undergraduates in the country, we can longitudinally evaluate the effects of our intervention.

We are working on a project that would have these things as goals, and we hope to measure things like critical, creative, and practical thinking; resilience; your ability, when you have really tough situations, to get through them and come out on top; quantitative and scientific thinking, and so forth.

EMERGING PRIORITIES

The other two things that I think are really important are, one, an understanding of your strengths. What is the unique contribution that you have to make to society? Second, an understanding of your weaknesses. Where are the things that you're not so strong and that you need to improve?

That's my global vision of what I'm hoping we can do if you're interested in doing it. We're forming committees to look into some of these issues, but ultimately, none of this will happen if you're not as excited about it as I am.

I wanted to mention one other thing that came up in the last couple of days. It's relevant because of Simon Wiesenthal's just dying yesterday, and that is that we have a former member of our Board of Trustees, who's also a member of our Board of Overseers, who is interested in the art media in genocide.

I myself have done work on hate and genocide, and I'm particularly interested. Partly it's because of my family background, but a really important problem for society is how hate can give rise to massacres and genocide. It's a problem today. Some think, "Well, that's before, that's World War II." But it's a problem today in parts of the world, and the problem of hate is a problem for this country now. We may not have genocides, but there's plenty of hate to go around. I don't even want to get started on that one. One of the things I said to the donor is that if she's interested in working with us, there are a lot of people who are interested in genocide studies here, and that might be another strength we could capitalize on to enhance Tufts as a premiere institution.

Those are pretty much the things I wanted to talk about. I know Jim had some announcements, but I guess the next thing I'm going to do is hear your thoughts on either anything I said or what you think we most need to do during the coming years. I've been in the job a month, and I've heard a lot of requests, all of which have been quite reasonable, some of which have been really pressing. I wish I had a better budget than I have.

As I think Susan Ernst can tell you, you don't get a huge discretionary budget in this job. I was promised \$2 billion, and it fell short. It's the old campaign promise deal. So it's a little bit short of that.

When I was hired, I made it clear that I've been fundraising my whole life, at least 30 years, and as a career, I've always been funded. I do a lot of fundraising, and part of my job is to help us raise the money so that we can do the things we want to do. As I said in the AS&E meeting, I'm willing to put in the time. I already am putting in the time. I'm meeting with donors. But if you have creative ideas for things that we don't have money for, I'm willing to work with you to raise money to do the things we need to do.

I'm here, and the Dean's Office is here as a resource. We don't always have the money to do everything you want to do, but we're willing to help raise it. Sometimes if you can raise money, then Central Administration is willing to put money in. That's my spiel, just to give you an overview of where I'm coming from. Your comments, suggestions, or thoughts about what we need to do are welcome, but I would like to have a discussion and get your views.

PROF. GROSSMAN: I have two points on that question. Just in terms of training future leaders and moral education, there's a conference they're having at Harvard in conjunction with facing history and ourselves on November 3 and 4. The first day deals with law, but the second day, that Friday from 8:30 to 4:00 at the Gutman Library is specifically about training future leaders, dealing with hate, dealing with genocide, and how can we as educators help shape the leaders of tomorrow. That is on the calendar.

The second thing is that there is on October 6 a Save Darfur Day in Massachusetts. Gloria White-Hammond is organizing that, and there is a website, www.savedarfurma.org. If you're interested in information, go to that. Those are my two points.

DEAN STERNBERG: One point on the Darfur Day, because it's directly relevant to that. There is a quote I used to have on my door from Reverend Martin Muller that I particularly like. Some of you may know it. I don't remember it exactly, but the basic idea was, "First they came for the Catholics, and I didn't help because I'm not Catholic..."

PROF. GROSSMAN: "And then they came for the Communists." It's on the New England Holocaust Memorial. It's one of the panels.

DEAN STERNBERG: "...And then they came for me, and there was no one left to help." It's a really great quote, because it's quite relevant that when there are these genocides elsewhere, or things going wrong elsewhere, we don't often tend to be as helpful as we should. Then eventually, what goes around comes around. It's just important to remember. Your question?

PROF. GROSSMAN: My question is how do you distinguish between different learning styles and learning disabilities? Could you make that distinction?

DEAN STERNBERG: Sure. Also in our center we do work on learning disabilities. Usually learning disabilities are uneven profiles of learning skills. A disability means that there is one thoroughly specific area in which you're weak. The person with a learning disability may actually have a high IQ or high intelligence in general, but has a fairly specific area in which he or she is quite weak.

That's a little different from learning style, which is a preferred way of learning. There are many people with learning disabilities who are enormously successful. Charles Schwabb is often given as an example. Gaston Caperton, President of the College Board, has a learning disability. A lot of people with learning disabilities are very successful.

And the way they do it, the primary thing that's important for people with learning disabilities is to help them figure out how to capitalize in strengths, and for that thing they don't do well, to correct it well enough so that they can get by and then to teach themselves compensatory strategies. There are good cognitive behavioral techniques today for helping kids who have learning disabilities, and they can do well in almost any college and university setting if there's a support structure in place to help them. But they are different things.

PROF. GARMAN: Do you have a timetable in mind that you could share with us? The reason I ask is it doesn't seem like you would want to change admissions in the way you're thinking of until we have had time to work on our ability to educate these students, and also have some of the assessment in place to know that we're doing a good job.

DEAN STERNBERG: The first thing I want to say about the timetable is all of this is contingent on the interest and enthusiasm of the faculty and other stakeholders. I've told you some of the things I'm thinking about, but in the end, if you don't all buy into it, it will never happen. A lot depends on how you feel about the idea.

The way we're going about it is we're now forming task forces to discuss some of these issues and things we should do. If we're going to do them, how could we implement them in a way that makes sense for Tufts? How can we get them funded so that we can do these things well? How would we evaluate them so that we know whether they work?

My own inclination is to move very slowly. For example, with the admissions, when I talked to Lee Coffin's office, I said there are different models of how to do it. One is to make no structural changes in admissions at all, but to do more of a Trojan horse model. That is, you just introduce, maybe you have one question on the application essay that asks, for example, a measure of creative skills telling a story, or writing a story.

Or in an interview, we use practical, situational judgments to measure practical skills. So you give a student an example of a problem a college student might have with a professor

or another student or with homework, and you ask the student how would you solve the problem. The implementation, for example, in admissions can range from quite mild, that you keep your structure, and just introduce some elements of change, to adding a page to the application, or something more major.

But my appointment is for five years, and unless I'm fired first, like I was for the last six years -- I didn't say that because it didn't seem like it would help me get the job. I really appreciated finally being employed. I think that these are things that will happen over time, and I would hope that in five years' time, if stakeholders are interested in these things, we would have made substantial progress.

But I think that they're all things that would happen solely and only if stakeholders were enthusiastic about them. I'm not trying to impose anything. In the end, what we have to do has to be a common decision. If the task forces don't feel like these are things we should go ahead with, then we won't go ahead with them.

When I was the American Psychological Association President, I had a series of initiatives. Some of them I was able to garner enthusiasm for, and a couple died on the vine. I thought they were good, but I wasn't able to garner enough support, so they didn't happen. The people who didn't support them have been severely punished, and they're in prison now.

PROF. CHEW: Thank you for sharing your vision. I wanted to ask about two particular aspects, because you may have some views on this. One is that we have already in undergraduate admissions quite a diverse set of students, and we have in a way a laboratory situation. We have at Tufts an opportunity to use this as an educational laboratory to educate people in certain ways using the diversity office.

I say this because one of the instructors in American Studies actually taught summer school elsewhere and came back and commented that she missed the diversity of students, and therefore the diversity of viewpoints.

The first question is how might we do that, how might we actually engage that diversity at the undergraduate level so as to educate people towards leadership? The second question is I wonder if in your research you found an issue that, I think, faces those of us in the natural sciences, and perhaps mathematics, particularly with regard to minority students, and that's something called stereotype threat, because the critical masses of them are not so large?

DEAN STERNBERG: Well, I'm glad you asked easy questions. I see here our time is up. With regard to your first question, I think that one way to start -- there are a lot of leadership activities at Tufts. There's even a University College that's devoted to promoting leadership activities. The one area in which I personally -- from what I see after a month, and I could be wrong -- it would be the first time, of course. I mean, as someone who's omniscient, I don't make mistakes.

Seriously, I think that there's a need to synthesize these activities, to bring them together. For example, there's a large, scholarly literature on leadership. And the question is can students learn about and leverage that leadership literature so that when they are engaged in leadership activities, which we very much encourage at Tufts, not only are they being leaders -- because what we're in the business of is providing education. Can we educate them in the literature of leadership, and that means developing creative, practical, analytical, and certain attitudinal skills, learning about models of leadership so that they can use that to become better leaders.

For example, if they start seriously thinking they know everything, and we all know leaders who are like that, who stop being able to admit mistakes, can they go and say to themselves, "I'm starting to commit the omniscient fallacy, or I'm engaging in group think. What I've done is surround myself with a small group of cronies or sycophants or whatever, and I'm not listening to other points of view."

We've seen this happen in government. Irving Janis wrote a book, Victims of Group Think, and all the examples were government leaders who surround themselves with people who are like-minded. They insulate themselves from other points of view, and they become ineffective and divorced. They don't know what's going on. There's a disaster. Instead of looking at it close by, they look at it from a distance, if they look at it at all.

One of the things I'm doing in the second term is I'm teaching a course on leadership. Sanaia Nathanson teaches a course on leadership. There are other courses on leadership. Leadership is not just a behavioral science thing. You can learn leadership from the humanities, philosophy, or literature. You learn leadership when you study other cultures and see how other cultures handle these things. You can learn leadership in the sciences, because the models in each field, the people who bring the field forward are the innovators, the revolutionaries.

I edited a book called Psychologists Define the Crowd about the psychologists who became leaders by saying even though everyone's doing things this way, we're going to do them that way. We're going to take a lot of flack for it, and we're going to do it anyway. There is a really substantive academic base that we can integrate with the leadership activities, and that's where I think we have our special contribution to make.

In terms of stereotype threat, some of you may not know what it is, so I'm going to just explain it briefly, because it may be a term that's unfamiliar to you. It emerges from work that Claude Steele and others have done, and the basic idea is this: it applies across socially-defined races. I keep saying socially-defined, because race is a socially-defined concept, it's not a biological one. It applies across socially-defined races, and it applies across genders.

Let me give you a gender example. If you give a difficult mathematical test, like a math GRE, on average, men do better than women. That's just a statistical finding. What Steele and Aronson did in their initial studies was they give something like the math GRE

or hard math problems, they find boys do better than girls. Then they introduce another condition. There are different ways that they introduce this condition, but I'll just give you an example.

They say, "All right, we're going to give you a difficult math test. And oh, by the way, on this test, boys and girls do equally." They don't show a difference. What you do is say on this particular test, you don't get the difference. The idea is then when you go into certain tasks, you tend to say, well, members of my group don't do well on this. For example, I have this theory personally that I don't do well on spatial tests. So I go in to do a spacial test, I say people like me don't do well on spacial tests. Then I don't pay attention, I don't do well, and it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. I say ah-ha, I didn't do well on this spacial test.

So they say, "All right, by the way, at this task you don't get any difference." What did they find? They find that when you tell them that, the women do better and the men do worse. So they start to converge. Is the finding clear? So what they're saying is that part of the difference you get on some tests that are supposed to be ability or achievement tests is not actually ability or achievement, but it's rather this stereotype threat. You feel that as a result of the group you're in, you're stereotyped, you're not expected to do well, you don't expect yourself to do well, and then it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

I think the most important thing we can do is be very encouraging to all students. I had lunch with Richard Light yesterday, who is a professor at the Harvard Education School and the Kennedy School of Government, and he had a couple of interesting things to say. But one of them was in the sciences. He's done these studies at Harvard and around the country, and he asked the question how -- you know, a lot of kids drop out of sciences. Why do they drop out? He found that one of the best predictors of whether kids succeeded in science or not is whether they study in groups. The kids who study in groups stay in science, and the kids who study individually on average tend not to.

One thing you can do is encourage students to study in groups, especially in difficult science and math courses. That way, you can complement each other, and the students are more likely to remain studying science. If you're talking about a gender difference, then a really important thing is to provide extra encouragement to women, who have traditionally been told, as in the case of the helpful Barbie doll, I find math difficult, or have been led to believe that they can't do well, and to provide as much encouragement as possible.

He also had one other observation that I thought was really cool that I'll tell you. That is that he looked at students who had rated their college satisfaction very high, and he compared them to students who rated their college satisfaction as moderate to high. He found one really good predictor of how to differentiate those who really enjoyed their college experience from those who just thought it was okay. The really good predictor was whether they, especially their freshman year, took the courses they really wanted to take, or they took the attitude, "I want to get my requirements out of the way," and took a bunch of requirements.

He found that the students who took the courses they really wanted to take in the end were much happier with the college experience. Interestingly, the worst offenders for telling them that they should get the requirements out of the way were the parents. Part of it was overcoming the influence of parents who meant well for their kids, but actually set them on a trajectory so that they would be less satisfied in school.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: While I appreciate the emphasis you place on leadership, I'm a little bit troubled by it, because it seems to me that one of the problems we face is that we don't have an education in active citizenship, so why would we be (inaudible) every year rather than focus on producing an engaged and active citizenship?

DEAN STERNBERG: I don't view those as different. When I talk about leader, I'm not necessarily talking about people who are going to be presidents of the United States. I'm talking about people who have the ability to say these are things I want to accomplish in my life, and then they're able to recruit the support of others to do those things. It might be a chair of a department, it might be the father or mother of a family, and it might be a sibling. I'm talking about leadership skills. It's a little like when I talk about creativity, I'm not talking about Chaucer, Darwin, and Picasso. I'm talking about the kind of creativity that everyone can have.

There's a story, if I can just give an example from creativity, about a politician and his wife who go to a fancy French restaurant in Washington, D.C., and the waiter comes up to them and says to the wife, "What would you like for the appetizer," and she says, "I'll have the pate de fois gras." And then he asks, "What would you like for the main course, and she says, "I'll have the filet mignon." And then he says, "And the vegetable?" And she says, "He'll have the same."

I like that story because what it does is point out that creativity is an everyday thing. Every day we have opportunities to be creative. It's not just something that some person out there shows. Creativity is about coping with novelty. It's dealing with new kinds of situations. Leadership is not -- I'm not just talking about some elite in Washington. I'm talking about the leadership you show when you're a teacher, you're showing leadership with your students. You're a role model for those students, and they look up to you as a leader, and you may do a great job or a good job or whatever, but you're in a leadership role. They are in a leadership role. It's something that's about everyone, and to me, it's part and parcel of active citizenry, and it's not just some elite class.

PROF. ORIAN: I agree 100%. One of the things that I think is really important is hands-on research. In the Biology Department, we try to get and we have really strong students test-wise, but we also have students who are interested in research. So one thing I would love from the administration is an effort to build up some research opportunities for undergraduates, raising money for endowments, finding ways to support faculty who want to spend significant amounts of time and money, as it turns out, supporting that undergraduate research. If there was some way that you could help facilitate research

opportunities for undergraduates, I think it would be a great way to highlight that diversity of learning style.

DEAN STERNBERG: I agree, because that's ultimately what science is about. What I discovered is I wasn't a very good multiple choice taker in science, but I really liked doing scientific research. There used to be a lot of money in NSF for science education to support these things. There's not so much anymore, but there's some. There are foundations that are interested.

As I said, this is an open invitation. If any of you have a goal who wants to brainstorm with me or with any of the deanery in terms of thinking about how to raise money to accomplish that, that's what I'm here for. I would be glad to do that, and especially things like project-based learning in science, I think is really important, because that's really the way you learn science. In the case of psychology, we have had an active empirical program, and what we find is the best way to learn science is to do it.

CHAPLAIN O'LEARY: I'm really energized by your vision. Part of the issue I hope would be how do we role model when we disagree with one another. I think part of diversity with this campus is maybe we do not model how we disagree with one another, even within departments or cross-disciplines. Wouldn't it be nice to model how we can disagree and still be friends and still be colleagues, where I disagree with someone's argument and position without attacking the personhood or dignity, and hopefully, that's part of leadership quality.

DEAN STERNBERG: It is. In the wisdom of the theory of leadership, two of the kinds of thinking one develops -- well, there's several kinds, but the two I want to mention, one is dialogical thinking, which is essential for leadership and is your ability to see. When I talk about abilities, I'm not talking about inborn abilities. Abilities are things you develop in your life, that kids come to college to develop. They're not fixed, they're modifiable.

Dialogical thinking is your ability to see things from multiple points of view, to understand other people's arguments, and be able to put yourself in their position. Ineffective leaders can't do that, or don't even try. They see their position, and they view their goal as trying to get everyone to come to their position. In the case of authoritarian leaders, they don't even allow other options.

Good leadership means that you can think creatively, that you can understand other people's positions, and then reach some kind of practical conclusion. Sometimes it's middle ground, sometimes it's not middle ground, but some kind of ground that takes into account how they feel about things, how they see things, and show that they understand it.

A good example from my past history is Yale has a history of labor relations problems that goes a long way back. One of the things I found frustrating is anytime there was going to be a big management labor negotiation, several months before that, both sides

would start advertising why their position is so great. Historically, I think that they weren't as strong in trying to see the other side's position as they could have been. It was like let's try to negotiate from extreme positions so that maybe then we won't have to concede as much, rather than saying let's try to find common ground. I very much agree with that and think it's essential for good leadership.

The other kind of thing I was going to mention is dialectical thinking, which is realizing that over time, what's true changes. It's like we find in our research and our teaching, research strategies that may work at one point in our career don't necessarily work later on. The kinds of research I did early in my career I probably wouldn't do anymore. There are ways of teaching when I started my career that I could use that don't work with today's students. So dialectical thinking is realizing that strategies that work at one point don't necessarily work at other points.

PROF. METCALF: An observation and question. I think the focus on assessment and measuring value-added is a really good one. It's something that the Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience thought a fair amount about. If you're trying to assess the process of how we're accomplishing what we're doing, it's also important to focus on what it is we're trying to produce in our students. But it's pointing to the educational outcomes of the task force articulated in our report.

DEAN STERNBERG: Yes, and I read that report, of course, and I think that this is a natural outcome of that.

PROF. METCALF: So the question actually is on a different topic, and maybe today is not the time to answer it, but I'd love, and I'm sure others would also love to hear your thoughts and vision about the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.

DEAN STERNBERG: I can give you my view as it is now. Thinking dialectically, it may change over time. One of Larry's and Jamshed's goals is to become a very strong research-based university, and that means doing cutting-edge research, and one of the ways we do cutting-edge research is to have a great graduate program. I think historically, the emphasis at Tufts has been more on undergraduates, and I think over time, ideally we would want more to balance that.

My career would be nothing if I hadn't had graduate students. In my second year at Yale, I had an offer from Bell Labs, better salary, superb working conditions, super smart colleagues, and I didn't take it. The main reason was that there were no graduate students. Graduate students have been essential -- I'm very proud of the graduate students I've changed. They have become leaders in the field. They're all over the world. One of the great satisfactions I've had is that I can say for whatever research I did that I've trained people who are really making a difference. (Inaudible) difference you make, because as we all know, our research kind of gets out of date, if we're lucky soon after we died; if we're not so lucky, quite a bit before.

I would like to see more doctoral programs develop. We are trying to get more funding for graduate students. In some areas, that might be that we become the best master's level program, but it's certainly something we care a lot about. I do, because I think that that's one of the keys to accomplishing the goal of making us cutting-edge in research.

I want to say that Jim Glaser had some announcements, and I've noticed a few people trickling out. I want to make sure you have time to make your announcements, so why don't you make them now, and then if there's time, we can continue the conversation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

DEAN GLASER: Rather mundane concerns, but important to communicate to you. First of all, as most of you know, Salman Rushdie is coming to give a lecture on campus on Tuesday of next week, Tuesday evening. We made tickets available last Friday, and within an hour and a half they were entirely scooped up, which is fabulous and really way beyond my expectations. I wasn't sure our students would all know who Salman Rushdie was, but I think it's a nice comment on our students and that they would be so excited about it.

As a result of it, we are opening up an overflow room in the Balch Arena Theater, so I raise that to you because if you wish to get some tickets for the overflow room if you haven't obtained tickets, they can be obtained by calling 7-2000 and talking to somebody at the desk.

Second of all, I got a phone call from the Biology Department this morning. We put out the registration materials recently, and they did include the new block schedule, which is going into effect next semester. I know in my own department, I got them with the materials that are distributed every semester. But Biology went online, and the old block schedule is still online. So I'm very sorry. It's my mistake. We should have updated that. But there is a new block schedule. It will be corrected online as soon as we can physically manage that to happen, and I just want to make sure that everybody goes back to your departments and make sure that you're working with the right block schedule for planning next semester.

Finally, I want to call Tricia Sheehan up here and give you just a real quick and dirty update on the DARS project, which is underway at Dowling Hall, well underway. The DARS system stands for Degree Audit Reporting System. What this system is going to do is get us away from degree sheets and make us better and more effective advisers. It's going to be excellent for us as advisers because -- well, let me just back up.

What it will do is on the web, it will automatically populate a webpage associated with each student with the courses that fulfill their requirements. So at any point in the student's career from the moment they step foot on campus to the moment they graduate, they'll be able to tell without a lot of fuss and without a lot of bulletin copies where they stand with regard to their requirements and how much more they have left to do. It's going to be great for you as an advisor, because you'll know this at all times, what's been

done and what's left to do. It's going to be great for the students, and it's going to be really great for us, because it's going to make the degree certification process easier and less dependent on one poor soul at the end, and that's Carol Downing, who does heroic work at the end of the year, but if something were to happen to Carol, we would be in very deep trouble.

That's the degree audit project. What I thought I would do is ask Trish to come and speak for five minutes about what this means for you in terms of getting the degree audit system up and running. So Trish, who is the director of the technical services team at Dowling Hall, and a very important person to us over there, is the person spearheading this project, and I want her to address you.

DIRECTOR SHEEHAN: Thank you. Jim gave a good overview of exactly what DARS does and how it will help you in advising, and more importantly information being delivered to students. We do have a pilot project up and running right now. We credit the advisory board in finding both Math and Mechanical Engineering to join us in this pilot project. So we have about 15 to 20 advisors currently using the DARS application. They've gone through training, and we will be soliciting feedback in another couple of weeks to make sure that how we've started the DARS project (inaudible) advisers to help them use the tool effectively in an advising appointment with students.

The pilot project has been a big success so far, or, at least, a lot of work has gone into it. I will give you quickly the scope of the pilot project, a quick overview about how we're looking to move forward, and how that will affect you in your departments.

Just a quick side note. Some of you have already been affected by this. We asked Gabrielle Bertucci and a student for some help in looking at the course offerings versus what we have posted in the Bulletin. I think some of you have already been meeting with her to clean up our course listings so that what is stated in the Bulletin is actually true and accurate so that the coding process of DARS can move forward quickly.

We're starting off any student entered in the fall of 2004 for the scope of our pilot program. Those students are loaded into DARS, and advisors (inaudible) audits for them. We have imported the foundation and distribution requirements for all undergraduate liberal arts students. We've got the math degree and mechanical engineering running. We're tracking our resident's requirements, total course credit requirements, and running a duplicate course check. We're running our advanced placement test scores through there now, so you as an advisor will know if a student has tested out of a certain course, which you did not know before. This will help them specifically in first year advising. All of this, as Jim had mentioned, will be over the web.

We've taken this past year to really get familiar with the application, understand how we're going to move forward with the coding, and we're now getting ready for our phase 2 rollout, which we should have in probably January. We will be inviting another set of advisors in departments to join us in this effort, and we'll be giving you more information about that. We are working very closely with Carol to help us identify the next set of

majors that she's comfortable doing the testing and getting feedback from the departments to get ready for January.

That being said, we're hopeful by next September to have close to half of the undergraduate population in terms of their majors, that is, the number of students that enroll in those majors affected by DARS, which will then obviously affect the majority of the departments here. I'm not sure if anybody has any questions.

DEAN GLASER: Just to say one thing. All undergraduates who are first and second years, their general requirements, their foreign language requirement and their culture requirement and all that will be covered. So everybody is covered now just for those, and it's the majors that we're adding on over time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One of the most difficult processes in advising are courses which are being petitioned in various faculty committees for (inaudible). Will the committees be notified somehow so that those (inaudible) timely?

DIRECTOR SHEEHAN: We have (inaudible) the transcript credit process, and we are getting that information back to Dowling Hall much more quickly than there has been in our office before. The transfer of credit of courses is being transferred now too -- we're getting information sooner, it is being data entered (inaudible) and therefore fed into DARS. So you will know if a course was transferred and what the Tufts course equivalency is, if one exists, how it's being audited, and how it's being applied toward the degree or if they just received departmental credit.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But there are also sometimes new courses, for instance, at Tufts which are offered here on campus, which may not yet have been approved, say, to serve as a Spanish Culture Option course or something like that. So all the faculty committees that approve those designations, will they be tied in?

DIRECTOR SHEEHAN: They are tied in in their communication -- Jack helped us with that -- in our communication back to Dowling Hall. But obviously, nothing will be included in DARS until we get the approval from the various committees.

PROF. GROSSMAN: Trish, in terms of course numbering, because I know that you want to avoid duplication, and if we are assigning a new number to a course that already exists -- is that something that we can do without having to go through the Curriculum Committee?

PROF. RIDGE: If the change in the course number in the department is required by the DARS system, then that can be done automatically when you talk with Gabrielle to renumber your courses. In other words, you're not going to have to go to through the Curriculum Committee to get rid of courses that aren't going to be taught anymore, or to renumber courses as a result of implementing DARS.

Quite frankly, we don't want all those proposals. This year, you will be allowed to do that. In fact, we're not going to accept proposals to the numbered courses or to drop courses from the curriculum. That can be done when we're converting to DARS.

PROF. GARMAN: A follow-up question: I'm really encouraged by the DARS automation, and it makes me think of other areas where we could really save some time with automation by putting the add-drop online instead of having all the paper forms; for chairs who are creating the schedule for the next semester, doing that online; and course evaluations. We handle a lot of paper that I think we could do online.

DEAN GLASER: All those things are on our agenda. I don't think we can move forward with the add-drop until the advisors have this tool. Once the advisors have this tool, it's very easy, I think, to automate the add-drop process. I know the students are very interested in not having to chase everybody around campus with their forms to be signed, and the advisors I'm sure would be very happy on drop day not to face the 30 students who are waving a form in their face.

That is something that will come, but we're doing it step by step. It seems like this is the first step, and that comes later. Online course evaluations are something we're looking at as well, doing some pilot projects in computer science classes this semester to just get the feel for what some of the issues or problems might be.

DEAN STERNBERG: Is there anything else anyone would like to bring up before we convene? Okay, well, thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Doheney
Secretary of the Faculty