

**ARTS & SCIENCES
FACULTY MEETING
COOLIDGE ROOM, BALLOU HALL
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2009**

PAGE

New Business

Recommendations for November 2009 Degrees for Liberal Arts and Jackson College.....	1
Recommendations for November 2009 Degrees for the College of Special Studies.....	2
Recommendations for November 2009 Degrees for the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.....	2
Curriculum Committee Proposals.....	3
Financial Update.....	5
Graduate School Tuition and Grants.....	8

Appendices

Liberal Arts & Jackson College Degree Candidates.....	A
College of Special Studies Degree Candidates.....	B
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Degree Candidates.....	C
Curriculum Committee Proposal.....	D

DEAN STERNBERG: Let me make the most important announcement, after which everything else will be trivial: Starting with the next A&S faculty meeting, we will be serving lunch again. This is the last dessert-only meeting until we return to normal lunch.

Let's get started. Thank you very much for coming.

LIBERAL ARTS & JACKSON COLLEGE - DEGREES

DEAN STERNBERG: I would like to open a Liberal Arts and Jackson College meeting at this time to vote degrees for our undergraduates, and I'd like to call on the Dean of Undergraduate Education for Arts, Sciences and Engineering, Jim Glaser, to propose the candidates for the undergraduate degrees.

DEAN GLASER: Members of the faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from Liberal Arts and Jackson College. It is the function of this faculty to recommend to the Board of Trustees candidates for degrees in Liberal Arts and Jackson College as authorized by the Trustees for the award of the degree in November 2009, subject to the usual conditions.

I am happy to certify that these candidates have met or will meet the degree requirements as set forth by this faculty for the programs in which they have been enrolled. The total number of Bachelor degrees to be recommended is sixteen. Of those, in Liberal Arts, there are six Bachelor of Arts candidates and two Bachelor of Science candidates. In Jackson College, there are eight Bachelor of Arts candidates and zero Bachelor of Science candidates. Do I have a second? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Thank you.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you. I would now like to close the meeting of Liberal Arts and Jackson.

ALL DEGREES APPROVED

LIST OF DEGREE CANDIDATES APPENDED (APPENDIX A)

COLLEGE OF SPECIAL STUDIES MEETING – DEGREES

DEAN GLASER: I would like to call on Dean Sullivan to open a College of Special Studies faculty meeting to vote degrees.

DEAN SULLIVAN: I would like to open a meeting of the College of Special Studies at this time to vote degrees.

Members of the faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from the College of Special Studies for the Bachelor of Fine Arts. I'm happy to certify that these candidates have met or will meet the degree requirements as set forth by this faculty for the programs in which they have been enrolled.

The faculty members of the department of Visual and Critical Studies of the Museum College, College of Special Studies, have approved this list of degree candidates. I would therefore move that this faculty recommend that these candidates be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for award of the degrees in November 2009, subject to the usual conditions, finishing the courses with passing grades. There are 22 Bachelor of Fine Arts candidates. Is there a second? All in favor? Opposed?

DEAN STERNBERG: Thank you. I would now like to close the meeting of the College of Special Studies.

ALL DEGREES APPROVED

LIST OF DEGREE CANDIDATES APPENDED (APPENDIX B)

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES MEETING – DEGREES

DEAN STERNBERG: I call on Dean Pepall to open a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences faculty meeting to vote graduate degrees.

DEAN PEPALL: I would like to open a meeting of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at

this time to vote degrees.

Members of this faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It is the function of this faculty to recommend to the Board of Trustees all candidates for degrees in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, as authorized by the trustees for the award of the degree in November 2009, subject to the usual conditions.

I am happy to certify that these candidates have met or will meet the degree requirements as set forth by this faculty for the programs in which they have been enrolled. The total number of degrees to be recommended is 22. Of those, sixteen are Masters degrees and Certificates of Advanced Study, and six are Ph.D. degrees. The numbers of graduate degrees specifically are as follows: eleven Masters of Arts, two Masters of Arts in Teaching, one Master of Fine Arts, one Master of Science, one Master of Public Policy, and six Doctors of Philosophy. I move that we award these degrees. All those in favor? All those opposed? Abstentions? Thank you.

Shall I close the meeting?

DEAN STERNBERG: I'll do that. There are very few responsibilities I have, so I would now like, officially and personally, as well as professionally, to close the meeting of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and reopen the meeting of Liberal Arts and Jackson.

ALL DEGREES APPROVED

LIST OF DEGREE CANDIDATES APPENDED (APPENDIX C)

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROPOSALS

DEAN STERNBERG: I'd like to call on Montserrat Teixidor I Bigas to give the Curriculum Committee proposals.

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: The Curriculum Committee met last week, and we have a proposal consisting of a few new courses that were approved by the Curriculum Committee and need to be approved by the faculty. I think you all have this. The first course is Psychology 65, Phonological Theory. Is there any discussion?

PROF. MULHOLLAND: I have a small problem. I'm old enough and have been sitting here long enough to remember a time when the Curriculum Committee spent endless amounts of time talking about commas and punctuation - tiresome stuff, and I don't want to get into it again. But, on the other hand, the *Bulletin* is supposed to be a description of the content of the courses, and there is (inaudible) rather stilted form of English usage (inaudible), which this course description certainly does not conform to. To say in the description of the course that students will 'learn how' is quite redundant, and instead something like 'the analysis of primary linguistic data', or 'an introduction to (inaudible)', et cetera, is proper.

I don't want to move this as an amendment, but I would suggest, however, that while approving these courses, as I hope we will because of their content, that is to say, their intellectual substance, that the wording would be referred back to the Curriculum Committee so that the descriptions conform with the *Bulletin*.

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Should we approve this course, subject to these changes in

language? All in favor? Against? Abstentions?

DEAN GLASER: I think that we can assume that all of these, with Dan's suggestion, will have one more eyeball from the Curriculum Committee to conform to *Bulletin* language, and I don't think that should be a difficult thing to do.

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Let's go to the next one. It's again another course in Psychology, which is called Neuropsychology of Cognition.

PROF. DEVOTO: Is there anyone from Psychology who wants to speak to this?

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Any comments or suggestions?

PROF. MULHOLLAND: I'm sorry, but this is entitled Neuropsychology of Cognition, and there was some question in the committee as to whether or not the general topic, neuropsychology of cognition, does in fact rely on damaged individuals. That is to say, is this Oliver Sacks, or are there other components to neuropsychology of cognition?

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: The wording now is different from the one that we discussed in the committee. I don't know if you have noticed, but it says a little bit about what cognitive neuropsychology is.

PROF. WOLF: What I thought they would do by using the word 'mostly' or 'largely' is to indicate that a lot of the data in this particular course is based on patients with discreet areas of brain damage, as opposed to other courses which rely largely on other experimental databases. I think that was the point of this.

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: When we received the proposal for the first time, the sentence before 'mostly' did not exist, including 'mostly'. Any comments? Should we move about voting this course? All in favor? Against? Abstentions?

One last item we need to work on is a new course in Art & Art History. It's entitled Contemporary Art Since 1960. Any comments?

DEAN GLASER: This course had been offered a number of times under Special Topics, and for the ease of our students and the use of DARS, it would be great if I could get the message out to folks from all the different departments that if you have courses that are being offered multiple times under Special Topics with numbers and names, it would be great to get it into the regular curriculum. And so I use this as an advertisement for the Curriculum Committee to move courses taught multiple times as Special Topics into the regular curriculum.

PROF. TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Should we vote on that course? All in favor? Against? Abstentions?

The rest of the Curriculum Committee agenda is just for your information about things that have

been approved but don't require faculty approval because they are minor changes to different courses.

DEAN STERNBERG: Thank you.

PROPOSAL APPROVED

FULL PROPOSAL APPENDED (APPENDIX D)

FINANCIAL UPDATE

DEAN STERNBERG: I'd like to call on Leah McIntosh for our financial update.

DEAN McINTOSH: Let me start out by talking about where things look so far for the year-to-date. So far, we are plugging along on the budget as we had established it. I haven't seen anything dramatic one way or the other. Those of you who are department chairs, but also those of you who are individual members of the faculty, have done things during this year to help us get to this point. It's a good thing that we all looked at our budgets and we thought about it. Having made some of the difficult choices together, it's playing out this year in a way which I think is a stable one, as far as we know. Whenever I say these things, I have to also say, "Barring unpredictable disasters."

We've started the budget process, believe it or not, for the next fiscal year. We have to start it now, because the way the process works, we need to submit a finalized budget in the middle of January. In order to do that, we have to start talking to people now. So right now, we're in the process of gathering information about what people need. We're starting to try to make predictions for what's going to happen nine months from now. As all of you can understand, that's a kind of scary moment, because nine months from right now feels like a very long time. We're doing a lot of work to really make some predictions and make some best guesses about what things are going to look like in nine months. So, everything I tell you right now, we all have to recognize that I'm telling you with a relatively high degree of uncertainty. If we were having this conversation four years ago, I would sound much more sure of myself than I'm going to sound with everything I'm about to tell you right now.

The big factors for us as we think about a budget for next year are going to be really mostly out of our control. There are a couple of things in the economy overall that are very much going to affect all of us. One obvious way in which the economy will affect us is if the stock market -- you know, if we all go back to our offices, and the stock market has stabilized today at 12,000, that would solve a lot of our problems, because a lot of our accounts would start to turn back on as the stock market goes back up. I know we've talked about it before, but as the market started to go down, many of our accounts froze as their value dropped. We had to pick up in the Arts and Sciences budget things that were being paid for out of endowment money. That was professorial salaries and also financial aid. Every day it goes up, I'm more cheerful, because some of these things will start to turn back on, and that would be a huge help for all of us. It's not enough for me to be really cheerful, but I'm hoping.

Employment is going to be another big issue. That rolls through to us in terms of the pressures on financial aid. The unemployment has been brutal on our kids and their families, and that's really a very hard factor for us to predict.

Let me just add one other thing, which is in terms of fundraising, the higher the market goes, the more cheerful our potential donors are about giving, and at the moment, many of our most generous and wealthiest donors are feeling very uncertain about their ability to give. An improved economy would help with that, too.

I see three big unknowns in the budget for next year. The obvious one is financial aid. We do financial aid assessments based on the prior year's tax forms, so that means that on 2009 tax forms, most people's incomes are going to look worse than they did in 2008, which was a year in which we increased our financial aid budget a lot and really needed to. So, trying to think about what's going to be the need of our students is something that we've been spending a lot of time with, and I think we're going to continue to see a lot of pressure.

As you know, and you've heard the president and you've heard Dean Sternberg talk about this, we feel very strongly that we have to maintain a commitment to the students that we've accepted; if a student's financial situation changes, we respond to that. Not every university has made that choice, but we really feel very strongly that it's our obligation to help the kids that we have accepted to get through.

On the graduate student side, we would like to continue some of the things that we've been doing. We have been working very hard with the graduate school and with individual departments to increase stipends. That's probably the most critical thing that we can do with graduate students. It has not been easy. We have not succeeded to the degree I think that any of us would hope, but we're still trying.

Where we have been able to succeed -- again, not as much as I think we would like to -- is in increasing health insurance for our Ph.D. candidates. We are now paying half of that cost. We would love to be able to increase the amount we are paying more. Again, I just don't know if we're going to be able to do that. It's something we think is important and that we'll keep working on.

Finally, salaries. That's a decision that's made at the university level. It's something that we all talk about. It's something where we have active conversations and debate. The factors that go into it are obviously the economy as a whole, if we can afford to give raises without bankrupting the school, the market conditions, and what's happening in our competitive schools. Last year -- I don't know of a college or university actually last year in this area that gave raises other than those built into union contracts. And then a kind of general evaluation of the -- let's call it 'morale issues'. This is not something we're going to see decided for months, because we really don't have the information now to know what we can do. It's something that's of a lot of concern to a lot of people in the school, and I know that. Again, if there's something that we can do, I think there's a very strong feeling that's what we would like to do. It's very hard to know -- it's really impossible to know right now where we're going to be.

I think that the only other thing that I would call people's attention to is that you've been seeing pressure on health insurance. I'm sure all of you have seen that the cost that we as individuals pay is going up. The climate right now for health insurance -- it's the topic of the month, and we can all get into a huge debate about that in just a minute, but there is a lot of pressure, once again, on healthcare pricing. We negotiate very vigorously with the companies that sell us insurance. There's only so far we can go, and I think that that's been a real issue. If those costs continue to go up dramatically, that's also a very real pressure on the school.

The only really positive thing about this, the economic condition, is that we have been able to do some hires. We're in the market in a limited number of places, but we are hiring some faculty, and I think what we've seen is that this is just an incredible time to be able to be out there, if you can. It's a matter of balancing lots of different things, but where we've been able to do it, I think it's been a terrific thing to be able to be out there and to be hiring. Questions?

PROF. WINN: Should we assume, given the analysis you made, that insurance, admission, financial aid for the incoming class, that it will not be need-blind?

DEAN McINTOSH: We've never been officially need-blind.

PROF. WINN: I know, but at least where we were just before the prices hit.

DEAN McINTOSH: We were able to read need-blind for a couple of years. We were not able to read need-blind last year. I think it's unlikely we will be able to do that this coming year. It's very expensive in the year that you do it, and one of the things that we've really seen in this crisis is that when you admit a need-blind class, they're more sensitive to fluctuations in the economy. One of the reasons why we've had to really work very hard to keep enough money in that is because of having admitted needier classes. So, it's a very hard issue. As you know, it's been a real goal of ours to get to that point and maintain it, but I think given the financial pressures, we're very committed to supporting the kids we let in, and I think that's really got to be where we focus.

PROF. WINN: This is question of nuance. It's true the market is not at 12,000, and it may never be at 12,000. It's also not at 8,000. And yet, I don't hear reflected in your financial report the sense, in terms of general financial reporting out there, that there's been a significant improvement, and I would hope this would somehow be entering into the budgetary process.

DEAN McINTOSH: Some of this has to do with when we're having the conversation, because we don't get good information about how this is going to roll through to our budgets until January. Anything I tell you right now would be speculative. If I could predict where the market is going to be six months from now, I would be a wealthy woman. I can assure you, that's not my skill.

If the market stays here, that would be a big help. What it's not high enough to do is turn on many of our accounts. Because a lot of our fundraising has been relatively recent, the value at which people gave these accounts was at a fairly high point. Forgive me if you know this, but

when the value drops below what was given, the accounts turn off, and so to really get everything back, we need the market to be higher than this. My guess is it will help, but my guess is it's not going to reverse the situation, let me put it to you that way. Other questions?

DEAN GLASER: I had a conversation yesterday with Patty Reilly, who's the Director of Financial Aid, and the amount of traffic in her department is up considerably, as students are appealing their financial aid award. They're even appealing the response to their financial aid award. It's more than it was last year; there's sort of a lag effect of the economy. So, what's going on there is substantially different, and the volume is quite increased over the past.

DEAN McINTOSH: Just from my perspective, we increased our budget -- this is an AS&E number, not an A&S number purely, but we increased the financial aid budget last year by about ten percent. Financial aid is a very big part of our budget, and that was a very big increase. As Jim is saying, it's still not -- I mean, we would have loved to have done it twenty percent.

DEAN STERNBERG: Thank you, Leah.

GRADUATE SCHOOL TUITION AND GRANTS

DEAN STERNBERG: I'd like to call on Lynne Pepall to talk about graduate student tuition and grants.

DEAN PEPALL: Another sobering story. I wanted to take some time at this meeting to talk about a change in our external funding policy, and that change has to do with our graduate students who are working on your grant proposals that you're submitting for external funding. Prior to September first, we recommended that for every graduate student that was working in the capacity as a research assistant that you would budget fifteen percent of the graduate student's tuition plus their health insurance fees. Over the summer, we made that no longer a recommendation, but effective September first, it would be a policy. So, now when you are working on your budgets, you need to budget the tuition, this tuition charge for a student who's working as an R.A. I wanted to talk to you a little bit about the background and why we're doing this so that you would feel supportive of that change.

First, it's not an unconventional practice to charge tuition. In fact, it's quite conventional at research universities, and I think that's in part a recognition that graduate students are an important part of our research infrastructure, and they're costly. I mean, you have to teach them, mentor them, develop their research skills and their teaching skills, and then apart from that, there are other aspects of their professional development that the graduate school is committed to providing for them.

We have the gift program, we have travel funding, we have research grants that they can apply for, T.A. training -- we're really working more proactively there. So, there are lots of costs to having graduate students. As most of you know, in our doctoral programs, we wouldn't be able to compete for students unless we offered one hundred percent tuition scholarship. So, we're not getting any tuition revenue from our doctoral students.

One way that we can try and capture the cost is through external funding. It's recognized by funders that this is an appropriate budget item. Certainly, the NSF recognizes it and gives a cost of education allowance for doctoral students who are funded by the NSF of \$10,000 a year, which would go into tuition. What we're trying to do now is encourage faculty to realize that funding will only help us be where we want to be in terms of attracting really good graduate students.

In the letter in the summer, we worked out an example that was based on 2009-2010 tuition. We looked at the doctoral tuition, which is roughly \$22,800, and then we looked at health insurance, which interestingly enough actually came down, or was stable last year for graduate students. It's at \$1500. And then the fee -- the fee is to allow them to use health services here -- is around \$680. So, if you take fifteen percent of the doctoral tuition and the health insurance and fees, the actual charge comes to about \$5,500, plus or minus some dollars there. That's what we're asking researchers to put on if they're budgeting a graduate student working as an R.A.

Now, one of the issues that I have not really -- and most graduate schools don't -- defined is what a full R.A. is. Let me tell you that for R.A.s and T.A.s, it's part of their program -- it's training. When we define a full teaching assistantship, that's twenty hours per week because the idea is that that's part of their degree program, but they need time devoted to fulfilling the other degree requirements. So, it's not like you can work them eighty hours a week because they've got a full T.A. It's a recognition that a full T.A. is roughly twenty hours a week. And, of course, teaching duties vary over the semesters, peak times, non-peak times, and we anticipate that instructors work with their T.A.s to try and understand what's reasonable. If they have a lot of mid-terms, and you have a lot of grading to do, you have to negotiate. We try and tell them that at their T.A. training; they need to be very clear with their faculty member about what's a reasonable expectation for a full T.A.

When it came to R.A.s, we talked about this at Policy and Programs, and I've talked about it with the Associate Dean of Engineering as well, whether or not we should try and give guidance as to what is a full R.A., and when we talked about it at Policy and Programs, people were very anxious that you can't compare research hours across disciplines, and how research is done at different conventions, and P.I.s need the flexibility to be able to design what they think is going to be the research assistantship. So, we stayed away from actually putting an hour, like a full R.A., but I'd like everyone to be mindful that it is part of their training program. I do understand that from the point of view of applying for external funding, you may only be requiring an R.A., let's say, for the summer. You're not expecting to use an R.A. for the full year. The kind of research that you are asking for funding is such that you need maybe three months of their time. So, we are working at the Office of the Vice Provost to pro-rate that, so to make it comparable to effort applied. I want you to be mindful that we're not defining what a full T.A. is, so you can't say, "Well, this isn't really a full T.A., he's working nineteen and three quarter hours a week, and so..." You probably wouldn't do that, but I don't want to see a lot of shifting around because we've been flexible to afford P.I.s flexibility, and so I just want to encourage faculty that this policy is really there to support graduate students.

As Leah mentioned, our priority is to get to one hundred percent health insurance, and that's for

all doctoral students. There are some doctoral students that will never be supported on external grants, so this is one way that we can cross-subsidize and help support the whole community. So, I just wanted to talk to you about it, give you a cheerleading pitch. This is really a good thing. It's good for you, it's good for me, it's good for the students.

External funding agencies recognize that this is practiced, and many faculty are concerned that they're going to not be as competitive as they could be. My view is this is a real cost of doing research, and it should be budgeted. You need these people, and we need to bring you the best people that we can. So, that's my push.

I also say that we do say 'graduate students'. Many of you work with Masters students. Masters students are on tuition scholarship. Often, it's not a one hundred percent tuition scholarship. It varies by program, but I have the data. I'm collecting a lot of data on it. We're pretty generous on our Masters tuition scholarship; I have a lot of evidence to suggest that. They would probably like more tuition scholarship, and if you put a Masters student and apply for tuition scholarship, it will be directed towards that student. So, you're encouraged as well. We did not restrict it to doctoral students only. The majority of the cases are doctoral students who are taking on research assistantships.

PROF. PINDERHUGHES: When we put a Masters level student on the grant, are we expected to write who's whom?

DEAN PEPALL: Yes. We wrote the policy because there are certain programs that really want to be able to fund their Masters students better, and this would be a mechanism to do that. I would work with you on that. But certainly, the health insurance would be enormously important to that Masters student who does not currently get the subsidy.

PROF. TOBIN: I don't need to tell you this, Lynne, but you've increased the cost of graduate student labor relative to other forms of labor, like post-docs or any graduates.

DEAN PEPALL: I'm an economist. I know.

PROF. TOBIN: Are you not at all concerned that this is a disincentive for researchers to use graduate students, or are you doing anything to monitor whether this might have an effect on increasing the number of post-docs as compared to graduate students who show up with grant proposals?

DEAN PEPALL: You didn't see the little cheerleading part of my presentation? You could shift to post-docs, but that would be a short-term measure that would have longer term implications for your doctoral program. At some point, the department has to really want their doctoral program and want to support their students. If they all shift to post-docs, then you will have effectively weakened your doctoral program, in my view, because you'll have less R.A. possibilities to support them. In the Sciences, that's an important part of their training. They won't be able to be successful unless they're getting that kind of training in research. I sympathize with you, because you can get more work out of a post-doc, typically. They work

more. They're somewhat more expensive in terms of minimum salary, but you can get more work. I do understand, but it's really to see that an R.A. is not a post-doc. This is part of the curriculum, and I would hope that faculty would see the longer-term danger of making that substitution.

DEAN McINTOSH: Can I add something? Just from a purely financial perspective, what we've talked about over the last couple of years has been making an effort on the school's part to show good faith and to put our dollars down first. Those of you who have Ph.D. programs know that the school has put real money into increasing stipends, not as far as we would like to, but we certainly have. I can tell you the cost of bringing health insurance just on the Ph.D.s to half of the cost -- we're doing it now for five years -- it is about \$600,000 every year in our budget. We've pushed as far as we can without some help in other ways. So, I hope for a gesture of good faith. It's not like the school hasn't tried to find ways to go as far as we can first.

DEAN PEPALL: I couldn't agree more. I mean, we did do that health insurance subsidy last year, when there was probably no increase in budgets. That was a huge expenditure that we managed to do in a year of extremely constrained financing. Any other questions? I hope you will relay this positive spin on this new policy to your colleagues, and I look forward to signing off on those grants.

DEAN STERNBERG: Thank you. If I could just make a comment, part of this is a matter of what we see as our mission as a university. One of the things we have been trying to do under the current administration is increase an emphasis on high-impact visible research, but we've equally well been trying to increase our emphasis on the highest quality possible teaching. We aren't trying to become a large state university, where the teaching is really relegated to fourth place, and faculty maybe in some cases put a lot of time into thinking how they can maximize their research and minimize their teaching. That's just not who we are. We have a shared responsibility to forward our missions of teaching and research collectively, and that's what I think all of these efforts are devoted to.

That is the end of our fixed agenda. Are there any other items of new business that people would like to bring up? If not, thank you very much, and I look forward to seeing you next time for lunch.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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