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AS&E BUSINESS

DEAN GLASER:  Sorry for the delay.  There was a little bit of confusion about who's going to be collaborating with me up here.  But this is an opening of the AS&E faculty, and it's a special meeting necessitated by the weather and our need to accommodate to the loss of classes.  I am going to turn over the leadership of this conversation to Anne Mahoney, who is the co-chair EPC, to make a proposal for vote by this faculty.

DISCUSS AND VOTE ON PROPOSAL FROM EPC RE: MAKE-UP CLASS DAYS DUE TO CLASS CANCELLATIONS

PROFESSOR MAHONEY:  Thank you, Jim.  I'm Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics and co-chair of EPC.  Thanks to the Executive Committee for tweaking the schedule on short notice, thanks to our colleagues from engineering for making it over here unexpectedly, and thanks to my colleagues on EPC for scrambling to put a proposal together.  There are copies of the proposal on the table in the back, but it's actually quite simple.

We've lost five class days, plus an additional Monday evening.  We can't make up all of them, but we'd like to do some of it.  We propose to use the first two days of reading period -- not the whole of reading period, just the first two days -- using the Tuesday as a make-up Tuesday and using the Wednesday as a make-up Monday.  Because as everyone knows, Monday comes whatever day of the week it wants to.

And faculty will be allowed to decide whether we want to hold a make-up session, depending on what you've done with your syllabus, what you've done with online work, how else you've made things up.  Maybe you don't need to, maybe you do.  But we will have that day available as a Tuesday schedule and the next day available as a Monday schedule with the regular classrooms reserved and so on, with the understanding that you can't hold an exam on those days and that we should be understanding and flexible about students who will have other commitments during the reading period.

In addition, because of the extra Monday night, we also propose to use the Monday of Patriot’s Day -- that is to say Monday after the marathon, after the holiday and so on, so from 6:00 PM to make up for the extra Monday when we cancelled school at 6:00 PM before the very first snowstorm, if anybody remembers that far back.  And although that doesn't make up everything, it at least makes up something, and it gives us flexibility.  We aren't required to hold classes on those days if we don't need to.  And it doesn't eat up the entire reading period, so students still get one day between the make-up classes and the start of final exam period.

So that's EPC's proposal, and we're happy to entertain questions, discussion, and amendments, whatever.  Please take a microphone and don't forget to identify yourself.

PROFESSOR WINN:  Peter Winn, history.  I support this in principle, but in fact, I think you should go even further.  The winter is not over.  There's more snow on the way.  And under these circumstances, it seems to me it might be wise to wipe out reading period entirely.  It's not a necessity.  And to hold out that Thursday reading period for possible needs that may emerge very
rapidly.

PROFESSOR SAIGAL:  I actually disagree with that.  I think reading periods are important, and I would like to propose a different thing.  In springtime, we have 66 working days, which includes 14 Fridays.  There's already an extra Friday.  And I would like to propose that Wednesday of the reading period stay a reading period, and one of the Fridays after the spring break -- for example, March 27 -- that Friday be a Monday schedule.  We have not lost a Friday, and we already have built into our system 14 Fridays and 13 of every other day.

DEAN GLASER:  Can I ask a question?  Anil, how do we know that?  I know you're the maker of the schedule, but it seems odd to me that Friday would have --

PROFESSOR SAIGAL:  The fall semester has 65 working days.  The spring semester has 66 working days.  13 Monday through Thursday, and 14 Fridays.  That's how it has been forever, and I'm sure there are others who can testify to that.

PROFESSOR CARLETON:  I just want to reiterate, and I just had my class, and I raised this with my students, that they don't have a voice in this decision.  And to a person -- this is a class of about 25 people who are adamantly against losing any of the reading days, not only because -- in fact, they would prefer to either flip a Friday or have school on Saturday, but keep the reading days -- not only because they do use that time in order to catch up on their work, prepare for exams, finish those final products; also, two, it's a kind of psychological stress barrier between that final day of class and then walking into the exam room the next day.

And then some of them would feel very torn -- and Mark just raised this at the last meeting.  If I schedule my class on one of the reading days, the students will feel torn saying, “Okay, I've got to show up for that final impression, but it's going to take time away from my preparation for my Chemistry exam,” or whatever the case may be.

And I understand there are students on EPC.  I don't know if they registered anything, what their voices were.  But I just want to say that at least in my little neck of the woods, my students -- we actually voted on what adverb to use.  Adamantly opposed, vehemently opposed, one suggested violently.  But we agreed on adamantly opposed.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY:  On that point of information, in fact, at yesterday's EPC meeting, the undergraduate students didn't happen to be there, but the graduate student representative did vote in favor of the proposal.  It's kind of unfortunate that not everybody can make every meeting, just like not everybody's necessarily here.  Who else?  Surely, there's more discussion.

PROFESSOR KENNY:  I just thought we might combine the last two pieces of information, give them back one reading day and make the make-up Monday the extra Friday.  That way, it would have less impact on the reading period.  I wasn't aware of the extra Friday.  I'm glad you pointed that out.

DEAN GLASER:  That sounds like an amendment to me.
PROFESSOR DeVOTO: It has to be formally moved.

DEAN GLASER: Anil, would you like to formally move your proposal?

PROFESSOR SAIGAL: I'd like to propose an amendment where we keep the Tuesday of the reading period as a replacement for a Tuesday, replace the Wednesday of the reading period, and instead have Friday, and I'll propose a date, which might be the Friday after the spring break so people have time to plan things, March 27 as a Monday. So that would give us two days of reading period and take care of a Friday that we have not lost, which is anyway a light day.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: That's a motion. Do we have a second? Discussion on the amendment?

PROFESSOR ZAVALA: Not to particularize any individual, but I think we only missed three hours on Fridays. So that's in effect going to mean two of those classes are missed. So can we opt out if the grad students in the class are able to do that, or is this binding in some way?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: The original intent was that it would not be binding. Of course, if you choose to teach one of your Monday classes on this Friday, then you can't also be in the same room with your graduate students.

PROFESSOR ZAVALA: I don't teach on Mondays. I only teach on Fridays, this particular class. So it just concerns me, because this is the one time a week that I meet with this group of 12 grad students and 2 other graduates. So I can certainly negotiate with them. I just want to make sure that that remains an option. And I would give the undergraduates the choice to go to their Monday class, if that's what they prefer.

DEAN BAUER: Just a quick point, Adriana. Not that I disagree at all with your substance or your proposal, but it might be a mess if some Monday classes were teaching on some Fridays, just at the level of the room assignments. I just wanted to make that point.

PROFESSOR ?: I have an issue on losing a Friday in that way and using it for a Monday. I know that we haven't lost any Fridays, but the fact that we had snow is not a reason to lose one more day if we can make it somewhere else.

PROFESSOR HABER: I have an issue with that particular Friday, which is going to cause a lot of problems, but that's personal, having to do with my class. But there have been plans made for that time, as well as the Friday before vacation. I would much prefer the Friday before vacation, if we were doing this, but I understand some people wouldn't.

PROFESSOR PROCTOR: I understand the need not to try to eat up reading period, and actually, I was the one person in EPC who voted against this proposal, because I value the reading period. But I also teach Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, so I understand the need to make up class time. At the same time, taking away a Friday at this point of the semester, to suddenly announce
that we're going to flip a Friday. People have scheduled exams, have scheduled events, have scheduled all kinds of things. And an act of nature is one thing. To flip a Friday at this point in the semester I think is just very, very problematic for a lot of people, and that's my personal view.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: So we're still discussing the amendment to use one day of reading period plus one Friday at the moment, namely the 27th of March. Further discussion of the amendment? So we'll vote the amendment.

PROFESSOR DeVOTO: If there is no objection to voting now.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: So all in favor of amending the proposal such that we would use the first day of reading period as a Tuesday and use Friday, the 27th of March as a Monday. All in favor? Opposed? The amendment fails. We are now back to the un-amended motion.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Call the question.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: If there's no objection to voting, it's now time to vote on the original proposal, not amended, which is to say use the two days of reading period and also the Monday of Patriot's Day, Monday night. All in favor of so doing?

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CAMPBELL: Anne, can you specify again that it's optional?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: Optional. Faculty will not be required to hold these classes, but will be able to have rooms available for us, should we choose. All in favor? All opposed? Any abstaining? It looks like the motion carries.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you very much, Anne. We will make sure that facilities and those people who run the classrooms will know about this vote. We will communicate this across the other schools, as the other schools are also figuring out how to deal with this, and we will let any parent who asks for a 5 percent rebate on their tuition know as well. Actually, that has already happened. Yes, we have gotten a request since we've cancelled classes to have a 5 percent rebate of tuition.

Also, with regard to Peter's comment that there may be snow in the future, I guess what I would say is that this does not need to be the final decision, that if we have to revisit it, perhaps a Saturday class, which is another viable alternative, we can come back and discuss that at a future meeting. Are there any other comments as we wrap this up?

I now close the AS&E meeting and open an A&S meeting. So we have a few announcements. I will start with Nancy and Bárbara talking about an update on faculty information form procedures.

A&S BUSINESS
ANNOUNCEMENTS
UPDATE ON FACULTY INFORMATION FORM PROCEDURES

DEAN BAUER: I'm going to actually give you the information, and as I make errors, Bárbara will correct me.

So as many of you know, certainly all the chairs and program directors, and I hope people have heard about this, Bárbara has been working and I with her on a way of putting all of the faculty information form stuff in an online, specially designed for us piece of software that will allow faculty as they have achievements throughout the year to put stuff on there so that when you have to do your faculty information form, you hit a button, and it will go right to us.

It will also automatically produce a C.V. for you, and it will also if you submit or have to submit a bio sketch to NSF or NIH, produce that for you as well. This will only be used in house. We are not looking at Academic Analytics. We are not measuring productivity. We are not looking for impact. We simply want to make, we both, as faculty members felt that it was a pain in the you know what every single year to fill out that faculty information form with that long --

We are working now -- Bárbara has spent a long time, and Paul Bergen, who is here from TTS, has spent a long time helping vet the firm that we're working with. They're custom designing us. It's really exciting, and we hope to have it up and running by the fall. We probably will have it up and running and piloted by the fall.

Meanwhile, we want to make your life easier this year, and we also want to make this procedure more rational. As you might remember, we used to have faculty information forms going from February to February because of the start of the semesters, which made no sense. So if you did something wonderful between February and February, you would hear about it. If you did something wonderful in February at year end, you wouldn't get a reward for it if everybody remembered it in September.

What we want to do now is make the connection between your merit raises and the things the faculty information forms are tracking to the actual academic year. So faculty information forms will be due later than they usually are. Next year, on the day it's due, you hit a button, and you're done. This year, we are sending out a faculty information form. It's two and a half pages long.

We've cut as much as we possibly can off of it. You do not have to report how many students were in your classes or course evaluations or anything like that. Everything that Bárbara and I can pull and our office staff can pull from SIS we will do. And with the rest of it, we will ask you questions that we think will be easy for you to report to us. So it should take you less time.

In about a week -- we've already informed the program directors and chairs -- in about a week or so, we will be sending out this new form to everybody. We're just preparing a little blurb so that people who aren't here will be able to understand this. And it won't be due until the end of April, like the 20-something of April. If you want to send it next week, that's fine.

You will be judged on what you did from January 1 -- because we're in a transition -- of 2014 through June 30 of 2015. And you may ask, “Wait, you said it would be due at the end of April.
What happens if I publish three books and win a Nobel Prize in June or July?” And the answer is just tell us. If something shifts, and we need to know about it, you can just tell us directly, you can tell your chair, you can send us an email, you can tell us -- whatever you need to do. This will be easier next year when we can do everything with our software.

So bear with us this year. If we make a mistake, we will correct it. Try not to worry about it. And next year, we will continue to evaluate you on the previous academic year's work. You will be rewarded for it, as the case may be, more or less, in the following September, the immediate coming September, and everything will be automated.

But for now, let me see if there are any questions about what I said about this transition process. You'll all get an email that will help you follow this. We're hoping to make it easier for you to report more rationally.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: You said that your staff would pull the information, such as enrollment, etcetera. Will that information be shared with the department chairs, because they are the ones that -- and what role, if any, what change will this mean for department chairs' input and having all that information?

DEAN BAUER: That's a great question. The answer is the role of the department chair will be exactly the same.

DEAN BRIZUELA: It's actually going to be in the email that goes out. The request for all data will be from your department administrators. So that won't be a change. In the past, you would write your chair's report based on all the faculty information forms, the C.V.s, and all the course evaluation data was pulled out by your department administrators or program managers. That will remain the same.

DEAN BAUER: The department administrators will give it to the department chair. They'll still have the same information. You just don't have to worry about getting that information put on your form. You can always look it up, obviously.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So does that make sense, Vida?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Yes. I just wasn't sure who's pulling how many advisees you have --

DEAN BRIZUELA: The department administrators.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Okay. I thought that we were going to relieve. So this actually involves work from us to the department administrators. So for 40 people in our department --

DEAN BRIZUELA: Not really.

PROFESSOR CARLETON: 45, Vida.
PROFESSOR JOHNSON: And I'm not even the chair anymore. I just still think like one.

DEAN BRIZUELA: In the past, departments needed to submit some kind of spreadsheet with all the course evaluation data. All that the department administrators need to add now are enrollment numbers. And yes, information about advising. But that should be very easy to pull out from SIS.

PROFESSOR CARLETON: As the chair of German, Russian, Asian, I have a question. As chair, I'm still going to be writing a review of each of my full-time and tenure-stream faculty members. But the problem with the May 1 deadline -- I love this idea, believe me -- is that the evaluations of my colleagues are not available to me at that time. They can look through these later. Can that be rectified? So for example, I didn't get evaluations in December of colleagues in my department. I got that way back into January. So in other words, if I'm going to be able to write a report using the spring semester evaluations if it's always due on a May 1-ish type date -- you see what I'm getting at?

DEAN BAUER: Yes, and this is why you haven't gotten the information yet. We're figuring out how to deal with that problem the exact way that you'll get the information. Next year, this won't be an issue, because people can get things in -- we can get that information quite quickly, and we'll figure out the deadlines, and the whole system will be much more streamlined and automatized. Which isn't to say -- if you check it Thursday, you can see what gets printed out. When you push a button, if there's an error, you tell us. But it's only German, Russian, Asian.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: I have a very simple question. Will we have to type in our C.V.s into your system?

DEAN BAUER: And the answer to that question is it depends. This software will pull citation data from things like Endnote, Zotero, other sort of common -- Google Scholar, other kinds of common things. So you just tell it. If you use Breathworks, or something like that, you can just get your stuff pulled from that.

The very first time you do it, it will probably be somewhat more labor-intensive than after that, because you want to get your backlog of stuff. And we are going to be hiring people, student workers who work on an hourly wage, to help faculty enter that data the first time around. And we've got that in our budget. Bárbara did an absolutely brilliant job of finding the company that we're using. They have a really good reputation, vetted by TTS.

The amount of money that we're paying per year to use this system and have it custom developed for us all together is about the amount of money -- about the average amount of money that we would pay a part-time lecturer to do one class for the entire faculty. And we're doing a three-year experiment with it. If it doesn't work, we'll punt and do something else. So we are supplementing with some student workers to get it off the ground.

We just figured the amount of faculty time it will save is enormous as we get it up and running. And we've had many requests from faculty over the years to do something like this, because
nobody thinks, “Oh my God, I'm so happy, it's faculty information form time.”

PROFESSOR SHULTZ: Just to make sure German, Russian, Asian doesn't get all the questions. One of the things that I found when I was chair that was a really nice change is when we went from February or March or whatever the actual date was to yearly. And the reason is because publications, you want to know what is in print in a year. The year is always part of the publication citation, but the month is certainly not. And how do you know, did this come out when I did my last year’s, or is it this year’s. That, I found to be a pain, and my faculty did.

DEAN BAUER: It varies from year to year. So my extremely (inaudible) field -- and my colleague Bart Smith will tell you that this is the case -- but some of the most distinguished journals, as we speak right now, are publishing their fall 2013 issues, are freshly printed. So it looks like it was two years earlier, but it actually came out this year. And other places do do it, and Flosky (?), you often get the monthly. So it just varies across fields.

What we think is that people who -- a lot of times, people will publish a book, they will get a grant, and they have to wait an incredibly long period of time to see any reflection of that in their paycheck, and we would like that to happen earlier rather than later. It actually will cost the school more money. It's easier for us in some ways.

I don't think any system is perfect, but I hope a lot of people will find -- we are often having people say but I published a book, and we say, “Oh, I'm sorry, you published a book in March. You're going to have to wait until the following September.” We'll try it this way and hope that it works. I appreciate what you're saying, but I think this also makes some sense.

PROFESSOR MANZ: I'm following up on Vida's question. You said when you publish something, this comes straight to us. Again, does it go to the chair, too? Does the chair have the access that you have to these forms?

DEAN BAUER: The chair will be able to have the access to the information. Have we figured out exactly how we're going to have this work yet?

DEAN BRIZUELA: You're going to have an admin role within your department so that you can see your own faculty's --

PROFESSOR MANZ: And then the second question I have, which your answer, which was supposed to be reassuring to Christiane, oddly enough didn't reassure. You can't just enter your C.V.?

DEAN BAUER: You can't upload your C.V.

PROFESSOR MANZ: Presumably, you can upload your C.V., right? You don't have to enter everything --

DEAN BAUER: What you want to do is be able to have the data be used for different things for
you yourself for different purposes. So you want it to be able to be printed out in faculty information form, in a C.V. form. If you're applying for a grant, and you want to do a bio sketch, you want it to come out in that form.

There's one other way that the deans might use the data, as we have permission from people. So a lot of times, we will get a call from The Boston Globe, and they'll say, “We need to know somebody who knows something about Iranian history, and we have to sit there and think who would that be? Well, there's Beatrice. And now what we can do is just type in bumblebee into this system, and it'll give us names of faculty. We don't say you have to talk to The Boston Globe, but we'll call you and say “do you know anything about this subject; would you like to comment on it”?

So what it does is give us some flexibility as a faculty for how we want to present as individual faculty members this information, and there's that one little other added little piece, which I think is just good for the school. But that's why we're having people help people enter C.V. information the first time around.

PROFESSOR MANZ: But do you have to get it off of (inaudible)?

DEAN BAUER: No, you just type it in.

PROFESSOR MANZ: But you're going to have to type it in item by item?

DEAN BAUER: You can cut and paste it from a Word document and put it all in at once, depending on -- but after you get it up and running, then it's just a matter of adding things to it. But you have to do your Word document and C.V. anyway, and you have to pull things from that for your information form. So the idea is to have everybody spend less time on that activity.

DEAN GLASER: Last question.

PROFESSOR ZAVALA: So I'm looking forward to this. I personally detested the FIF, so thank you for taking this on. But I wanted to just make sure to all the department chairs that are here and also to the deans that there are certain kinds of labor -- I mean, there's a lot of labor that is invisible, and you know that, and I've talked about this.

But I'm thinking as a concrete example. In American studies, seniors register with a particular part-time faculty member for a senior class within which they are invisibly advised by two members of the faculty to write their senior projects or their theses. For example, when I advise these, I don't appear on SIS. The faculty of record for that course appears.

So yes, faculty need to report this, but I just want to make sure that it circulates to the places it needs to so that people doing that kind of labor have it recognized by the chair.

DEAN BAUER: Absolutely, and let me just say there will be room -- you can upload any information that you wish, such as that narrative that you just gave.
PROFESSOR ZAVALA: But I'm concerned for this, particularly, this gap year.

DEAN BAUER: Right. I hope that people always put down information. We ask you, “Is there anything else you want us to know?” and that's true. We hope people bear with us this year during this transition year. We'll do the best we can with it. But I think the point made is extremely important, and as many of you know, and I won't talk about it now, but we're working on a way of trying to make everybody's hidden work, as you're talking about, more visible and more rewarded so that we will routinely be looking for it and asking you about it.

DEAN GLASER: Nancy, Bárbara, thank you. Thank you for the good questions, and we look forward to seeing how it goes, and we're optimistic that it will make life easier for you.

I'm going to do a cold call on Elizabeth. I don't know if you'd like to say something about the survey.

ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

PROFESSOR REMICK: Yes, thank you. I was going to ask if you didn't. So Elizabeth Remick, Committee on Faculty Work/Life. I just wanted to remind you that that the dependent care needs assessment survey went out yesterday. If you did not receive an invitation, please let me know, and we'll get you one. Please also encourage your colleagues, which include faculty, staff, graduate students, and post-docs to participate in the survey. It is for Medford campus only at this time. So I do encourage you all to participate. It will help make a big difference if we have a high rate of return. Thanks.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Elizabeth. Two other quick announcements. One announcement is, as we've announced previously, that the strategic plan for arts and sciences was issued. It's up on the website. And Heidi Brown together with Vicke and myself put together an executive summary of the strategic plan. It is short and sweet and easy to read, and hopefully whets your appetite for reading the entire thing. But we have copies of the executive summary that are at the table, and on your way out, please feel free to pick that up and enjoy it.

And a second announcement has to do with an election last week. The full-time lecturers have an election for the full-time faculty union, and that proposal has passed, and passed with a significant vote. So sometime in the very near future, we'll begin -- usually there's a period of time where there's some data collection where the union is requesting materials from us. That period of time usually lasts a couple of months, and sometime I would guess if the experience with the part-time lecturers is any indication, sometime in the next four or five months, we will begin collective bargaining with the full-time faculty union as well.

I expect that there will be many questions that come up from our full-time colleagues, full-time lecturer colleagues, and if you have any questions of me, Bárbara, or Nancy, I encourage you to corner us, write us an email. We'll do our best to answer them. There will be implications of this, and I understand that people may be uncertain about what those implications might be, but we'd be very happy to have a conversation with you.
Any other announcements or questions or concerns that people would like to raise before we get into our new business?

PROFESSOR ROMERO: I have a question concerning the issue of part-time. By the way, PBS announced the professors voted to unionize. But of course, we are not unionized. And how does it change, unionization, how does it change the relationship between part-time and full-time lecturers? For example, part-time lecturers want to participate more in faculty meetings. I have no idea how legally it would proceed, and maybe it's too big a question to answer now.

DEAN GLASER: I don't know the answer to that question, and it's unclear to me how the SEIU will be able to represent both the part-time faculty and the full-time faculty. By the way, tenure-stream faculty in private institutions under the present interpretations of the law are not eligible to unionize. That I suppose could change at some point. But the full-time lecturers are not under that ruling. And how the union will balance those two groups -- because their interests don't always align perfectly -- is not clear to me. But I do know that they are thinking about that, and I suspect it will come up.

As most of you know, I attended every single one of the negotiation sessions with the part-time faculty union, and I became quite familiar with my colleague on the other side of the table, we became quite friendly, and I know very well many of our part-time colleagues. That will happen again, and we will muddle our way through some of these questions. I don't know the answer.

PROFESSOR SMITH: I think this is the first time we've been together since the event in question. I consider it appropriate that we acknowledge and congratulate our new dean.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you. And it should be no surprise to you, I am so happy to be doing this, and I feel very proud to be part of this group, I really do. And I feel lucky to have great colleagues who are leading the school with me.

Let's talk about Professor of the Practice. I'm going to call on Bárbara to lead this discussion.

NEW BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO PROFESSOR OF THE PRACTICE APPOINTMENTS

DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you. So the proposal that is on the table right now in front of you is for a change in the bylaws that govern the positions, Professor of the Practice. Currently, there is a five-year limit on these appointments, and the proposal is to allow these appointments to be renewable, in the same way that full-time lecturers are renewable.

I want to give you a little bit of the history of how we got here. On the one hand, there are specific disciplines which I hope are represented here and can speak about the impact of this change for their own departments. On the other hand, the School of Engineering passed a similar change last summer, Jillian?
MS. DUBMAN: Yes.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So the School of Engineering had gone from a five-year limit, which is our current working, to an eight-year limit, is that correct?

MS. DUBMAN: Yes.

DEAN BRIZUELA: And then last summer, they approved the same change that is on the table right now, which is for renewal of appointments. In terms of the process, we started working on this in the fall. We first met with the Executive Committee and solicited their feedback, and then we brought this to a chair and program directors meeting in December, I believe, and got their feedback. And so what you have in front of you has input from the Executive Committee as well as department chairs and department directors.

And my understanding, Jillian, is that today, we are discussing and that we'll be voting at the March 11 A&S faculty meeting. Open for discussion right now, questions.

PROFESSOR CANTOR: This change, if there's to be a Professor of the Practice, this change will allow us a better pool from which to choose that Professor of the Practice in Poetry, in my department, and will allow us, if as happened with our last hire, the young poet becomes even more accomplished, will allow us at least a chance to retain that person as part of the teaching staff.

There's a particular issue with the Professor of the Practice in poetry that may not apply as in engineering and makes it even more necessary, and that is the Professor of the Practice in Poetry does not earn any additional income beyond their teaching, so that makes it particularly crucial that we can say that there's at least the possibility of their retaining this condition, which as I say, constitutes their full livelihood. Thank you.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: Is it the case that Professors of the Practice under these newly proposed rules will not be forced to join the part-time lecturer or full-time lecturer receiving it?

DEAN BRIZUELA: Professors of the Practice are excluded from the bargaining unit.

PROFESSOR HABER: Just to add a couple of things to Jay's comments. It is the case that we cannot hire tenure-stream faculty anymore who do not have Ph.D.’s. And it is also the case that many, many fabulous poets do not have Ph.D.’s. So since we have to have Professor of the Practice, this, as Jay said consists of a better pool, but it also serves the students' interests, because these people work with students, work on senior theses.

And were somebody to leave after five years in the middle of many students' careers seems kind of crazy to us. It doesn't help the students, and then they have to get used to somebody else. Not that we necessarily keep the person. Of course, the person would have to publish and do all the things that he/she is supposed to do, but this would enable more continuity with our students as well.
DEAN BAUER: I'm just going to quickly throw something out that should be obvious, but I just want to say it. You might say, “Why did we ever have this in the first place?” and the answer is because if they're a Professor of the Practice, and they're working here full-time, they might not be practicing the thing, so they get out of date with their thing. But there are lots of people who we have here, for example, we have a part-time Professor of the Practice in film who is making movies, lots of movies, and with our students, that is thoroughly up to date, and we have poets obviously writing poetry. So the idea was that there is something about this role that was a good idea, but it's counterproductive in a number of cases.

So it gives us flexibility to renew people when clearly they're continuing to practice. And I think you'll see, if you didn't notice it already, that there's a little clause there that says there has to be evidence of the continuing of practicing in order to renew. I just wanted to make that clear.

DEAN BRIZUELA: I'll just add in terms of the framing of the proposal that it's not like every single discipline and department is going to be required to have renewable Professor of the Practice appointments. But this provides departments for whom it makes sense, like drama and dance or English, that option, that flexibility. For departments where this is not necessarily something that is going to contribute to the education of your students, you know, you might hire Professors of the Practice for three years, two and three years, and then search for a new person. So it's not like everyone is bound to this, but it definitely provides some of our colleagues flexibility.

PROFESSOR LITVAK: I'd like to add to what my colleagues just said. I'm very much in favor of this proposal for the reasons that they have mentioned, but also for the practical reason that under the current policy, the five-year appointment is really more like a two- or three-year appointment, because the person holding -- in fact, the last person who held the Professor of the Practice appointment in the English department, very talented, young rising star poet, left after three years because she knew there was no possibility of renewal.

So now, in fact, this very day, seeing another candidate on campus. We would not be spending all this departmental and administrative energy if we had the possibility of keeping people for five years and longer. So I'm very much in favor of renewal.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: I fully appreciate the need for this in departments like English and drama and dance, and I will support the proposal. But I do have some concerns about creating an indefinite term faculty position that is separate from the tenure system. In the long run, there could be risks. I don't see them in the short run, but I think in the long run, there is some danger in setting up unlimited term appointments on the faculty that are not part of the tenure system. So I wonder whether any thought had been given to ways of structuring it that might enlist that.

One that comes to mind is in the examples that have been given, one of the reasons why the faculty question eligibility for tenure-stream appointments is that in many cases, they don't have doctoral degrees. Could that be made a requirement for such a position, that this would be specifically for people who do not have terminal academic degrees in their discipline. But maybe there are other alternatives. Again, this will not prevent me from supporting this motion, because I think it's very
important, but I do just have that concern, and we can address it.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Just to clarify, the contracts would not be indefinite. They will be renewable on two or three years. And the situation is not that different from our current full-time lecturers, many of whom are -- in my own department, the more senior colleagues are actually full-time lecturers. We have some language on Page 3 of your handout that we've added for review of Professors of the Practice, but we can certainly (inaudible).

PROFESSOR McCLELLAN: I'm just curious going forward how it's possible to think of our landscape in terms of when and where Professors of the Practice are appointed versus full-time lecturers versus perhaps tenure-stream faculty, something like music. It's not clear to me how you sort out on what occasion it's decided to do a full-time lecturer versus a Professor of the Practice, because most of the people we hire in our art departments are practicing. That's why we hire them, because that's what they're teaching.

And if they're continuing to practice, which we hope they are, why would they want to be a Professor of the Practice, or why would we want them to be -- the criteria are a little unclear to me.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Actually, I want to answer Andrew. I'm reading the first line. "The title Professor of the Practice shall be held by a person with eminent accomplishments in his or her field." So I think that that may be -- I don't know whether that can be strengthened, but my understanding would be that this is someone who is -- now, I don't know about an up and coming young poet who's got a great deal of talent, but it would generally be I think people who are already established, and a lot of those practitioners are working in the field, but are not eminent. So I would think that each department would have to demonstrate something that would separate professor of the practice from a regular lecturer in the field. Am I right?

DEAN BRIZUELA: I don't know that I have all the answers. I have an answer, which is I think that the Professor of the Practice appointment would give more flexibility to departments to be able to make these decisions, and there are sometimes clearly candidates who are just teaching, and they're only interested in teaching. And then there are other opportunities, like the Professor of the Practice in Poetry, where their faculty candidates are clearly engaged with their practice on a day-to-day basis and also doing teaching. So I think it provides more options to departments.

DEAN GLASER: Can I just say in engineering, they are looking for the continued practice while someone is in the position. So if somebody stops practicing, they would consider that at the renewal time, and they would not be renewed.

DEAN BRIZUELA: One more question, and Jillian says we need to move on.

PROFESSOR BEDELL: I support the Professor of the Practice position, but there's a lot of questions I have in terms of our faculty, our full-time faculty and our part-time faculty do practice. I'm sure that what's going to happen is we're going to have to have conversations about the last comment about departments figuring out which classification as well as working with our academic deans about this. Is there going to be a plan in terms of outlining examples of what
would classify a Professor of Practice? That could be part of the conversation as well.

DEAN BRIZUELA: We can definitely do that. We already have Professor of the Practice in arts and sciences, so we can showcase those and clarify how they are different from full-time lecturers or part-time lecturers of departments. Again, English and economics, as well as drama and dance.

DEAN GLASER: We will be voting on this proposal at our next arts and sciences meeting, so please join us again. I would also note that I happened to notice in the newspaper that a very prominent poet who had been a member of our English department passed away this past week, Philip Levine, a very, very famous and prominent poet who passed away. And so we'll spread it on the minutes of the arts and sciences business that we pay tribute to him at this moment.

We're going to move to our final item, and I call on Carmen Lowe to lead the discussion about academic credit.

UPDATE FROM ACADEMIC CREDIT COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE
DEAN LOWE: I'm Carmen Lowe. I'm dean of Academic Advising and Undergraduate Studies, and I'm here to represent the Academic Credit and Compliance Committee, which is an ad hoc subcommittee of the EPC. And we've been working for about the last year and a half on trying to come up with a response to NEASC, our accreditor, which has been charged by the federal government, the Department of Education, to insure that every degree granting program for the bachelor's degree and the masters degree meets certain minimal requirements.

So the committee is working on a couple of different options, and we are here to discuss them with the faculty, get faculty feedback. A lot of professors have shared their ideas. We've been changing things as we've gone along. Most likely, we're going to present -- and this all depends on what the EPC actually puts forward -- put together a couple of options for faculty to consider. When it comes to the March 25 AS&E faculty meeting, we're hoping to have a decision by then that the faculty will make about how we'll proceed with our academic credits.

So what's at stake is accreditation and our eligibility for federal financial aid. Other colleges are in this boat. So the committee has been charged with coming up with a way to define our credit for both graduate students and undergraduates in arts, sciences, and engineering, and to demonstrate how every single one of our students adheres to the minimal criteria for graduation for two degrees, the bachelors and the masters.

So this is serious. Other colleges have already changed, and we're trying to come up with a system that works for Tufts, makes sense for us as an institution, and also is good for our students. So that's the challenge.

So there's a couple of different options here that we're looking at, and these aren't finalized it. It's sort of a weird setup. So one of the first options is stick with our current system in which one course is one credit, basically. But create more nuance into our system so that courses that require more instructional time, more homework would be worth additional credit.
So our initial idea has a lot of nuance, so that our basic unit would be one class is equivalent to one credit, and three credit hours. We have another option that I'll describe in a little bit, which a professor just sent to me last night which is another option we'll look at, which is a little bit more elegant mathematically. So that's an option.

Another option is to just chuck out what we have and adopt an entirely new system, and that would be the 3, 4, 5 semester hour system, which is pretty standard at research universities around the country. It's certainly not the only system out there. MIT has a unique system. Other colleges have a unique system. But that is another option, and I'll talk a little bit about that.

And then the third option is we could just simply keep all of our courses as saying they're one credit and do something else to explain how we're defining our credit equivalency, our credit hour equivalency, raise the degree requirement slightly for the bachelor's degree, make sure that we have the ten Tufts credits, 30 semester hours for our masters degrees. There's a couple of different options. We're looking at different options. We're seeking faculty feedback and input.

So I want to go into a little bit of detail about the system, the proposal that is posted to the Trunk site, which goes into a little bit more detail, which is our nuanced system, which most courses would simply remain one credit. Our credit formula would change, and this is what's important, is that right now, our transcript says that if you teach one Tufts credit, it's equivalent to four credit hours. I taught here, and I never knew I was teaching a four-credit-hour course. I thought I was teaching a three-credit-hour course, because it met up for 150 minutes a week.

So what we're saying is that if we were -- right now, we tell the federal government that a Tufts students who's enrolled, an undergrad who's enrolled in three classes, three credits here, is a full-time student, and they're eligible for full financial aid. So if we adopt this new system, we would say that the student needs to enroll in four credit hours, four credits if they're an undergraduate, three credits if they're a grad student to qualify for federal financial aid.

Now, this is important, because if the federal government does not agree with the way we define our credit hours, they could say our students are ineligible for federal financial aid. We could be audited by the Department of Education. We could be fined. Our director of financial aid is very worried about this, so we need to define our credit unit.

Right now, an undergraduate in liberal arts, the School of Arts and Sciences, needs 4 credits to graduate. We raise those to 40. It sounds like a lot, but if we're awarding additional credit for courses that require more instructional time and work outside of class, we could do it. This is a formula we would use. I'm not going to go into that right now, but you could see that it corresponds with the credit hour system. And a credit hour, by the way, is defined as one hour of instruction with two hours of outside work or the equivalent. There's a lot of flexibility there.

So an example would be let's say you've got a freshman right now, they're in English 2 with one credit, Spanish 3 with one credit, Bio 13 plus Bio 13 lab with a Bio 13 recitation, one credit History class, one credit, yoga, half credit. That's 4.5 Tufts credits.
Let's say in the fall of 2017, we have a more nuanced system. Potentially English 2 would remain as one credit, Spanish 3 could be 1.25 credits, which is equivalent to four credit hours, which is standard around the country. Bio 13 could be 1.75 credits. That's five credit hours. That's pretty standard around the country. History 10 potentially could remain one credit, and yoga would probably be half a credit. That's 5.5 credits, same course load. It would be relatively easy for a Tufts student to hit that mark of 40 credits, which is equivalent to 120 credit hours.

The committee spent a lot of time working on this proposal, because we think it's a way to bring this into compliance. It adheres to what we've been doing for a really long time. As an academic advisor, it would be easier to advise your students about putting together a balanced course load and registering for classes. If you're chair of a major, and you're trying to put together the major degree sheets, your adding incremental amounts to certain courses isn't going to change your major too much. So it's not too much of a change. It will mean that SIS is going to need some reprogramming. The registrar's office is going to have a lot of work to do. But it's not a major overhaul.

So there's a lot of benefits for undergrads. We have a timeline that we think is pretty doable, and we could roll out this system in fall of 2017. We would inform students who start in the fall that there's a change coming, and we would start advising students differently beginning in fall of 2015. The students who matriculate prior to fall 2015 would be grandfathered in at the same exact requirements, no change.

I'm going to jump ahead here, because we're pretty short on time. So the school requires some reprogramming of SIS, have to re-clarify our policies, use different language. Another option is a semester hour system. I know a lot of faculty like this, because it's familiar. This is what I had as an undergrad. It's pretty standard. It aligns with the federal definition of the credit hours. It certainly works with our block schedule, the same as with a 1.-something system that would also work with it.

So it has a lot of advantages. You would have the same ability to help students balance out their course load every semester so they're not overwhelmed. But the disadvantages are primarily logistical. And it's not so much programming SIS to do this. We could certainly program SIS to do it. The problem is you're going to have roughly three different classes of undergrads and countless grad students who are going to be straddling two different credit systems.

And there's a way to program in a translation, but the transcript -- and I still haven't been able to get a satisfactory answer from TTS about what the transitional transcript would look like. This would be the transcript that students will leave Tufts with for three years. And one half of that transcript will say that all their courses they took their freshman year, sophomore year, junior year are going to be in units of one, and then the last few years are going to be in units of three, four, five. So we'd have a lot of explanation attached to that transcript.

When I met with the folks from TTS, they said, “Well, just add an additional sheet and stick that in the envelope.” I'm like what? That doesn't sound very good to me. They have a couple of years
to figure it out. Maybe they can figure something out that's a little bit better than that. I don't think that's a satisfactory answer for what our official transcript is going to look like.

So there's still a lot of details that need to be ironed out. I've asked TTS to look at this, figure out how many additional people they're going to need to hire to reprogram SIS entirely. The advisement report that some of us use when you're advising your students, that's going to need to be taken off line for two or three years to be completely reprogrammed.

The transition is going to span several years, and that's just to be aware of it. Certainly by the time 2020 or 2021 rolls around, it will feel normal by then, but those transitional years will be ugly and confusing and complex. So I'm going to post more details about what this looks like so you can go to the Trunk site and read the details. I don't have time to go into that here.

So there's another option, and this is the tweak, in which we say, “Okay, all of our classes will remain one credit, and we'll raise the graduation requirements, maybe 38, maybe 36 credits, something like that.” We could come up with a different way of defining our credit that's non-standard, just keeping the credits as one. We just have to define it differently and hope that NEASC buys it.

Or if we go with something like this, which is a very (inaudible) proposal, we still -- we vigorously debated all of these in EPC -- is some other way of designating courses that require more work, basically to demonstrate that all of our students have met the 120-credit hour requirement. So that's another kind of option. We're exploring all of those options.

The reason we went with this is another kind of proposal. It doesn't have to be this one exactly. It's the easiest logistically, and it's one we could change to very fast. The reason there's a timeline on this is that we need to respond to NEASC by fall with an explanation of how we are bringing or have brought our credit into alignment with the federal definition. As I said, what the stakes are accreditation and our eligibility for federal financial aid. So I'm hoping I have time to answer questions and get faculty feedback.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: I don't think this is going to work. I think the proposal of 38 courses, etcetera, is going to get incredible pushback from the students. I like this, the 1.5, etcetera. I was just looking, Russian teaches 250 minutes, first year Russian, and it should get more credit.

And I don't see why this can't be the transition, we'll immediately go to that, and then when everybody's been on this system, we'll just multiply by three, and you get the credits. I mean, there's no big -- right? Everybody's credits simply would be multiplied by three, so one credit becomes three, one and a half becomes 4.5, and you have it. But not having any kind of transition between to different systems. I mean, this would become a kind of transition system, and if we don't like it, and we want to be like so many other schools, just change it.

DEAN LOWE: So we're not required to move to a semester hour system. We just have to provide a definition of formula. If we move to this system and then to a 3, 4, 5 system, that means reprogramming SIS twice, just to be clear.
DEAN GLASER: Carmen, if you do this, you're still moving the finish line from 34 to something else.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Right, but it's acknowledging what students are actually doing now, that they are doing more work.

DEAN GLASER: Yes, that's correct.

DEAN LOWE: And also for this version, Professor Alva Couch from computer science came up with a more elegant proposal, and this was to -- so this is a rather complex formula, but it'll work. It is serviceable. But Professor Alva Couch, he looked a more elegant one in which one would be equivalent to three credit hours. That's our basic course. 1.5 credits, Tufts credits, is equivalent to four credit hours. And two Tufts credits is equivalent to five credit hours. Our .5 would be equivalent to two credit hours. It's hard to sort of hear it aloud, and I'll put it online so you can take a look at it. The AC3 and EPC haven't really had a chance to look at this yet and hash it out. But this is another option if this scale doesn't work.

PROFESSOR BERNHEIM: First of all, as you said, a lot of the schools have made the switch, and some haven't figured out their technology system to do it, and they don't know how. But I know some schools went from the quarter system to the semester system and did it pretty well. So I suggest that you do your research to figure out how other schools have done it.

Moreover, I find using fraction credits complex. I'd rather use integers. And if you're going to go to fractions, I'd rather see 3, 4, 5 than 1.25, 1.5, which I think makes it very inelegant.

DEAN LOWE: So I did speak with the dean at Emory College, at Emory University in Georgia that made this switch in 2003. They went from a system very similar to Tufts which every single one of their courses was worth four credits, but the numeral 4 appeared after the class. And just like Tufts, they required 34 -- the equivalent of 34 Tufts credits, was 136 credit hours at Emory.

And they switched to 120 credit hours and the 3, 4, 5 system and simply told their students, you know, when you started here, we told you needed 136 credits. Now we're telling you you need 120. And they made the switch relatively easy. I spoke with her and asked her a lot of questions. She gave me a lot of information, and AC3 has been using that. I know some schools in Ohio did this. The entire state of Ohio transitioned in about 2012, right after the 2011 “Dear Colleague” came out from the Department of Education.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: I have a more basic question and problem for the humanities. If I think of my own department and the language courses, most of them would get more credit, because of classroom contact with the instructor. If you go up, students have to read novels, long texts. There's more independent work expected, but maybe only three class meetings, and I think that's true in history and other subjects. And yet we want to get the students to work more independently and think more independently. So just counting -- and some subjects need the contact. But just counting classroom contact versus independent work just doesn't seem right.
DEAN LOWE:  So we've put together, and it's still an internal working documents that AC3 and EPC are working on, and this is a series of guidelines which has been shamelessly plagiarized in other universities that have gone through this change. Taking into account that the federal government allows us to do this is additional work outside of class.  So one of the options for the humanities in particular is we could with EPC's support, if EPC supports it, designate certain classes as writing intensive, for example, and those courses would be equivalent to four credit hours.  That's standard practice around the country.

You could also say that this course has an additional component that's outside of class.  Maybe it's an online component, maybe it's a really significant project.  If you could put your petition in your Curricula Committee, that course could be designated as four credit hours.  So we have a plan in place where departments would be looking at their curricula and looking at individual courses and say, well, maybe we want this one integrative seminar for a major to be writing intensive, or maybe this should be a four-credit course.  So let's petition our Curricula Committee.

So the way this process would work, regardless of whether we transition to this more nuanced system or if we adopt a wholly new system, 3, 4, 5, who determines whether your class is worth 1.5 credits or four credits, that's the Curricula Committee.  And so we'd have to put into place a mechanism for departments to petition the Curricula Committee.

When Emory did this, they created an online forum, streamlined it.  Plagiarism has its place, and may be interested in copying some of what they did that worked.  So that's something else to consider.

DEAN GLASER:  The main thing we're doing is we're moving the finish line, and we're trying to figure out ways to get people to that finish line more quickly.  And from the perspective of the school, I would rather not spend lots and lots of money to do that when we have so many other needs.  Of course, we'll do what we have to do.

I want to thank Carmen and EPC and the committee that's been working on this.  As you can see, it's very complicated, and she's done a fabulous job of organizing all of these different alternatives and keeping us on track.  And so I want to thank Carmen for that.  And with that, I wish you a happy day.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Jillian Dubman
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering
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EPC Proposal for Make-up Snow Days

The first two days of reading period (Tuesday April 28 and Wednesday April 29) will be designated as make up days with a Tuesday and a Monday schedule respectively. On those days, faculty teaching on Tuesday or Monday respectively can but are not required to hold a class at their regular time and in their regular classroom. These days cannot be used to hold exams. Thursday April 30 will remain as reading period day and the exam schedule will stay unchanged.

In addition, Monday April 20 (Patriots day) after 6 p.m. can be used as a make-up day with a Monday evening schedule.

Faculty planning to use these days as make up days will let their students know and should be aware of the fact that some students may have other commitments.
Proposed Changes to Professor of the Practice Title

Motivation:

We currently have a 5-year limit on Professor of the Practice appointments. In many A&S fields, having this term limit constrains the potential impact of outstanding practitioners. We want to provide more flexibility for these appointments by basing decisions about renewal of their contracts on the quality of their work, and not on an administrative term limit.

Item needing a vote: Change to the text of the Bylaws of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Jackson College Article I

Current Wording:

The title professor of the practice shall be held by a person whose accomplishments are principally in the nonacademic venues and whose expertise complements the educational and scholarly work of the tenure-stream faculty. The initial terms of the appointment will vary between one semester and three years and may be renewed, but the appointment may not continue beyond five years. Professors of the practice may not become lecturers any time after the end of their five years.

Proposed changes:

The title professor of the practice shall be held by a person with eminent accomplishments in his/her field and whose expertise complements the educational and scholarly work in his/her department or program. The initial terms of the appointment will vary between one semester and three years and may be renewed. An individual holding an “of the Practice” appointment for a total period exceeding three years is expected to maintain active involvement in the profession. Professors of the practice can hold either full-time or part-time appointments. Professors of the Practice are not eligible for tenure in the School of Arts & Sciences.
FOR YOUR INFORMATION ONLY:

Proposed change to the A&S Faculty Handbook

Chapter 2 (Faculty Appointments>Academic Ranks and Titles>Professorial Ranks>Modified Professorial Ranks)

**Text changed is highlighted in yellow below**

Current Wording:

Practice Faculty (School of Arts and Sciences). "Professors of the practice" are individuals whose accomplishments are principally in the nonacademic venues and whose expertise complements the educational and scholarly work of the tenure-track faculty. Professors of the practice are not eligible for tenure. A full-time appointment to this position may not continue beyond five years. Such a professor may not be reappointed to any faculty position at the end of his/her five-year term. The expectation is that these faculty members will have a significant on-campus presence. The extent to which these faculty members participate in departmental or program affairs will be left to the discretion of the departments.

Proposed changes:

Practice Faculty (School of Arts and Sciences). The title professor of the practice shall be held by a person with eminent accomplishments in his/her field and whose expertise complements the educational and scholarly work in his/her department or program. The initial terms of the appointment will vary between one semester and three years and may be renewed. An individual holding an “of the Practice” appointment for a total period exceeding three years is expected to maintain active involvement in the profession. Professors of the practice can hold either full-time or part-time appointments. Professors of the Practice are not eligible for tenure in the School of Arts & Sciences. The expectation is that these faculty members will have a significant on-campus presence. The extent to which these faculty members participate in departmental or program affairs will be left to the discretion of each academic unit.
Proposed Changes to Professor of the Practice Title

Proposed changes to language in Faculty Handbook

**Proposed additions/changes in bold and underlined below**

Contract Review and Renewal Procedures for Nontenure-Track Faculty Members
All nontenure-track faculty members are on renewable or nonrenewable term contracts. If the appointment is renewable, the department or program conducts a review for contract renewal.

Review Procedure for Full-Time, Nontenure-Track Faculty Members and Part-Time Professors of the Practice

1. In the fall, the dean’s office informs the department chair or program director via memorandum that a contract review and recommendation must be sent to the dean’s office. This is required for all nontenure-track faculty members whose contract termination date and terms require a recommendation during the current academic year. (A review and recommendation are not required if the faculty member has a nonrenewable contract.)

2. The tenured and tenure-track members of the department or program, and full-time lecturers who have direct supervisory oversight of the program, meet formally to review the faculty member’s activities and vote whether to recommend renewal of the contract. The department chair or program director sends the dean a report, signed by all of the faculty members who voted, conveying the recommendation and detailing the discussion. This is not intended to be a lengthy report, but it should contain a brief evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments in the areas of teaching, advising, and service; and should be accompanied by a current curriculum vitae. For professors of the practice, please include evidence that the faculty member maintains active involvement in the profession. Evidence could include confidential letters solicited from practitioners in your department, program, or field. If the department or program wants to increase the contract length for a non-tenure track faculty member, a recommendation should be made at this time. The department’s or program’s written evaluation is a confidential document and should not be shown to the candidate.

3. The department chair or program director should assemble the following additional documentation.
   a. A list of courses taught and enrollments in these courses
   b. A numerical summary of student course evaluations
   c. A summary of written comments on student course evaluations
   d. Any available information on advising performance

4. The dean informs the department chair or program director, usually one month before the notification deadline, of his/her recommendation. (If the dean's recommendation is contrary to that of the department or program, the dean consults with the department chair or program director before making a recommendation.)

5. When the above procedures are completed, the department chair or program director informs the candidate of the decision.

6. The procedures for renewal and nonrenewal, respectively, are as follows.
   a. In the event of renewal, the dean's office sends a reappointment contract to the candidate at the appropriate time.
   b. In the event of nonrenewal, the candidate must be given written notice in accord with university nonrenewal deadlines.
Proposed Changes to Professor of the Practice Title

i. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service in the university if the appointment terminates at the end of that year; or, if an initial one-year appointment terminates during the academic year, not later than three months prior to the date of its termination.

ii. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service in the university if the appointment terminates at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, not later than six months prior to the date of its termination.

iii. Not later than twelve months prior to the date of termination of an appointment if it terminates subsequent to the completion of more than two years of service in the university.

The dean and chair or program director determine who will convey the outcome to the candidate.
Credit Hour Compliance

Information for Tufts Faculty and Students on Proposal to Change Academic Credit for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering
What’s at stake?

• Tufts’ accreditation
• Tufts’ eligibility for federal financial aid

NOTE: _Tufts is not alone! Since 2011, many colleges changed or adjusted their credit systems. Many NEASC colleges are now looking into their options. Tufts is the first NEASC-accredited university to face this change._
What Are Our Options?

1. **Create a more nuanced system** so that more credit is awarded for courses that require more work. Credit will be in increments of .05, 1.0, 1.25, 1.5, and 1.75, with a total of 40 for the BA or BS and 10 for the MA or MS,

2. **Transition to the semester hour system** in which courses are worth 3, 4, or 5 credits and 120 are required for BA/BA and 30 for MA/MS.

3. **Keep all courses in units of 1 credit**, but raise degree requirements to 38 credits for BA/BS and 10 for MA/MS, and designate some courses as “extended” or “super” courses so those are equivalent to more credit hours.
Proposal 1: More Nuance

• Maintain system in which most Tufts’ courses are worth 1 credit.
• Revise the credit hour formula so that 1 credit is equivalent to 3 credit hours.
• Require 40 credits for a Tufts bachelor degree and 10 credits for a Tufts master’s degree.
• Award additional credit for courses that require more instructional time and work.
# New Credit Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tufts Unit</th>
<th>Transfer of Credit Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 cr.</td>
<td>3 credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 cr.</td>
<td>4 credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 cr.</td>
<td>4.5 credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75 cr.</td>
<td>5 credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 cr.</td>
<td>.75 credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 cr.</td>
<td>1 credit hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2 credit hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Undergraduate Course Load

Fall 2014
English 2 -- 1 cr.
Spanish 3 – 1 cr.
Biology 13 – 1 cr.
History 10 – 1 cr.
Yoga -- 0.5 cr
TOTAL: 4.5 credits

Fall 2017
English 2 – 1 cr.
Spanish 3 – 1.25 cr
Biology 13 – 1.75 cr.
History 10 -- 1 cr.
Yoga -- 0.5 cr.
TOTAL: 5.5 credits
Benefits of This New System for Undergraduate Students

• Students will earn extra credit for courses that require more time (especially foreign language courses, lab courses, and some courses with recitations).

• Students and advisors will find it easier to put together a more balanced course schedule each semester.

• Nuanced credit system benefits students during transfer-of-credit process.
When Will This Change Happen?

• Fall 2017: New credit system in place, with credit value per course determined by Curricula Committee for each school.
• Fall 2015: Undergraduates entering Liberal Arts in Fall 2015 will need 35 credits to graduate. (No change for Engineers.)
• Fall 2016: Undergraduates entering Liberal Arts or Engineering in Fall 2016 will need 38 credits to graduate.
• Fall 2017 and after: Undergraduates entering in Fall 2017 and after will need 40 credits to graduate.
• Students who matriculated prior to Fall 2015 will still need only 34 credits to graduate from Liberal Arts or 38 for Engineering, regardless of graduation date.
Advantages of 1.25 system:

• No change to vast majority of courses.
• Easy to roll out over a period of three years, with first implementation happening almost immediately to satisfy accredditor.
• Few (minor) changes to transcript; no need for “retroactive” change to transcript.
• Few changes to SIS – with little cost or risk.
• Least amount of risk and confusion; easiest transition among other options.
Disadvantages of 1.25 System

• Will require some re-programming of SIS.
• Will require clarification or revision of various academic policies.
• Hard to predict how students will respond (i.e., future enrollment patterns).
• This is a novel credit system. It will not be as familiar as other credit systems.
Proposal 2: Semester Hour System

• Advantages of 3, 4, 5 credit hour system:
  – Standard system used at many universities nationwide
  – Aligns with federal definition of credit hour.
  – Works with Tufts’ block schedule
Why Not Change to 3, 4, 5 Credits?

- Disadvantages of Switching from Credit System Based on Units of 1 to 3,4,5 System:
  - Will need to make major changes to transcript of every enrolled student to avoid errors or inconsistencies in cumulative GPA (risk of error).
  - Transcripts from transition years (2017-2020) will feature two different credit systems and may require an extra sheet explaining the transcript.
  - Will need to re-program SIS (risk of error and malfunction; higher cost to hire more people).
  - A lot of confusion and complexity for students straddling two different credit systems.
Proposal 3: The Tweak

• Make no changes to current credit system.
• Require all undergrads (in A&S and SoE) to earn 38 credits to graduate.
• Require that 4 of those courses be from a list of “super courses” equivalent to 4.5 credit hours – generally courses with labs and recitations.
• Students may petition with approved alternatives (such as 36 courses with 8 super courses or 40 credits with no super courses).
Advantages to 38 credit option

• Requires virtually no change to SIS. Little cost.
• Requires minimal change to transcript (to designate “super courses” and explain credit system)
• Can be rolled out in Fall 2016 for students matriculating in 2016.
• Parity between Engineering and A&S.
• Engineering needs to make no changes.
• Can be implemented as early as Fall 2016.
Disadvantages to 38 credit option

• Will be difficult for some students to earn 38 credits, especially if they have no pre-matriculation credits.

• Some recitations will need to be increased to 75 minutes each week to earn “super course” designation.
Summary of Most Feasible Options:

1. **Build more nuance into current system** so that more credit is awarded for courses that require more work. Credit will be in increments of .05, 1.0, 1.25, 1.5, and 1.75, with a total of 40 for the BA or BS and 10 for master’s.

2. **Adopt an entirely new system** in which courses are worth 3, 4, or 5 credits and 120 are required for BA/BA and 30 for MA/MS.

3. **Tweak current system**: Keep all courses in units of 1 credit, but raise degree requirements to 38 credits for BA/BS and 10 for MA/MS, and designate some courses as “extended” or “super” courses so those are equivalent to more credit hours.