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DEAN GLASER: Welcome, everybody, to the first faculty meeting of Arts and Sciences of the year. I hope your year is off to an excellent start, and in the dean's office, we're all very excited to be underway.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

DEAN GLASER: We have some announcements, and I wore my Jumbo tie today in honor of Andrew McClellan, and so I'd like to ask Andrew McClellan to make an announcement about a very exciting exhibition.

TUFTS GALLERY EXHIBITION, “JUMBO: MARVEL, MYTH & MASCOT”
PROFESSOR McCLELLAN: Just to announce the opening tomorrow afternoon at the Tufts Gallery an exhibition I spent some time working. The opening is tomorrow from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM. John McDonald will be performing some music composed for Jumbo in the 1880s with a student, probably around 6:00 PM, 6:30 PM. The show will be open more generally during normal office hours starting tomorrow through December 7, so I hope you all stop in sometime and have a look. Thanks.

DEAN GLASER: Boris Hasselblatt.

A CONCERT IN MEMORY OF MARTIN GUTERMAN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
PROFESSOR HASSELBLATT: I do hope that this is going to be music to your ears. A number of you remember our colleague Martin Guterman from the Department of Mathematics, who passed away ten years ago this year from cancer, and I wanted to announce two concerts that are given in his memory. One is the Boston Artists Ensemble. One of them takes place in Salem, and that's Friday, September 19. The other one takes place in Newton on Sunday the 21st.

This is chamber music. It's three trios, one by Haydn, one by Dvorak and one by Schostakovich. You are all invited to come to these concerts. The ensemble is the Boston Artists Ensemble, and you'll find links to the concerts, where they are and when they are. The venues are quite impressive. The one in Salem is in Hamilton Hall, which is a beautiful historic building. Thank you.

CONSTITUTION DAY
DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Boris. You may or may not know that next week is Constitution Day. We as a university are required to celebrate Constitution Day, and it's the only day we are required to celebrate. Actually, our federal funding is tied to our compliance with Constitution Day. So with that in mind, my office, the Political Science Department, has sort of taken responsibility for celebration of Constitution Day, and we will be hosting on Friday, September 19 from noon to 1:30 PM with a lunch offered by and paid for by the president's office, which of course we're saving a lot of money by not losing our federal funding.

And we would like to fill the room to hear Carol Rose, who is the executive director of the Massachusetts Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union. Carol is a terrific speaker, very exciting person. In addition to being executive director of the ACLU here, she's a former New
York Times reporter, who has reported from Pakistan, Northern Ireland, and other hot spots around the world.

She's been a leader in the marriage equality effort here in Massachusetts. She is a frequent (inaudible) person to talk about government surveillance and a variety of very interesting, provocative subjects. The title of her talk is “Sex, Drugs and Rock & Roll: A Constitutional Update.” I promise it will be very interesting. So please spread the word to your colleagues and to your students.

Is Peniel here, by chance, or Adriana? Did you want to say something about the two big events coming up?

**DIALOGUE ON RACE DAY**

**PROFESSOR ZAVALA:** I don't know which events you're referring to. So I guess Jim's asked me to do this because Neal's not here. So as many of you know, I was named the director of the new consortium of studies in race, colonialism diaspora, which includes Africana studies, American studies, Asian-American studies, colonialism studies, which got its first (inaudible) yesterday, and Latino Studies.

So we are not co-sponsoring the two events, but we are very much in support and encourage everyone to go. So these are going to be sponsored by the Center for the Study of Race and Democracy, the CSRD, not to be confused with the RCD. So these events are Monday, September 15 at 8:00 PM in Cabot's ASEAN Auditorium. It will be the National Dialogue on Race Day.

So this year, the dialogue is titled "The Civil Rights Act: 50 Years Ago, 50 Years Later, 50 Years From Now," and they've organized a diverse panel Specializing in civil rights, in the wake of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and of course most recently the Ferguson event. And that panel will be followed by ample time for Q&A, and you can go to the website for more information.

And then on Wednesday, September 24 at 7:00 PM in Alumni Lounge, they have organized an event called "Ferguson as Metaphor: Racial Equality in the 21st Century," and this event will focus on the recent events of Ferguson with a question and answer between a panel and the audience, and it will probe the militarization of police departments, the state of black equality, and leadership in America and how to turn Ferguson's (inaudible) movement.

And I just want to add -- so I strongly encourage everyone to go to these two events. We have distributed this information to our constituencies as well. And after this meeting, which I am leaving early, I'm going to talk to Katrina Moore to see if we can organize something in the Africana Center so that students can have a more intimate dialogue. So thank you.

**DEAN GLASER:** Does anybody else have any announcements for the community? So I will classify this not as an announcement, but it's old business. We have a new colleague. We introduced our new colleagues two weeks ago, but this particular new colleague was out of the country at the time, and so I'd like to ask Vida Johnson to introduce him.
INTRODUCTION TO MARKUS WILCZEK

PROFESSOR JOHNSON:  Hello.  I'd like to introduce Markus Wilczek, who is a new colleague, new associate professor, very good sense of humor.  I already told him about Boris, so his sense of humor.  Two Germans with a good sense of humor.

Markus hopefully will be teaching a lot of different things, not only in German, but in ILVS, the International Literary and Visual Studies program that we have.  He specializes of course in German culture, literature and film, but he has a particular interest in the relationship between the humanities and the environment and sustainability and these issues.

We have also just stolen him from Harvard.  I mean, sometimes the traffic goes the other way, but we're happy that the traffic comes our way as well from Harvard.  So welcome to Tufts.

PROFESSOR WILCZEK:  Thank you very much.

NEW BUSINESS

DEAN'S AGENDA FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

DEAN GLASER:  So to open up the year, we thought that it might be useful for you to have some sense of the kinds of things that we're working on in the dean's office.  The PowerPoint that I'm about to work my way through is not comprehensive.  It does not include every single thing that we are hoping to accomplish this year, but it's just some of the coming attractions for the year.

And what I'd like to do is -- these are sort of the five or six big things that we would hope to accomplish, and I'm going to finish with some words about the strategic plan, and then that will segue way into the second item on our agenda, which will be a discussion of some of the big themes coming out of the strategic plan, which is now very close to a second draft.  So we're really working along very nicely, and we've got something to show for our efforts.  I would call upon Vickie as my co-chair of the strategic plan to talk about that.

I just want to say before all this that while we do have working goals, the main thing that we do in the Dean's office is support you, support the departments, support our faculty.  All the things that we do on a routine basis are things that we will continue to do and we want to do.  Our reason for being is to be supportive of what is going on in the departments and the programs.  So Bárbara, Nancy, Bob, Scott, and myself, as well as all the other folks in the office and in Dowling Hall and elsewhere.  Our reason to be is to be supportive of you, and that underlies all of this.

So we talked briefly about some of the big things that are going on with regard to supporting faculty research and teaching.  Many of you know that we're hoping to put forward a new workload policy.  It is something that I've been personally working on and worked on with a faculty group last year.

Given the big change that was proposed by the Provost last week, and which will continue to preoccupy us for the next couple of weeks, I believe, and maybe beyond, I'm going to put this on hold for a little while, just because there's just so much big change that we can deal with.
But one thing I want to say here is that we will be proposing this to the chairs. We'll be proposing it to the faculty. If people hate it, we'll withdraw it. It's a big idea that we'd like for people to engage, and we will shape the idea in response to suggestions, and if it's a dud, then it will die, and if it's embraced, then we'll move forward.

We have several big projects in terms of faculty hiring. There is a bridge professorship in cognitive science, which is underway. That committee has been formed, and the applications are open, and the committee is working. We have two Mellon professorships in the Humanities which bridge departments and programs that are going to be part of the search process this upcoming year.

Let me just say that with regard to the bridge professorships and the Mellon professorship as well, it is not just a matter of these people. The bridge professorship is actually kind of a complicated thing. There are things that have to be worked out with faculty who will have homes in multiple schools, and we hope to be able to work through those many things. This is something that Bárbara and Nancy and I will be working on with our colleagues mostly in Engineering. It's not just a matter of bringing some exciting new people to campus, which we hope will happen, but to work out how this mechanism will actually work out.

There's some changes underway in sponsored research, changes in how particularly the Arts and Sciences research operation is changing, and Jackie Dejean is responsible for this reorganization, which will be to what she calls cradle to grave support for the grants, meaning beginning to end. In other words, your pre- and your post-support won't come from different folks. And this is underway. There's a position that's now being hired for, and it is something that we'll make sure you know about and understand in the weeks to come.

And I have spent for the past nine months one day out of every two weeks negotiating with the union, the part-time faculty union, which was formed last year. We are I would say two-thirds of the way through negotiating that contract. We still have the money issues to deal with, so it has a long walk still to walk. But we've been making a lot of progress, and we hope that sometime this semester that contract will be complete and we'll be moving forward.

It will have implications for you, particularly for those of you who are department chairs or program coordinators, and we're going to make sure that you understand what the new environment is with regard to part-time faculty. So thank you.

There are several things going on with regard to curricula. We are interested in supporting the faculty initiatives for the majors and programs. Adriana talked about the new consortium, which is a faculty initiative, which we've been very excited to support, and which we think has ripple effects beyond the actual programs that have coordinated there. There are a few ideas out there in education, in nutrition and food -- there might be one other -- film and medias studies, that are underway, and we hope will yield new opportunity for our students.

And there's a new partnership in the works between community Health and UEP, which has the potential to be very exciting in marrying these two programs into the department and allowing us to ultimately hire tenure stream lines in our community health program.
And the NEASC accreditation some years ago did shine a light on a problem that we had in our credit hours both at the undergraduate level and at the graduate level. Carmen Lowe is leading a group that's looking at the problem and trying to forge some solutions. You will be hearing about that in weeks and months to come. And on the graduate side, Bob, I don't know if you have anything you wanted to speak about.

DEAN COOK: No. I'm just going to work with Carmen to solve these credit hours she's in the masters programs.

DEAN GLASER: Yes, it's a masters degree problem, not a general graduate degree problem.

I'm going to ask Bob to talk about this particular slide, which has to do with graduate students and graduate programs. We do have an important agenda in this area. Bob, if you want to say a few words.

DEAN COOK: Sure. With the university's newfound commitment to graduate education, I think the time is right for us to make good progress in GSAS, and we're going to do that on a variety of fronts this year. If you were at the P&P meeting on Friday, you know I can filibuster for much longer than 30 seconds about this, because there are lots of changes going on within the program. But these are a few of the ones that we wanted to highlight today.

First of all, we're going to implement a new renovated admissions cycle. One of the things that we've been doing over the past few months is working very closely with Lee Coffin and his group to improve graduate admissions, at least on that side. I mean, graduate admissions is fundamentally different than undergraduate admissions in that it stays within the departments, but undergraduate admissions also has expertise that we can use to decide --

Well, one of the things that we've done is set up an office of graduate admissions within that. There's a new director there, Karen Richardson. We're going to be doing new things that we've never done before, such as go out to various kinds of fairs and outreach to increase both the quality and diversity of our graduate students. That's never been done before.

We've implemented a new admissions software called Slate, which will be a dramatic improvement over the previous one, so this should be tremendously successful. So that's all getting going, and we're working closely with Lee on that.

On the other front, we're going to have a new graduate school website as well. This is going to come online somewhere around March or April. It's a big commitment, both by the School of Engineering and A&S to pay for this. I have slides I can show you. I think everybody who saw it on Friday, it looks very exciting. It's designed specifically to increase the quality of our graduate students by increasing the visibility of our programs, increasing the call to actions so that we can get a larger quality of graduate students so that we can increase the people that we really want to come. And I think it will be tremendously successful, and we're working very hard on that.
GRADUATE STUDENT BARBECUE
Also, we're working with the departments to try and strategize ways to increase the quality of our graduate students overall. Those are at least the highlights. I have more, but that's it. Oh, one last thing. The barbeque today, graduate student barbeque from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM today. Come, have some barbeque, make your ears bleed. It's good.

DEAN GLASER: What Bob didn't say is that his group is performing, is that correct?

DEAN COOK: Yeah, if you want to call it performing. It will be the event of the year.

DEAN GLASER: Accessibility. With this, we're really talking about accessibility of the school -- at any rate, we're hoping to increase the accessibility of both our undergraduate and our graduate programs. I have to say, and I've learned this from Lee, that financial aid is a hungry beast. It just consumes and consumes. We can't ever really reach the aspirations that we have in that area.

With every increase situation, with every attempt to diversify our class, it costs more money. And so we will continue, and I will continue to work with our friends in advancement to try to bring support in for our students. And we do have a target of having 40% of our undergraduates on financial aid, which is actually not -- Lee, you want to say a word about that?

DEAN COFFIN: So 40% is a target to have a percentage of the freshman class on a need-based grant. So this year, it's 38%. Last year, it was 33%. So we made a big jump in one year, and we're trying to grow it to 40. A bigger goal would be 45, which seems to be more of a national average, but that's a big, scary number, and probably it's beyond our grasp right now. But I can connect this to a larger conversation that was in the New York Times yesterday about low-income access to higher ed, and that's very much a part of this. So as we raise the resources, we can continue to expand the number of low-income students. This year, we have 176 first-year students from very low-income backgrounds. It's a record high for Tufts.

DEAN GLASER: And requires continual work and tending, and we will continue to work towards that and tend to that.

In addition, John Barker and Lee and I have had conversations about changing the family contributions policy that we've had for a long time. I won't go into it, except to say that we're hoping to make it possible for the students from the very poorest families in their first year not to have a contribution. We want them to own a piece of their education, and in subsequent years, they will have a piece of their packages that they will be responsible for. But we're in the process of making a change there.

The fabulous BLAST program that John Barker is taking the lead on is now in its third cohort, and we will continue that program, and we will continue to both support it and study the impact of it. I think that the first results have been very, very promising and very exciting, and you'll be hearing more about that over the course of the year.

Enhancing accessibility services is not about financial aid. It really is about students who come with disabilities, and the number of students who have learning disabilities or physical disabilities
is very large. We have in Arts and Sciences, in this class, we do have a blind student, and I think five hearing-impaired students. And the resources required to accommodate these students, which we are both legally and ethically required to do, morally required to do, they're really substantial, and they will require accommodation from you.

And in addition, we have a staff that I would say is understaffed, given the volume of work that they have, and we're going to address that problem, that issue this year as well. And we want to continue to identify and execute ways to support diverse students. John, do you want to say a few words about some of the things that we've done recently?

DEAN BARKER: So one of the things that came out of the diversity report was the fact that not all of our students could take part in international study that they wanted to. There were barriers to entry. So one of the things that we did beginning this year was working with study abroad to offer those students who are Pell-eligible money that will soften the blow and the hurdles that they have to obtain their study abroad and have the same kind of experience that all of our students should have.

So we're looking at identifying barriers to excellence and success at Tufts and try and identify those and reduce those. So that's one of them, and we can talk about it a lot more.

DEAN GLASER: Those are coming attractions, and John will have the floor at some point in the future and talk about that.

Finally, this is the penultimate slide. Facilities and infrastructure. Those of you who are planning to move into 574 Boston Avenue or CLC, as it's known by our friends in advancement, know that occupational therapy, physics and astronomy, some parts of child development and community health will be moving into 574 this year, or maybe at the end of this year. It's a very exciting, beautiful building. If you have traveled down Boston Avenue, you can see it's really taken shape. It's going to be a spectacular space. But getting ready for that is a big ordeal, and I'm looking at Roger, because there's just so much that has to be worked out both within departments and across departments.

We also have the Science and Engineering Complex, which is in a heavy-duty planning stage right now with a lot of the central staff and a lot of the school staff and a lot of departmental folks, faculty and staff alike, as we prepare for what I think projects to be a 2017 building.

Tisch Library has major renovation plans, which are contingent upon raising the funds to make them happen, but there are some big-time changes that they envision, as the library becomes a 21st century and beyond library, and Laura Wood will at some point, I think, have the opportunity to talk to you about what those plans are.

And our classrooms, some of our space around campus needs a fix, and we plan to work with our friends in Central to address those problems. There is talk of, I know from the Executive Committee agenda, of a classroom committee that will I think have a bolder purpose, and that is I think coming this year.
A&S STRATEGIC PLAN
DEAN GLASER: And now finally, just a little bit about the strategic plan. This is, of course, something that's been in the works for some months, really this entire year. Joanne initiated this with Vickie. The two of them were the co-chairs of this project, which has included about a dozen representatives from across the school, a graduate student, an undergraduate student. There's faculty from the different ranks and different departments.

We are hoping and planning, and as of right now, on track for a late October target date. Before that final version comes out, we will be providing opportunities for feedback for the ideas that are being presented and the posts that are being presented in the strategic plans. Those opportunities will be both in person and online, and we will make sure that it's very well publicized so that everybody has an opportunity to review these ideas, get feedback, and give us the time to adjust the final product. Obviously, this is something that we hope will inform future decision making and future fundraising in the future.

One thing I wanted people to understand -- and I'm really glad Kevin is here, Kevin and Vickie are here, because the 2005 strategic plan really shows that the strategic plan actually matters, that things actually happen as a result of the strategic plan. And if you go back and look at the 2005 strategic plan, all kinds of things are in existence that we now take for granted, but they weren't in existence in 2005, and the good work of Kevin and Vickie and Nancy and Joanne and Bob Sternberg. Let me just remind you what those things are. The Center for the Humanities was a recommendation of the event the Center for the Humanities at Tufts, CHAT, was a twinkle in the eye of the 2005 strategic plan. The fact that prior to 2005, we did not do department external reviews, but we now do. We're almost all the way through all the departments, and we'll start over again when that happens.

We did not have a junior faculty mentoring program. This is something that I know Kevin had a major role in starting and forming, and it's been I think a very important program for us as a way of integrating new faculty in the school and connecting new faculty to each other.

Health insurance for graduate students was proposed, and with Lynne Pepall's leadership, that became a reality. I learned a lot from Lynne about being tenacious and not letting go of an issue. She was really, really tenacious about that particular issue, and it's one of the legacies of her deanship.

And then a publication fund for faculty. That is something that happened, and it disappeared. It's coming back. FRAC is going to be entertaining proposals for Open Access charges, as well as book subventions and other kinds of costs associated with publication. So FRAC will make it I think clear how to go about doing that, and they will be allocating those resources.

And then finally, we have added 60 additional full-time faculty lines since 2005, which was a scientifically-derived number by the strategic planning group in 2005. We crunched the numbers and then just grabbed one out of thin air. And with this, I'm going to turn the microphone over to Vickie to talk about our particular strategic plan.
PROFESSOR SULLIVAN:  Thank you very much, Jim.  First of all, I'd like to thank all the members of the Strategic Planning Committee.  They have worked through early mornings, over the summer, and on Friday afternoons.  It has really been a lot of work, and they've been very, very committed.  And I have no doubt that it's more than each of them bargained for when each accepted the invitation to participate on this committee.

We have not always agreed, but I think through the process, what has become clear is that everyone is deeply committed to the school and is extremely grateful for the opportunities that it gives to all of us, both collectively and individually.

I am happy to talk a little bit about the document that will be disseminated later this month, and at that time, there will be lots of time for feedback, and we welcome your input at that time.  I'd also like to invite the members of the committee to clarify or to elaborate on some of these points.

First, the document that presents what arts and sciences is, and that statement at the beginning of the document encapsulates the spirit of the faculty-generated response to the prelude to the strategic plan for the university.

So first of all, it says that Arts and Sciences has a twofold purpose.  First, to educate undergraduates in the liberal arts within an intensive research environment that includes graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.  And what we want to do is make the most of that twofold purpose.  It's our view that undergraduate and graduate education, when done well, can complement each other.

It also highlights our responsibilities to the community, the broader community; however we want to define it, and also our commitment to the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge itself.  The document pursues its recommendations through three different themes: community and climate first; research and scholarship; and then academics, curriculum and pedagogy.

We have three major recommendations, although there are many recommendations that are interwoven through those three themes.  If you've been listening to Jim's presentation and also Bob's presentation, they will not be a surprise to you.

First of all, we acknowledge the commitment that the university and the school has made to people over the last decade, to resources and funding for undergraduate students and for faculty and the growth of faculty, and we acknowledge that that has really improved us academically.  And we argue that we have to consolidate those gains, that we don't want to give up those gains, but it's now time to look also towards facilities.  And obviously, we're doing that.

And when we talk about facilities, we talk about new buildings, renovating and refurbishing, repurposing old buildings, creating new residential spaces, both for undergraduate and graduate students, and creating more spaces for our intellectual community, whether that's conference space, gathering spaces -- are there any others that the committee wants to elaborate on on that?  Oh, our guesthouse.

So we can accommodate, we hope with the guesthouse, international visitors who want to be here
-- who we want to be here short-term or perhaps slightly longer term, a few weeks to a semester, and also accommodate job candidates. And we think we can actually perhaps save some money and at least not give a lot of departmental funds and dean's resources to off-site hotels.

So buildings, facilities, our physical space we think is important for the climate of excellence that we want to foster. But in addition to that, we are not moving away from our commitment to financial aid, as Jim and Lee have discussed, and we think that that's fundamentally important to the character of who we are.

Thirdly, the graduate school. We think that it's very important to further our character as a research university and also to support faculty to have a really healthy graduate school and to compete with the very best graduate students out there. And in order to do that, we need more graduate funding and more funding for programs. Bob, do you want to say anything more about that?

DEAN COOK: Yay.

PROFESSOR SULLIVAN: So those are our three major recommendations that are woven through this document. And I think, just in conclusion, I would be doing a disservice to faculty members, students, and administrators who have been serving on this committee through not one, but two existential crises. The first existential crisis was when we found out that the co-chair and the dean was going to be leaving us, and what do we do then with the strategic plan?

And it was at that point that the provost came to us and met with us and gave us a very inspiring message that got us to persist, and I think it was very, very wise. He said precisely in times of transition that it's most important to imply who you are and where you want to go.

And now, there's another such crisis, which is who are we and why are we doing this, when it's possible that some of the things that we talk about that are at the very heart of our plan -- financial aid, admissions, co-curricular activities, extracurricular activities -- the responsibilities for those things may be changed.

And I think, again, at times of transition, it's very important to say precisely what we think is important and where we want to go. And I think also that this is an opportunity to declare that part of who we are as a school is to be found in our tradition of shared governance, and this is an opportunity to do that. And so we think this entire strategic planning process is an element of this longstanding character.

DEAN GLASER: Why don't we turn to the last item on the agenda. I welcome any questions or comments that you might have.

PROFESSOR GARDULSKI: I'm Anne Gardulski, from Earth and Ocean Sciences. My colleague and I, we were talking just a few minutes ago before the meeting started, and she was mentioning how the faculty are so much a part of the momentum of the university. And so I would say it's terrific that faculty have been involved as much as they have been in the strategic plan, and I'd encourage all my colleagues when we see the draft of the strategic plan to really look
at it and take it seriously.

And then along those lines, from 2005, you say there are 60 additional full-time faculty lines. And I know for a fact that there are more faculty, but I'm wondering do you have a breakdown of how many are tenure stream versus non-tenure stream?

DEAN GLASER: Two-thirds are tenure stream. Can I just say working with Vickie has been -- I mean, I knew this, because we've been colleagues for a long time, but working with her has been great. Actually, we're among the (inaudible) birthdays, and I'm a lot older than she is.

But working with Vickie has been such a great pleasure, and working with my colleagues -- and of course, I stepped in in the middle of this, and they were the ones who have this all started in working with Joanne and setting the framework for where we are right now. And the fact that we're on track and that we expect to have a product at the end of October is testament to the really high-quality work and the dedication of the members of this committee. So thank you very much for your efforts and your help. Thanks, Vickie.

PROFESSOR SULLIVAN: Likewise, Jim.

AS&E REORGANIZATION
DEAN GLASER: The final thing that I thought we would talk about has to do with the provost's reorganization of Arts, Sciences and Engineering. Of course, the plan was distributed, or a sort of rudimentary plan was distributed last week, and we had a conversation on Wednesday of last week. And what was interesting to me was how much of the conversation was surrounding issues of tenure and promotion, and I think that actually made a lot of sense to me, and I was not very surprised by that. And of course, that's something we all know very well, most of us having lived through it, or participated in it in some way.

But it also made me think that there are many things that members of the community don't fully understand about either the status quo or about where the provost envisions us going. And so I thought that for the final half an hour of this meeting that if people wanted to ask questions to clarify some of the issues that are raised in the provost's plan or ask questions about the way things are now --

When I first became dean of undergraduate education back in 2003, and I moved into Dowling Hall, I had absolutely no idea of the work that was done there and how extensive it was, how many people were involved, what they did, and the really high quality work and dedication that they had for our students, and I became a big fan of the operation here.

But I realize that to most of you, Dowling was a distant building, and certainly what happens in admissions is not always apparent to everybody, and (inaudible) is quite far away, and these are things that you may have questions about. So I've invited David and Kevin to join us. I know that there will be a faculty forum on Friday at noon here in this room where administrators will not be present, and there will be a free-flowing conversation -- I suspect a free-flowing conversation -- but it will be a conversation without me and without David or Kevin and without Nancy.
But I thought if people wished to make comments today or if people wished to ask questions that this would be an appropriate time to do that, and perhaps those questions and answers might help inform the conversation that you have on Friday. So if you want to come on up and join me, David and Kevin.

PROVOST HARRIS: Good afternoon, everyone. So thanks for having us back. We've been talking a lot, Jim, and Kevin and I, about these issues, and we talked to other deans and other folks, and we agree it makes a lot of sense to have this conversation, especially as we tee up the faculty forum on Friday, and then the subsequent meeting the following Friday.

So let me first start, with all sincerity, to say thank you. I thought last week's meeting was great. It was wonderful to see so many people there, and as much as I told people -- I focused on two different things. One is diversity of a group, and it was a range of people from across AS&E who were there and who spoke. But also, I appreciated the tone of the conversation, so I just want to say thank you to all of you for -- really, I feel we're partners.

And what I think are really an important set of decisions for Tufts University and a set of decisions that people continue to ask, and I will continue to say, we have not decided all this stuff. It would be easier if we knew all the answers, but we don't. People are raising good questions, and we're going back and thinking about it more.

So let me just say a few things by introduction, Kevin will say some things, and then we'll put it off to the group. The first thing to say is that we talked about five different areas. We talked about tenure and promotion, admissions, athletics, student services, and graduate studies.

So as we've been talking about this more, we said, “You know what, given time, let's separate these a little bit.” So what “separate these a little bit” means is that I believe, and I will continue to believe, that tenure and promotion, the things I talked about, are critically important for the future of this university. Don't think that this means I don't think it's as important as I talked about last week, but it can be in a little bit different time line.

So we're talking to dean candidates, and we'll tell those dean candidates what's their relationship to these other areas. They're still going to be heavily involved in the T&P decisions, and so I feel like it's a little bit less critical that we know in the next couple of weeks.

It's also the case that as I said openly before the last meeting, I can't change Statement 11. So that's going to require -- Jillian or someone correct me -- I think the requirement is two meetings of the faculty, or no. It requires deliberation in T&P, and it requires faculty deliberation. It just requires more time.

So what I'm going to do is to focus the conversation the next two weeks on the other four areas. And that's a really important area. I want to continue to push there. And the Engineering faculty are talking about it in their meeting, which is either this week or next week -- this week, now, right now.

And I want to start where Jim was about information. I want to encourage folks to talk to -- those
who haven't, really talk to your colleagues who live in these areas. Part of that is the dean's office, but that's the people in admissions, it's the people in Dowling, it's the people in athletics. You know, this notion of lack of objective reality. They have a perspective that you may not have from where you sit, and frankly, that I didn't have before I started delving into this more deeply and really understanding these issues.

So what do I end up concluding at this point? At this point, I continue to conclude that the current model we have with respect to the structure of -- and I'll be more detailed, but first at the high level, it's Dowling, admissions, athletics, grad studies -- is not the right structure for Tufts. The question in my mind is what is the right structure, not should we leave it exactly as it is.

Some of the reasons that I end up saying this, some things it's easy to talk about, and some things that it's harder to talk about, because they're really about interactions that I see between certain individuals that lead me to believe it's not bad actors in some cases, it's really structural, what's going on.

But take some examples. Take orientation, for example. Orientation just happened with the students. That's a decision about how our students are going to be brought into this, how they will be introduced in this community called Tufts. But this challenge is structurally. If Engineering has certain thoughts, and A&S has certain thoughts, it's challenge is structurally and how it might be implemented, and frankly, how it is implemented. But I think structural, more than anything else, given the size.

Take admissions. And sure, I'll talk to Lee, and I will say -- I told Lee this, and he and his staff should feel fantastic, and I hope he went back to talk to his staff -- and he said he did -- about what they heard. It's clear that's what's happening in admissions is fantastic. I get that. I'd be pretty thick to not get that. And we want to make sure that whatever we do is not something that erodes our ability to continue to bring in absolutely incredible classes.

You know, there are times in which the conversations that occur are actually conversations with admissions, the president and provost about policy, about what we want to be doing as a university in some areas. It's inconsistent with the structure we have now; it's structural things. And athletics, we all talked about. It doesn't seem to make much sense, the way it currently reports. So we're talking about how to make the change.

Last couple of things. I think it's important -- I was talking to a faculty member earlier today who was talking about -- the administrator and proposed VP -- I think it's really important to know what we're thinking about when we say a VP. What are the characteristics of this person? I want you to have in mind someone who -- and we're going to send out a document later this week that will give you more detail --

I want you to have in mind someone who's spent their life on the academic side of the universe. I want you to have in mind someone who has deep experience in one of these areas that reports in. I don't want you to have in your mind somebody who is an HR professional who spent their life there. Someone who spent their life in finance as a professional, other aspects of the purely administrative part of the universe. That's not at all what we're talking about.
We're talking about that pure academics belong in the school, but there's lots of things of things that are either transactional or across schools that, in my opinion, belong reporting to the provost's office, because the provost -- while an administrator, I acknowledge that is also the chief academic officer and is on the academic side with connections to the academic side.

It's different from someone who reports to Patricia on the administrator side. So I want to make sure people have that in mind, because I think that's an absolutely critical distinction, and I wouldn't at all support if that moved it over to the administrator side.

Faculty will continue to be heavily involved in ways that faculty are now, and I think there can be some ways in which faculty might even be more involved in some of these than they are currently if we set this up right.

So that's some of the key things I want you to keep in mind. There will be others I'm sure that will pop up once I hear people talking. But I welcome the opportunity to hear you, and I'll let Kevin see if there's additional things that he might want to say as well.

VICE PROVOST DUNN: Maybe just one thing. Jillian, is our followup meeting the 26th?

MS. DUBMAN: The 19th.

VICE PROVOST DUNN: It's the 19th. So at that meeting, we really do hope to be making proposals at a much more concrete level. So this next week and a half is kind of a crucial time, so please, please send emails, call me, come and see me, talk to David. This is still a time where your input can really have a major impact on the way things will look.

PROFESSOR ORIANS: I just want to say when we had the strategic plan, the graduate school was emphasized over and over again. It's been a huge theme, and I feel like coupling the graduate discussion with these other three parts does the graduate school a disservice. I feel like we have to have a separate conversation that's on a different time line, much like you've set with T&P, that's graduate only focused, because otherwise it again seems second fiddle to what we're trying to do at the undergraduate level. I think we really need a graduate only focused discussion, which would include departments that have and departments that want to have graduate programs and what kinds of structures they'd like to add. So my plea is to not put it on the same time line.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thanks, Colin. I think in all of these, I should have said, is that what we're trying to figure out right now is sort of principles, in many cases, and we're going to work out details. So on the issues of Dowling, for example, we've had a lot of conversation with Jim, because he knows Dowling better than we do, because he lived there for a number of years. A lot of discussion about, “Okay, what would make sense to move and what wouldn't make sense to move,” and that really required a deep conversation with the staff in Dowling, because there have been some changes since Jim left as well. So it's broader that we have to talk to in detail.

With respect to strategy, you're helping me think about this differently as you're talking. The most important thing we've got to figure out with respect to the service (?) for the deans I think
with grad students is will there be a university-wide graduate school that will have responsibility for graduate programs and the dean will not have that responsibility? We don't have to answer the detailed question right now of, “Well, is it the third academic dean in A&S, is it some different structure in A&S?” We have to answer that, and I'm pretty comfortable -- and people should talk and see if we have different opinions -- that it does not make sense for us to have a university graduate school that pulls that out of the schools. I think we can stop the current conversations that, “Great, we understand that, now let's have the deeper dialogue you suggest.” But if others have thoughts, you should comment. I don't want to rush that, but I would need to know fairly soon. Does that make sense?

PROFESSOR METCALF: Gib Metcalf, Economics. So I totally agree that we have a need to change both around the graduate school and around the relationship with Arts and Sciences and Engineering, and there are a variety of ways to do that. I look back to the work that was done in the Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience and the strategic plan back in 2005, or whenever that was.

There's a common theme that goes back at least a decade, if not longer, and that is the very close and intimate relationship between core academics, the composition of the class, co-curricular activities, athletics. So a lot of the recommendations have really been how do we have a comprehensive educational experience that really uses all of these pieces.

And so where I'm struggling is seeing pulling one piece of that out of the schools of Arts and Sciences and Engineering and elevating that to the provost's office seems to go completely counter to at least a 10- to 15-year trend, and I'm not sure that really is -- we have a problem, to be sure, but I'm not sure that this is a solution that's going to address the structural issues that we have, and I think it does do a disservice to the education in the School of Arts and Sciences and in Engineering.

PROVOST HARRIS: I think, Gib, that that, to me, is the critical side. And I think that's why we've got to have in our minds clearly is to work on the details. I don't think it has to distance these things you're talking about from the educational mission. And I also think, frankly, that this looks differently, depending on where you sit.

If you sit in A&S or sit in Engineering, just given the difference in size of the two places, I think -- the things I hear from folks in Engineering, it's a very different take, and it's a take that it's just simply one of numbers and power resulting from numbers. I think you can have a structure -- again, we're talking about the characteristics of this person. We watch model of how to operate.

There could be a model of how to operate, which says the provost's office is here, and somebody here, and they think about these things, and they come and talk to me and say we should or shouldn't do this with respect to these different areas. That's not in any way the model we're envisioning.

We're saying that this person needs to continue to have very close contacts with the deans, because you want to integrate it with the academics, and we're not trying to take the academic mission away from the schools. We're saying this person needs to continue to have faculty involvement and so
forth. So I think you could achieve what you want, but also get the structural instabilities out of the way.

What one person suggested was we'll just give solid lines in all of these, instead of having a solid to A&S and a dotted to Engineering. I think that just would exacerbate the problems that we have right now, rather than address them. So like I said, we're open to different solutions, but this is the one that for now is making the most sense.

PROFESSOR DUNN: Just one thing real quick on what Gib said. One thing that's becoming increasingly clear, at least to me, after having these conversations, and especially going across the schools, is that this position is still going to be primarily concerned with Arts, Sciences and Engineering. It's going to be able to offer things to other schools, transactional services, but it's still going to be very focused, but hopefully a little bit more potent in what it can do for the schools. More potent and more equitable in terms of the two schools.

So I think as it was presented initially, it was really very much, you know, this is really a central office for everyone. I think it's better to think of Dowling being elevated and Arts, Sciences and Engineering still being the focus of what happens there, and physically.

PROFESSOR SCHILDKRAUT: Hi, Debbie Schildkraut, Political Science. So I have to admit, before this proposal came out, other than the T&P side of it, these are things I have never thought about before. So this has been education for me, just in terms of sorting out the pros and cons and learning about how all this stuff works. And I've been surprised to realize how much my own bias is to like just not changing things.

And also to hear you say -- to tell us imagine who this person is and what their background is was helpful to hear. But also, Jim, you've been on these related issues as a faculty member, as a dean in Dowling, as a dean here, and I was wondering if you have to educate other people, what are some of your thoughts and some of the pros and cons of what's being proposed?

PROVOST HARRIS: We talked about this. We talked about the fact that there's a challenge -- I just want to be clear. Some of the people in the room are the point people in these areas, and they both have clear perspectives, but it's a bit challenging. Jim and I talked about this, and we thought that what made sense was for Jim to -- if anyone asked, or even before, to just share with you what he thinks. So that's the way we want to operate.

DEAN GLASER: So I will say to you, Debbie, what I have said to David, that there are some ways where I think this can help us move forward. So, for instance, where multiple schools are involved, where there's economies of scale, it can be achieved, where uniform policy makes sense. Those are areas which I think rightly belong in the provost's structure.

An example of that is I know there's some conversation about the libraries, and I know there's a lot of economies of scale that can be accomplished by bringing the libraries together. I know it's not part of this particular plan, but I know that there is a separate conversation going on about what to do with the libraries, and that makes a lot of sense to me.
We've talked about disability, our accessibility services, and some of the issues there are issues that I think -- multi-school solutions make a lot of sense. Where it's our students -- as a general principle, I think where it's our students and our curriculum and our requirements and their studies, I think those things belong in the schools. And I've said this to David and Kevin.

And parts of Dowling, like the alpha deans, who are responsible for the curriculum, executing the curriculum, and who can opt out of a requirement -- not that they'd do that -- or who needs a special pass on a language requirement or whatever, or the study abroad fit, where Sheila is hiring people who are teaching our students, giving Tufts credits, deciding which programs count as an academic program. To me, those things are teaching our students, and are involved with the teaching of our students, the education of our students, and I think those things belong in the school.

So I've encouraged David to think about this not as this very big, grand, let's just take all these units and consolidate them in one place, but maybe look at it in a more nuanced way, and with the principle in mind that it's our students, it's our curriculum, it's our requirements, it's our academics, it's our student studies, and it's in Arts and Sciences, I think that that should stay in the school.

And by the way, I think that has to do with graduate studies, and I think that has to do with undergraduate studies. And I'm not sure about some of the other areas. So I just don't know.

PROFESSOR SCHILDKRAUT: So just to follow up, Kevin said that there's a need to move quickly in turning this into something concrete. So is the idea that maybe what you're thinking, that there would be some other position that would be in charge of the things that you're talking about, that report, that dotted line reports to this person that is responsible for those sorts of things, or not creating a new position, but how does that play out?

DEAN GLASER: I don't really know, Debbie. This is pretty fresh to me, too, and I haven't thought about exactly what it would look like.

PROVOST HARRIS: Just quickly, just to add, all I'm going to say is agreed. We believe we can work out the details of what exactly -- we don't believe lock, stock, and barrel, you move -- these are the kinds of principles we're talking about.

PROFESSOR PEPALL: I just want to go back to Colin's point about a conversation about graduate studies, a separate conversation, and also Gib's point that we've had a lot of conversation about undergraduate education and where it belongs and the school engagement with the undergraduate. We haven't had a parallel conversation about graduate, so I don't believe that we can just make the jump.

We've discussed all this with the undergraduate, and it's obvious it applies to graduate. I personally don't think that is the case, but it may be. But it's not a conversation, and I don't think we've spent a great deal of time thinking about it. I understand that you're under a certain pressure to sort of write job descriptions and get those jobs filled, and reporting structures are an important part of that job description, but I also don't feel like we should be held to that time line, and there might be -- you can be hiring a position for deans and say, 'Look, if this is an area that is in flux,
and we don't know what's going to happen, and you have to be prepared for changes there.”

I feel like we're just so pressured by the dean search that we have to make structural decisions that maybe are not the best structural decisions we could make at this particular point in our career.

PROVOST HARRIS: I agree with you to a point, but there are constraints here. I mean, it would be nice if we had an open window open longer. I don't think we do on some of these things. We've only spent the last week talking about this. There's been an intensive push over the summer. And we've had exchanges about it more recently.

For me, on the grad piece, as I said to Colin, I do think we should spend a lot more time flushing out the details, but I'm not convinced at this point that we need a graduate school that's above the schools. For me, that's the critical question for hiring a dean. But the other details, I agree we should work out.

PROFESSOR ORIANS: But I think all we're asking for is a meeting that focuses on that question only so you can address that. So having a separate meeting that's apart from admissions, apart from T&P, apart from anything else. Do we want a graduate school? Let's have a conversation.

PROVOST HARRIS: Okay. Jillian's going to kill me, but yeah, let's do it. We'll send you a note very soon about that.

VICCE PROVOST DUNN: And if you want, we can just say that it's now no longer part of this meeting. If everyone's satisfied with what David's saying, all we really need to decide now is there will not be a university-wide graduate school. Then we can focus on the Dowling side of the discussion.

PROFESSOR WINN: Peter Winn, History. I'd like to speak to the admissions part of the proposal. Everyone has agreed that over the last ten years, Lee Coffin and admissions have done an extraordinary job. As a former chair of that committee, during that period of time, I've also talked to other subsequent chairs, including the current chair of the committee, and no one I talk to is in favor of your proposal. Everyone feels, first of all, that if it's not broke, don't fix it, and I think that's certainly the case that we're talking about here.

But also that the idea of the dean of admissions reporting to someone in student services in your office, which is how we understood this -- is that wrong?

PROVOST HARRIS: That's wrong. This will be someone who has a broad portfolio all around. It's not reporting to John Barker.

PROFESSOR WINN: I didn't say that. Even a label I think is, in our opinion, or in my opinion, a mistake in understanding of what admissions is mostly about, and I think it was Vickie Sullivan last week who talked about this. It's fundamentally an academic person. And I would like to add to that, in a sense, as I thought about this after the meeting, those students who are candidates for admission -- it's Dowling out of student service. It's almost comparable to our hiring processes in terms of evaluating candidates to teach those students. And I think if you can think of this in
those terms, and again in terms -- the admissions process is best served by having the reporting going to the respective school deans.

And I understand that if you can make sort of a diagram of the lines of authority, the lines of reporting, there's a certain logic behind what you're composing, but my feeling strongly is that we can solve those problems in another way. And I think that it's important to retain the strength and the message, the academic message, of the existing structure of things.

PROVOST HARRIS: Let me ask you a question, Peter. So if you have admissions reporting to this office, if you had a strong committee of faculty advising it, how different would it be? I mean, if you had a case -- for example, some of the issues that come up that are really across schools, how do we handle the documented folks at this university who applied? Are we okay with admitting students who aren't documented, or are we not okay with that? How do we think about some of those key financial aid questions? Those are questions that are really not an arts and sciences question or an engineering question. That's a Tufts University question about how we handle admissions.

So I'm saying for those kinds of questions of policy, for the processing issues, it seems to me it makes sense to have that handled by an office that's saying that it's across the schools. The question about who's the right student for arts and sciences, who's the right student for engineering, that seems very much like a different kind of question. But it's these other issues which are probably less visible to most of the faculty and to me, in many cases, those are the kinds of things that I think really are appropriated --

PROFESSOR WINN: I think those are obviously extraordinarily important for a difficult and complex issues that involve university policy. But it seems to me you can take the current structure and say this is something you need to talk to the provost about, that you don't have to change the structure for those particular instances.

DEAN GLASER: So we are at the very tail end of our meeting, and Christiane has the mike with one last question. And then there will be an opportunity for a lot of conversation on Friday.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: My question is simply -- it's a real question -- we are carrying on a very wide-ranging conversation and talking about real changes. What about the other schools who will also report to this uber dean, or whatever? And I wonder, do they consider those kinds of major changes? Have you initiated those? Of course, there's a difference in size. There's a difference in the money coming in, etcetera, etcetera.

PROVOST HARRIS: Yes. So Kevin was down in Boston -- Kevin, yesterday, I think you were down in Boston a good chunk of the day and meeting with deans and the EADs. There's a difference in the time pressure, and there's a different context here, because, one, we're searching for deans of A&S and E. There are existing deans in those places. But, two, the existing structure, and what's residual from when this was one school, is what makes what we do with Arts, Sciences and Engineering a different kind of a question from the other schools.

But we're not exempting them from the broader conversation. We're simply saying that because
of the current, I call it structure and stability we have in AS&E, it has more immediacy.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you all.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Jillian Dubman
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering
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COMING ATTRACTIONS
Supporting Faculty, Research and Teaching

• Workload Policy
• Bridge/Mellon Professorships
• Sponsored Research Support
• Part-Time Faculty Union Contract
Curricula

• Support faculty initiatives for new majors and programs
• A new partnership in the works
• Carnegie credit hours
Graduate Students, Graduate Programs

- Implement renovated admissions cycle (SLATE, new recruitment materials, new role of Admissions Office)
- New graduate school website
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Facilities and Infrastructure
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