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PRESIDENT MONACO: Before I hand the microphone over, I just wanted to say for those who were able to attend the forum on Race and Equality in Action, I think it was a very, very stimulating discussion, and I just wanted to thank Provost Harris and all the faculty members who helped organize it or were panel members. I think it was a great conversation and a great beginning to more of these on the campus. So thank you very much.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Welcome. By the way, I want to thank the provost, too. I attended, and it was very eye-opening for me, and a lot should happen.

The first item of business in nominations of Committee on Committees, and I call on Ioannis Evrigenis.

NEW BUSINESS

OPEN POSITIONS AND NOMINATIONS FOR 2015-2016 ELECTED COMMITTEES

PROFESSOR EVRIGENIS: Hi, I'm Ioannis Evrigenis. I'm here on behalf of the Committee on Committees, and I want to announce the upcoming elections and the nominations, invite further nominations, and say something about another vote which is going to take place which regards the task force on university-wide faculty governance.

The first thing to do upon any of these occasions is to thank Jillian and Maxine for providing support for the Committee on Committees. We couldn't do it without them. I also want to thank my fellow committee members who have been pestering you over the past few weeks to get you to put your name on ballots.

There's a list of the nominations, and Jillian maintains a website with the nominees and some information about their experience in relevant positions. So I'm going to jump right in.

We have a full term for budget for priorities. We need to elect one member from engineering, and we have Irene Georgakoudi from biomedical engineering and Dan Kuchma from civil and environmental engineering.

We have an opening, five-year-term, for the Committee on Committees. We need to elect one arts, sciences and engineering faculty member to replace Yannis Ioannides, and our nominees right now are Kathleen Camara from child study and human development, Bruce Hitchner from classics, and Ed Kutsoati from economics.

We have an opening in the Executive Committee for a one-year replacement. We need to elect two arts, sciences and engineering members, and our nominees right now include David Henry Feldman from child study and human development, Jack Ridge from earth and ocean sciences, Kim Ruane from mathematics, and Jeff Taliaferro from political science.
We have an opening for a full term member on the Faculty Advisory Board, and right now, our nominee is Kelly Greenhill in political science. And we have a full term of three years on the Grievance Panel. We need three arts, sciences and engineering faculty members. Our nominees right now are Soha Hassoun from computer science, Jerry Meldon from chemical and biological engineering, and Jeff Zabel from economics.

We have a one-year replacement for which we need to elect two arts, sciences and engineering faculty members, and our nominees right now are Alessandra Campana from music, Lisa Lowe from English, and Aniruddh Patel from psychology.

And we need to elect a full-term member for T&P from engineering, and right now, our nominee is Jeff Hopwood from electrical and computer engineering.

I would like you to take a moment to review the list, think hard about your colleagues who you think might make good nominees, and please nominate them to any member of the Committee on Committees or to Jillian directly. As I said, there's a website with the relevant information. We need candidates.

It's been a very hard couple of years, in the sense that a lot of you have been called on to serve on task forces, workgroups, committees, and so on. So I understand that it's been taxing on people's time, but we really need people to step up and participate, so please think about whether or not you have the time to do that.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is briefly give you a sense of the time line. So we will be soliciting nominations until March 11. You can do that, as I said, by contacting any member of the committee or Jillian. The voting will begin on Wednesday, March 18 and conclude on Tuesday, March 24 at midnight. We're still using electronic voting and using campusvote.com. If you do not vote right away, you will receive successive emails until you do. And the Committee on Committees will announce the results of each election on March 25. So that's as regards to the regular elections.

As I mentioned, there's a special election that we want to hold in order to elect two arts and sciences members for the task force that's going to consider the issue of university-wide faculty governance. You should have received a message from Jillian which comes with an attachment of a memo issued by a working group that has considered this issue. It lists some of the topics that were discussed. It lists some of the concerns that were raised for future consideration.

And the idea here is that each of the schools is going to contribute two members to the task force, and that these representatives of the schools will get together, consider these questions, collect input from their various constituencies, bring that in, put together, come up with some proposals, vet the proposals with their respective constituencies, and then come up with some suggestions for what university-wide faculty governance should look like.

We have requested nominations, and we have received eight as of yesterday, but maybe a couple
of more have come in since then. The way we're going to handle this is that we will contact the
nominees and ask them if they do want to be on the ballot, and once that is done, we will contact
you by email with a survey so that you can vote to elect these two representatives, and we will
announce the results by email.

So I'll take any questions about either election.

PROFESSOR MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. I just wanted to ask about the special election.
If we nominate and vote on this, does this mean we accept the purview of that committee, and does
it also mean that we accept the level of representation of each school? I'm a little puzzled that we
moved forward so fast on this, because I think some questions were raised about, for instance, why
arts and sciences would be represented by equal numbers with schools that are much, much
smaller. Could you explain?

PROFESSOR EVRIGENIS: So we raised this issue when the Executive Committee when the
Committee on Committees received the request. My understanding, and the details are included
in the attachment that came with Jillian's note, but my understanding is that the work of the
committee is very much exploratory. So the committee is not going to come up with a series of
rules that are then binding on the schools. The idea is to bring a small number of representatives
from all the schools so that they can discuss what these various models might look like.

And part of the process will involve looking at alternative models, how this is done at other
universities so that they can consider the pros and cons. So I don't think that it's intended to be a
binding committee, but it's intended to produce some kind of material that the faculties can
consider in order to make a decision on this issue at some later date.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON PROPOSED AS&E REORGANIZATION

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you, Ioannis. We have made a switch in the agenda with Vida
Johnson, the chair of T&P, to put that last, and discuss and vote on the reorganization first, because
the Executive Committee on the request of a number of people would like to make the vote a secret
ballot. And my understanding is that we have to first vote whether you agree that we should have
a secret ballot. The concerns were on the part of untenured faculty, but it also is I think more
reasonable and fairer for everybody to be able to vote without having to raise a hand and be seen by
everybody.

So if you want to discuss the secret ballot, let's do it briefly, and then I will entertain a motion to
have a secret ballot. I understand from our parliamentarian that once the motion is brought and
seconded, there's no more discussion. So you want to have discussion now, or are you in
agreement?

PROFESSOR MIRKIN: Sergei Mirkin, biology. I want to say I'm in strong support of this
motion, and it's indeed several of my untenured faculty less secure for my department, and
lecturers said, “We want to come, we want to discuss, we want to vote, but we are concerned how
this can affect our future.” And I told them to vote, and I don't even know who they're in favor.
Maybe me. Either way, I thought people should not feel intimidated by voting, and the secret ballot is a perfect option for us.

PROFESSOR SMITH: I just want to raise the issue. The resolution that I put forward in September ended up being voted on by virtually everybody on the faculty, not just people attending this group, as today. And there's at least a question whether these motions should be handled in the same way. It was Beatrice Manz who had the genius of taking that resolution and putting it up to her department. Then it ended up going to every department. I had no expectation of that. But that vote seemed to me to be one of the most representative votes this faculty has ever done, because it just covered every tenure-track member of every department, got involved, and no names were needed. There was no issue of who voted how. It was just votes from each department.

So I just want to raise the possibility that maybe the appropriate way to vote this, in fact, is to put it before each department over the next couple of weeks and have the individual departments respond.

PROVOST HARRIS: David Harris, Provost. My question has nothing to do with substance and everything to do with process, and I guess the question is what does this say about precedent. I've been here two and a half years, and I haven't seen a single vote that was a secret ballot, and I wonder if this is now something that -- and also George raised a really important question, which I had to think about as well, which is who should be the electorate, those who can and do show up, or those who are eligible given their status. So I think there are actually a couple of really important process issues to discuss.

PROFESSOR WINN: I'm opposed to George's idea. If a department, hypothetically, whatever department has 20 faculty members, whom half are not tenured and half are tenured, if the vote that comes in is one of 20 to nothing in one direction or the other, then those junior faculty would be exposed without that being the intention.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: The discussion for the moment, we still want to call on the committees who worked on the proposals to give a summary, but right now, the discussion is whether to have a secret ballot at this faculty meeting. I think we can discuss what to do in addition or afterwards. But everyone knew it was coming up, and I think the Executive Committee has discussed that we should have a vote in this forum, and then we can discuss what's afterwards. So are we discussing the secret ballot? The question is we haven't done this. We have done it before many times. We had secret ballots, and it's perfectly okay. But we have to take a vote whether you all agree.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, German, Russian, Asian. There's another option, and that is -- and we have joined the 21st century, and we are voting for all of our committees, which are very important votes. We used to vote whoever showed up in the faculty meeting ended up electing, and I remember that the economics department was fantastic about getting out their group, and they also had somebody on budget and priorities, on T&P, etcetera.
So I remember that very well, and then I started getting my department out and got elected. But in any case, what about simply the same kind of balloting that goes out to everyone else, I mean not with the committees; you know, one person, one vote, hopefully secret.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Anything else? Okay, I would entertain a motion for a secret ballot, and unless anybody objects stringently to have a voting now, we can always discuss what else we could do to have the faculty opinion most representative. Is there a motion to have a secret ballot, yes or no?

UNKNOWN FACULTY MEMBER: So moved.

UNKNOWN FACULTY MEMBER: Second.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: All in favor? Against? Abstaining? Okay, thank you.

Now, I would like to call for a brief summary -- we had a summary in December of the committees we have asked to look into the proposals of the faculty. It should be brief, and I would call on David Garman, chair on the Committee of Admissions and Financial Aid first.

PROFESSOR GARMAN: Thank you, everyone. You've heard from me on this before. You've seen the report circulated several times. I don't have anything new to report since the December verbal report and the November written report, so let me just hit the highlights very quickly.

The Committee on Undergrad Admissions and Financial Aid had met in September and October. We got terrific cooperation from administrators, from the two school deans, vice provost Kevin Dunn and Bruce Reitman, John Barker, Lee Coffin, Carmen Lowe, Patricia Reilly, Dawn Terkla, all participated in these discussions.

In the end, we came down to discussion of three essential resolutions, three essential questions, and the first question was should the AS&E dean of admissions be responsible for coordinating or admissions practices in schools other than AS&E, and all the respondents to the voting poll that I took were opposed to this.

It was thought that undergraduate admissions, AS&E admissions are too important to Tufts and too large a responsibility to take the risk of disrupting across what's working really well right now and giving more responsibilities to the dean that we think is really heavily loaded with responsibilities already.

The second question was about budgets, and it wasn't clear from the original proposals what would happen to budgets, but since we thought this was so important, we discussed it. And the question that I surveyed was: “Should the budgets for AS&E admissions and financial aid be set and controlled by the provost's office or by the deans of AS&E?” And all but two of the respondents felt that budgets should clearly be set and controlled by an equal collaboration of the deans of
AS&E, and the other two respondents had variants of that feeling. Nobody felt that central administration of the budgets would be a good idea.

So our third question was should the AS&E dean of admissions report to the deans of A&S and E with solid line reporting relationships to both deans and a dotted line informational report to the provost's office, or should the AS&E dean of admissions report with a solid line report to the provost's office and a dotted line informational report to both deans?

All the respondents felt that the AS&E dean of admissions should have solid line reporting relationships to both the dean of A&S and the dean of E, and all felt that improving the flow of information to the central administration by having a dotted line informational report to the provost's office would be fine as long as this improved the flow of information, but didn't really add to the administrative burden of Dean Coffin.

And essentially, those were the three questions that we surveyed. Those were the conclusions of the voting members of the committee. And in a few minutes, you'll hear a motion that is being proposed that I'm co-sponsoring, and I'm co-sponsoring that resolution not on behalf of the committee, but as an individual faculty member who has been very involved in these discussions, attended a lot of meetings, and feel that making the change right now with what we know about the proposal would not be a good idea.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you, David. I call on Joseph Auner, chair of FAB, the Faculty Advisory Board, who was given the task of looking at the Dowling and the Dowling operation.

PROFESSOR AUNER: I hope everybody has the full report, so I'll just keep this brief. We were grateful to everybody who spoke to us, and we had a very good series of frank conversations, and I think we all learned about the way Dowling operates and the degree to which it's a very complex ecosystem that works well together and that serves students in productive ways.

One thing that came out from those discussions is it does not -- from the dean we spoke to, it does not seem that the current reporting structures cause the problems or challenges that they face, and it seems like -- so nobody really focused on reporting structures or the split reporting between the deans of arts and sciences and engineering as a big challenge.

As with other reports, we were really responding to the document that was -- I don't remember the date of the final flow chart that we were looking at. That's what we looked at. And a lot of details weren't fully spelled out in that report. And a big thing that was a big question mark in evaluating the proposal is it was unclear which parts of Dowling would move, but it seems like there was a feeling that only certain parts of Dowling would move.

And then that became a big concern of ours, precisely because Dowling is a complex integrated ecosystem, that it seemed very problematic potentially to move parts of it under the provost and leave parts of it under the dean, where you would also be creating more problems than you would potentially solve by such a move. There's that feature.
The biggest thing that came out is that there was a real consensus from everyone we spoke to at Dowling that there was a challenge in getting issues facing student services and student affairs and student life brought to the attention of the upper administration in timely, efficient ways. But people didn't seem to think that the change in reporting structure was the way to do that. Rather, there was a feeling that other mechanisms, including different kinds of meetings, more frequent meetings, getting more people around the table more frequently who could raise issues of problems that come up, short-term problems, but also long-range planning issues that come up that involve facilities, enrollment, student affairs, budgets that impact student life.

And so there is an issue that needs to be addressed, but it would be best addressed by other means rather than a reorganization that many thought could cause more damage than it would help. And I think that's the main thing.

One thing that did come out is when the committees were tasked to look at these proposals, there wasn't a clear committee that had the purview of the Dowling operation. So FAB was put in charge of that, and we were happy to do it, but I do think it seems coming out of this process that some committee that would be more directly connected to Dowling and student affairs and student services that would be ongoing could also help with this issue of communication. So we hope that would be something that could come out of this process. I can't read my handwriting, but I think I said everything.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you, Joe. Next would be Fio Omenetto for the Committee on Budget and Priorities.

ASSOCIATE DEAN OMENETTO: So we were tasked with looking at the nitty-gritty, so everything that connects everything, all the work of the other committees, to see exactly where the money was going beforehand and the division of the money between the schools, the impact of tuition, the shared resources, and all of the different implications of that.

And most importantly, the task of the committee was to try to figure out what would happen with the money, and so how would these flows be affected by the reorganization. So what we did is we provided a very colorful chart, for those of you that have the colored version of this, and we made an attempt to understand things as they sit.

We certainly noticed that the system was very flexible and interconnected and that the management was very adaptable. We talked with a bunch of people, so we managed to have consistently both Scott Sahagian, the EAD, and Jonathan Dudley. We talked with Kevin, Patricia Campbell, and Tom McGurty, and so forth. And the best approach that we had was to come up with a set of questions and to address some of the issues and to give a prediction, a projection of how finances would be managed under the new plan. It's a complex problem. We're waiting to see these answers.

The stance of the committee is we took this as a fact-finding mission, so we felt like we were trying
to support the work of the other committees, and to see where everything could be affected, starting from the amounts of money that were allocated initially under the old budget. So we have substantially not changed their stance. This question still stands.

And one word of clarification, the use of the word redacted is to be interpreted in a journalist editorial style, and not in an FBI style, because I've heard -- this is probably due to my oversight. Thanks.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you. Vickie.

PROFESSOR SULLIVAN: I'd like to be recognized now.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: We have two more. Are you in a hurry? I forgot to mention, there's also the report from the Graduate School Executive Committee on budgets only for A&S. And Krzysztof couldn't be present, but I think he has designated somebody who wants to quickly report on the findings and resolution. However, I don't think it's something we can vote as an AS&E faculty, but I think since Krzysztof wanted a report to be included with the others, I'd like to recognize you and give you a chance to --

PROFESSOR POTT: Sure. I'll be brief. Martha Pott from child study and human development, and Krzysztof, or our chair, has asked that a report be included. But as you just heard, it won't be part of the vote today.

We reported before the full report was on the Trunk site, and I urge you to have a look at it. We met many times, and we want to acknowledge the ongoing concern that the graduate studies needs a very strong voice at Tufts, and right now, that voice is submerged within the undergraduate educational program, although we certainly appreciate the new language about graduate studies that appears in the strategic plan.

So we met with current and past deans of arts and sciences, including the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and also the deans of engineering and the associate deans of graduate studies of engineering, and with Provost Harris, and we have the following statement.

"The GSAS Executive Committee recommends keeping the current financial structure of the GSAS within the School of Arts and Sciences intact. At the same time, we request that the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences together with other deans be present at any and all meetings at which financial issues and matters of policy priorities are discussed and decided."

"We believe that this seat at the table will insure that graduate programs are well represented and that the graduate and undergraduate programs will continue to be mutually supportive and integral to the overall goals of the university."

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you. And then finally, I want to thank Steve Hirsch, who is chair of the Athletics Committee. As those who were present at the last meeting, the faculty voted
at the request of David Harris on that part, and indeed, the Athletics Committee was by a narrow vote moved from the dean to the provost. And I don't know if we have a new athletics director, but --

PROVOST HARRIS: It's close.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: On behalf of us who passed on the faculty request to thank the committees for their hard work, unless anybody's a chair, we are not administrators. So it was quite a bit of extra work for all. But I think we all learned quite a bit. Certainly, I did. And now I would like to recognize Vickie Sullivan, finally.

PROFESSOR SULLIVAN: Thank you very much, and thank you again to the committee chairs. What I'd like to do is to read one motion. There are actually two motions that are pursuant to the findings of the committees and a resolution that was passed in the fall. The first resolution relates to admissions and financial aid. David Garman and George Smith and I are the co-sponsors. So I will read it.

"Motion 1. Whereas the faculty of AS&E endorsed this resolution, by votes of departmental faculty both in arts and sciences and in engineering, to refer the provost's proposed structural changes to the appropriate committees;

"And whereas the Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid Committee and Budget and Priorities Committee examined the proposals, received input for administrators, and requested additional information;

"And whereas the faculty membership of UAFAC consisted of three from arts and sciences and three from engineering;

"And whereas UAFAC unanimously rejected the aspect of the proposal that called for the expansion of the role of the AS&E dean of admissions to cover any aspects of admissions practices at the other schools;

"And whereas all but two of the members of the UAFAC supported the view that the budgets for AS&E admissions and financial aid be set and controlled by the deans of arts and sciences and engineering and none supported unqualified central control;

"And whereas all the members supported the dean of admissions reporting directly to both the deans of arts and sciences and engineering;

"And whereas the faculty membership of B&P consisted of seven from arts and sciences and two from engineering;

"And whereas it was the view of B&P Committee that it is impossible to assess or predict the possible consequences on the operational budget of the schools without any details on what the
future budgetary/financial plan or budgetary evaluation/projection will be;

"Be it resolved that the proposed structural changes with respect to admissions and financial aid be rejected by the faculty of AS&E at this time and a further vote be reserved for such time as the required additional information becomes available."

PROFESSOR SMITH: The second motion is sponsored by Vickie, myself, and Joseph Auner. I'm simply going to read it.

"Whereas the faculty of AS&E endorsed this resolution" -- the resolution from last September --

"By votes of departmental faculty both in arts and sciences and in engineering, to refer the provost's proposed structural changes to the appropriate committees;

"Whereas the Faculty Advisory Board examined the proposals with respect to student services in Dowling Hall and conducted a series of meetings with a dozen individuals in key administrative positions;

"Whereas the faculty membership of the Faculty Advisory Board consisted of four from arts and sciences and one from engineering;

"Whereas the Faculty Advisory Board concluded that the proposal in its current state makes it impossible to predict if the benefits of the proposed reorganization would outweigh the negative consequences on many aspects of Dowling operations, including its integration with the academic mission;

Be it resolved that the proposed structural changes with respect to student services in Dowling Hall be rejected by the faculty of arts, sciences and engineering at this time and a further vote be reserved for such time as the required additional information becomes available."

PROFESSOR ROMERO: We need a second for the motions.

UNKNOWN FACULTY MEMBER: Second.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Both motions.

UNKNOWN FACULTY MEMBER: Second.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you. David.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thanks to all of you who came to be back earlier today, and just quick plug to let you know Jill LePore is going to be here at 4:30 PM today, and we're looking forward to it. Thanks to the departments that are co-sponsoring.
So let me just first say thank you to David, Fio, Steve, Krzysztof, Joe and their committees for the hard work that they've done. I appreciate it.

Let me next say something that may surprise some of you. If I had a vote -- and it's still unclear whether I do get to vote in these things -- I would vote for both motions. So I don't actually see a disagreement here, and let me explain what I mean by that.

We started this in April of 2014. You all heard the story, so I'm not going to go over it again. But then we went over the summer looking into trying to understand what was the best way to proceed, Kevin and I working with faculty and staff and other folks. Then we came back in September with a document, we met in this room, we talked about it. We then had faculty forums, other meetings, and then there's the document I sent out in October saying, “You know what? We're going to slow this thing down, because it's clear that there's an appetite for more faculty consideration of these proposals, and so let's slow it down.” And we did.

And there were a couple of these that were more pressing on the dean searches. One was -- I see Bob Cook over here -- graduate students in arts and sciences in particular, and engineering as well. And if we were going to move that out of the schools and say we have a university-wide graduate school, that's something that the dean candidates were going to ask about. And so we had to know what we were doing, and I appreciate the hard work that the GSAS Committee did to meet with them about that, and we were all in agreement that that wasn't the best way to proceed. Check that box.

There's a second one with just Tenure and Promotion, and we said, “It's under the purview of the faculty,” as I said at the very beginning and continue to say, when we talked with the T&P Committee.

The third one was athletics. Athletics was a little different, as I said last time, and Christiane mentioned, we really had to move on because we're recruiting in AS&E, and we couldn't, as I said last time, tell the person, “You'll report to somebody who's in the room.” We had to tell the person who he or she would report to.

Which leaves the following two. And what we were looking for was some sense of where are the faculty, what are we thinking, and what additional questions have to be answered. So that's exactly what I hear the committee saying here. I hear Joe's committee saying, “Well, there are no challenges in here.” But when we think about Dowling, we think about do we move some, do we move all, how do they get a seat at the table, so to speak, for some of the key issues.

I heard Fio's committee saying, “You know, there's some key budget issues here. We've looked at the budget, and I understand some of it, but there are other questions we don't know.” I hear David's committee saying about admissions, “Well, people have some discussion around what pieces we are talking about.”

So I think that what makes sense -- and it's consistent with where we were at the start -- is to dig
deeper. That's exactly what this motion says. Let's not say we're going to move things, but let's look more. And I would float out there I would love to -- and I don't want to put Fio on the spot, but as we have these conversations, I'd love to have Fio as chair of the committee in those conversations. Sorry. I told you. Be in the conversations. Not all of them; don't worry. But here and there, with Patricia and Tom and the deans and Scott and so forth as we talk about what's the budget, what are the budget implications.

So that's how I think about this moving forward. I don't see a disagreement with respect to what we do. I appreciate the work that's been done. I look forward to digging deeper. And I think that's all I have to say at this point.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you. George?

PROFESSOR SMITH: I'm going to be a little self-indulgent, so I apologize beforehand.

This is my 38th year at Tufts, but as many of you know, the last 15 I've had more of my time either on the MIT campus or the Stanford campus than on Tufts campus from 2001 until 2014, where I in effect resumed full-time here. Because of my age, I vowed not ever again to get involved in serious issues of faculty governance. I have a feeling it should be left to younger people, people who will be here a lot longer, given my age, than I'm going to be here.

The resolution is a sentence I wrote. I wrote it because my department members said we can't go to a meeting without a resolution on the floor, because otherwise, the discussion will just meander. I wrote that resolution with a good deal of thought, reflecting what I saw had changed at Tufts during the 15 years I was not much on the campus. And so that's what I want to address here.

I don't view either of these motions as directed particularly against or to either David or President Monaco. What I noticed on return that starting in fact in 2001, there is a very notable shift of authority that has historically lay within Arts and Sciences more and more either to central administrators or to people hired by central administrators' deans who were in no way representative of our faculty and who reported only to him.

I saw that difference. I was absolutely appalled as a five-year chair of Budget and Priorities to be told that committee members could no longer see the budget. I had no idea how that could have ever happened, because I had real detailed analysis when I was there of the budget over 20 years.

So I looked at that situation and wrote that resolution thinking that the issue is essentially one not of the specific restructuring proposals that were made; that the issue -- and I think it's a valid issue -- is how much of the authority that historically lay within arts, sciences and engineering back to the days when the provost's office consisted of Sol Gittleman, his assistant, and one secretary, how much of that authority had shifted toward higher levels, starting with Larry Bacow, how much we wanted that to continue.

And I could easily see people have quoted President Monaco to me, perhaps not correctly, but
quoted him to me as saying, “We want the authority to go to high levels so that the faculty would be free to pursue their goals and their research without having to worry about the administration.”

And having been on both the MIT and Stanford campuses -- the Stanford provost is somebody I've known for years, because he's a philosopher. It's interesting to reach him there. It takes a two-to-three-week notice beforehand. He might as well be in Washington, as his predecessor, of course, was for a long time.

So that's a picture of a university, run from top down with major decisions being made at central administration, and it's not the Tufts that I was at for 23 years. And my suspicion -- and this again, David has heard this -- my suspicion was that we were as successful as we've been in the 38 years I've been here, in spite of having, as Sol Gittleman always said, “doing more with less than any other comparable university.”

We were successful precisely because of the extent to which this faculty pulled together and accepted responsibility and worked at carrying it forward. And so I thought -- and a very personal statement -- I thought the more that authority moves away from us, the more this university is going to change, and I wasn't confident President Monaco, for whom I have enormous respect, could increase our endowment by a factor of ten over the next few years, and put us, like those other universities, with so much money in the bank that you can make mistakes.

So let me end this -- and again, I apologize for being so self-indulgent. My picture of the point of these folks is not really primarily about the specific proposals. It's about where the burden of argument ought to lay in the future on movement of authority to higher levels and how large that burden of argument is from the point of view of this faculty. Now, that's making a simple of these votes maybe more than people want, but I thought I should say this.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you, George, for the philosophical view, and I think we appreciate it.

Now, I think we have to take a vote on the motions at hand. Somebody has to call the question, unless somebody still thinks very strongly about adding to the discussion. Shall we go ahead with the votes. We have ballots prepared on both motions. They will be passed around, and everybody who is a voting member -- the only people who cannot vote is part-time people. Full-time faculty, lecturers, and assistant professors are able to vote, and they should all raise their hands to receive -- well, everybody who can vote should raise their hand to receive a ballot.

Excuse me. You have two ballots, and it says, “yes,” “no,” “abstain.” And to say yes to support the motions that were proposed by Vickie and George. Motion 1, the longer motion on finance, Motion 2, the shorter motion that was presented by George.

We have one more agenda item while Jillian and her helpers count the ballots. I think what we
can do, we have heard some wishes for more votes. Please, we don't have time now to discuss them, but please let us know, and we might bring that up on Trunk, whatever we can do.

Now I call on Vida Johnson, chair of T&P, who will talk briefly about the revisions they have done on the famous Statement 11, which is getting very hard to implement, to read, etcetera.

**UPDATE ON CHANGES TO STATEMENT 11 FOR 2015-16**

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: I'm afraid George is a very hard act to follow, but I figure since this is my 41st year here, I might be able to handle it. Anyway, I saw the light not at Stanford, but at Harvard, as a young graduate student and came over here.

The one update from what Provost Harris, as he mentioned, the tenure and promotion process, what has emerged out of this is that I understand the Engineering School is discussing the issue of whether they would like to have a separate T&P committee so it's in their hands, in their faculty's hands. What we have done is elected Mark Cronin-Golomb as chair for next year from engineering in order to totally undermine their efforts.

But anyway, what we have done is nothing dramatic, and so it doesn't require a vote of the faculty. I'm just reminding everyone that you, the faculty, have elected us to do your business, and we've taken this very seriously. Any changes that we feel have been major changes, major changes to the actual process, would come to the faculty vote, as will our famous proposed interdisciplinary hire proposal, how do we handle hires across departments and programs in a more formal way than we have done. But that is coming up at the next AS&E meeting.

So these are what we would consider housekeeping changes. They simplify and clarify Statement 11. We didn't go looking for things to fix. I just added up that we had 18 tenure cases just to get a sense. My first year, we had eight. Last year, we had 12. This year, we have 18, plus ten or so promotion cases. So this was a very busy committee.

But what emerged out of that is that anything that was unclear in Statement 11, we got asked by faculty about how to proceed. The more cases we had, the more perhaps issues ended up coming to our attention. So we have been mostly in a responsive mode.

We have taken the incredible step of moving into the 21st century and allowing that letters from external evaluators and confidential letters from faculty may be submitted via email with electronic signatures. I'm trying to make this more interesting than it really is.

We have also asked for some additional information, such as getting the fourth-year review from the deans to see what, in fact, was relayed to the candidate at the fourth year or the most recent reviews and how those issues have been dealt with. T&P has had the right to ask for additional information, and it has asked for this kind of information, so we thought we would institutionalize it.

We already voted on Point 3, which was how to replace recusals. We've had two recusals. Mark
was recused from one case. I was recused from another. We were able to get past committee members. Thank you, Steve Levine, and thank you, Beatrice Manz, to actually create a full committee, and that went very smoothly, and we see no problem in the future.

We have come up with in promotion-only cases sometimes not getting enough information, teaching information. But say in the last five years that I've seen people who either come up in three years, and you don't want to go back to their maybe previous stuff, but also people who have been away from Tufts for a couple of years. So whenever possible, we'd like to request eight past semesters rather than just how many chronological years ago.

I'm just going down the points. English translations are now required for titles of candidates' publications and for letters received from external evaluators. They've generally been translated in the past, but basically, in case someone on the committee doesn't know Russian, for example, we want to make sure that this problem is solved.

We have also asked and are now receiving specific information about departmental recusals. Those who did not -- full members, voting members of the faculty, since all members are supposed to meet, T&P needs to know why some departmental member was not there. We don't really need a detailed explanation, such as which conference you went to or where you gave the talk.

For example, the bio department assures me that they're a large department that they can never get everyone together. In fact, one or two people are always away at a conference. There's not a single week of the semester that you get to bring that department completely together. But we would like to know that every effort has been made. Because in the past, there was some departments had the habit, so not everyone showing up, and there was no explanation to T&P.

The next point about clarification under two distinct departmental votes that are taken one from tenure, one from promotion. Again, this is not new, but it wasn't clear that we now actually have two different kinds of cases. One, when an assistant professor is being considered for both tenure and direct promotion to professor, so assistant to full; or two, we're seeing more lateral hires at the associate, untenured associate professor level. And for those cases, we also need to vote, one for tenure and one for promotion to professor.

Okay, just a couple of more points. We have actually read the bylaws, and we read Statement 11, and we have -- for example, the recusal issue of how to replace committee members who are from a department, and the only -- like from Engineering, and how to replace them in the committee, that emerged out of our reading both Statement 11 and the bylaws.

And the next point. So we have changed the language, but again, to being in line with bylaws that any subcommittee T&P member can request a meeting of the full -- when they can request a meeting of the full T&P Committee.

We no longer need paper copies of course evaluations. This is the part about moving into the 21st century. We can electronically submit even more material.
And finally, just again, housekeeping for us so that we can pace this in a timely fashion, that committee requests the department distribute dossiers within two weeks of signing the department statement, but no later than two weeks before the external subcommittee meeting. Sometimes we were getting these reports like a week before the subcommittee meeting, or not just reports, but the whole dossier, and that, when we had 18 cases, became almost impossible.

And I think you'll be all happy to learn that we now have descriptive subheadings that we provide for each step. I think I accidentally put a subheading on something. Sara Lewis, whom I have to thank, Sara from biology, who actually took on -- I'm getting to stand up here and give you all of this, but she's the person who actually every time we had a change, she put it in Statement 11, she phrased it, she brought it to your attention. So thank you, Sara. Which is why it probably was done, with the committee being so busy.

So we have subheadings, and we have clarified, and 23 steps are now being condensed and reorganized into 18 steps. And I leave it up to you. I always say when you can't sleep, just put this document next to your bed, start reading it. You'll be out in five minutes. Thank you everyone on the committee as well.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you, Vida, for making it much more exciting. While we wait, Roger Tobin would wish to say a few words.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: I would have liked to have the results of the vote first, so I don't know how things are going to turn out. But I guess I want to say that I've spent an inordinate amount of the past year thinking about the issues that we just voted on. I was on one of the committees in the summer. I've been I think to just about all of the public meetings and innumerable private meetings and email conversations and meetings with the committee chairs. And I'm not the only one.

And what I want to say is I'm not really interested in doing a deeper dive into this anytime soon, because I think the fundamental piece of information that has never been provided is what is broken, and why are these plausible ways to fix anything that's broken. The problems that have been unearthed by the committees seem to be relatively modest, and there seems to be no indication that major restructuring of reporting lines is a useful way to move forward.

So I'm not sure that faculty -- I don't want to speak for the faculty, but I will speak for myself. I think until a higher burden of proof is surmounted that there is even a problem here to be solved for which this sort of solution is appropriate, I don't think the faculty needs to be a deeper dive. Now, that's not in the motions. That's not what we voted on. I just wanted to express that opinion as someone who's been more deeply immersed in this than I would have liked to be for the past year.

I think there were legitimate issues that were raised a year ago. It was a time of change, and it was an appropriate time to look, but I actually think the major issue has been answered.
RESULTS OF VOTE ON PROPOSED AS&E REORGANIZATION

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ: So I get to report the results of the election. For Motion 1, 108 voted in favor, four against, one abstain. And for Motion 2, 108 voted in favor, four were against, and there were two abstentions.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you. Are you satisfied, or do you want more voting? Okay, there's a lot of very good dessert. Please help yourself. And I want to thank Jillian, not only for her work, but also for the lunches she has provided. Thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Open Positions and Nominations for 2015-2016 Elected Committees

Speaker: Ioannis Evrigenis, Committee on Committees

Summary: On an annual basis, the Chair of the Committee on Committees announces the opening of nominations for elected AS&E committees at an AS&E faculty meeting during the spring semester. The purpose of this announcement is to make faculty members aware of the available openings on the six elected AS&E committees: Budget and Priorities Committee, Committee on Committees, Executive Committee, Faculty Advisory Board, Grievance Panel, and Tenure and Promotion Committee. Nominations to the ballots for each committee can be made from the floor or by contacting a member of the Committee on Committees. All nominees must be willing to serve on a particular committee in order to be nominated.

Key issues: There will be elections for the following openings on the elected committees:

- **Budget and Priorities Committee**
  - One Full-Term Position (2015-20): Engineering Member (Replacing Fiorenzo Omenetto)

- **Committee on Committees**
  - One Full-Term Position (2015-20): A&S&E Faculty Member (replacing Yannis Ioannides)

- **Executive Committee**
  - Two One-Year Positions (2015-16): A&S&E Faculty Member (Replacing Christiane Zehl Romero and Fulton Gonzalez)

- **Faculty Advisory Board**
  - One Full-Term Position (2015-20): A&S&E Faculty Members (Replacing Susan Napier)

- **Grievance Panel**
  - Three Full-Term Positions (2015-18): A&S&E Faculty Members (Replacing Sabina Vaught, Joel Rosenberg, and Jan Pechenik)
  - Two One-Year Positions (2015-16): A&S&E Faculty Members (Replacing Rosalind Shaw and Mary Jane Shultz)

- **Tenure and Promotion Committee**
  - One Full-Term Position (2016-19): Engineering Faculty Member (Replacing Mark Cronin-Golomb)

Action required: Faculty members are asked to consider the call for nominations to the six elected A&S&E committees and submit all nominations to the members of the Committee on Committees no later than Wednesday, March 11th. Electronic voting will begin on Wednesday, March 18, 2015 and close on Tuesday, March 24, 2015. Election results will be announced on March 25, 2015.

Further information: For information on each available opening, nominees who have already been named, and eligibility lists, please refer to the attachments for this faculty meeting, as well as the Faculty Committee Election Information website: [http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/committees/elections/index.htm](http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/committees/elections/index.htm). Information on election procedures can be found on pg. 11-12 in the AS&E Faculty Bylaws: [http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/pdfs/bylawsASE.pdf](http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/pdfs/bylawsASE.pdf).
Update on Changes to Statement 11 for 2015-16

Speaker: Vida Johnson, Tenure and Promotion Committee

Summary: An outline of changes to Statement 11 for 2015-16.

Key Issues: The 2014-15 T&P Committee has reviewed Statement 11 and implemented revisions as detailed below.

Minor procedural changes and updates:

- Letters from External Evaluators as well as the requisite Confidential Letters from tenured faculty within the candidate’s department may now be submitted via email (with electronic signatures).
- The case provided to the T&P Committee will now include the Candidate’s 4th year review report from the Dean.
- Whenever the recusal of a T&P member for a particular case leaves no representative on the committee from the School of Engineering or from an area of A&S (humanities and arts; social sciences; natural sciences and mathematics), then a replacement will be made from a pool of faculty members with T&P service. This replacement procedure now provides compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article 4, section 2, part c).
- For promotion-only cases, candidates’ teaching information is now requested for the past 8 semesters of teaching (rather than from the past 5 academic years, which often include leaves).
- English translations are now required for titles of candidates’ publications and for letters received from External Evaluators when these are written in another language.
- If any tenured faculty member cannot be present in person (or by videoconferencing) at the departmental discussion and vote, revised procedures now ask for a detailed explanation for such absence in the written department statement.
- Language now clarifies that in the following unusual circumstances, two distinct departmental votes (one for tenure, one for promotion) are needed: 1) when an assistant professor is being considered for both tenure and direct promotion to professor, or 2) when an untenured associate professor is being considered for both tenure and promotion to professor.
- Language has been added to provide compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article IV, section 2, part c) concerning the right for any T&P subcommittee member to request a meeting with the full T&P Committee.
- The committee no longer needs paper copies of course evaluations and correspondence; they will only be submitted electronically.

Formatting changes:

- To help facilitate use of Statement 11, descriptive subheadings are now provided that indicate each step’s intent.
- What were previously 23 steps have been condensed and thematically re-organized into 18 steps.

Action Required: No action required

Discussion and Vote on Proposed AS&E Reorganization

*Speakers:* Members of the AS&E Executive Committee

*Key issues:* Address the reports produced by the relevant AS&E committees that were charged with reviewing the provost’s proposal.

*Action Required:* Discussion and vote
Committee Reports on AS&E Reorganization Proposal
On September 2nd, 2014, the Provost presented to the Tufts Faculty his proposals for a reorganization of the current structure of A&S and Engineering. Realizing that the proposed modifications may have significant consequences for the students and faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, the Executive Committee of GSAS held a series of special meetings to discuss the existing structure of GSAS and possible ways to improve it.

At a special meeting held September 19th the GSAS EC decided to invite the past Deans of A&S and GSAS to seek their opinions and input.

On September 24th, we met with Lynne Pepall, Robin Kanarek and Susan Ernst. It was extremely useful and instructive to hear different concerns and points of view expressed by the past Tufts administrators, who were also Tufts faculty, and who all value graduate education and would like to see its importance more highly recognized on this campus and the University. The discussion at the September 24th meeting was in the context of just the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. However, given the number of significant overlaps, shared problems and common goals between A&S and the School of Engineering, we felt it would be important to have a joint meeting with representatives from both schools.

The joint meeting was held on October 1st, 2014. Karen Panetta, Associate Dean of the Engineering Graduate School, Tufts University, and Mark Ranalli, Associate Dean and Executive Director of Tufts Gordon Institute, joined us from the School of Engineering. It was another useful and very informative meeting. We decided that our deliberations might benefit from finding out more from the current Deans of both schools. We agreed to invite Linda Abriola and Jim Glaser, the current Deans of A&S and Engineering, to another joint meeting of GSAS EC and the Engineering Graduate Studies Committee.

The meeting with the current Deans of AS&E took place on October 8th. It was a very informative, in-depth and revealing meeting, and resulted in our taking more steps to gather even more information about the financial structure of both schools and, even more importantly, about the financial structure of GSAS within A&S.

Based on the information we were able to collect, we discussed several possible options and suggestions in response to the Provost’s proposal, and specifically to the one which would affect the GSAS. We considered: i) keeping the existing structure as is; ii) creating a position of an independent Dean of GSAS, reporting to the Provost; iii) creating a position of an independent, joint Dean of Graduate Studies within A&S and the School of Engineering; iv) adopting the Provost’s proposal; v) keeping elements of the existing structure with modifications that we felt were essential to improve it.

After another meeting on October 15th, we reached an agreement on October 24th, and prepared a summary of our discussions and recommendations, to be presented to the Tufts Faculty. Enclosed please find the document. We also decided to invite David Harris and Kevin Dunn to another special meeting of GSAS EC to discuss our recommendation with them, even before showing the document to the Tufts Faculty.

We met on November 5th, 2014. I think everyone agrees that we had a very productive and
constructive conversation. The Provost did agree that the Dean of GSAS should attend many
more of the important meetings than in the past, including meetings between the Provost and
the Dean of A&S (at least once a month), as well as other meetings concerning Advancement,
Development, and the Capital Campaign. We were promised that the final details will be agreed
upon in a joint meeting between the Provost, the Vice Provost, the Dean of A&S and the Dean
of GSAS. We were pleased to hear from the Provost that “there’s no reason we need to wait
to start implementing these ideas.” We also had a useful discussion of the Provost’s proposal to
create a position of associate or vice-provost for graduate studies. We expressed strongly our
position that implementing our recommendations will serve the needs of GSAS better. We
think that the proposed new administrator will be unlikely to match the experience and
dedication of the Dean of GSAS. We also think that creating a de facto intermediary between
the faculty and Tufts Administration would also necessarily, although perhaps unintentionally,
diminish the role of the Dean of GSAS, and dilute her/his voice. This is precisely what we think
should be avoided.

The GSAS Executive Committee has met several times to consider the Provost’s proposals for
the Strategic Plan 2014 and administrative restructuring. First, we welcome the new language
and emphasis on graduate programs in the Strategic Plan 2014 Working Document. We find it
encouraging that both the Administration and Faculty understand and appreciate how crucial
graduate programs are for Tufts. We also welcome the Provost’s pledge to hiring an A&S Dean
with a deep commitment to graduate education.

During the meetings and discussions, which were part of T10 planning, the most consistent
message heard from the A&S&E faculty and staff was that support for graduate studies and
graduate students falls short of what is required. Also, it was pointed out repeatedly that
graduate studies need representation in the higher administration and that the present structure
submerges the interests of graduate students in the undergraduate mission.

In our meetings we consulted with a number of past and present Deans of Arts and Sciences
and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, as well as the Dean of the School of Engineering
and the Associate Dean of the School of Engineering, Graduate Studies. We tried to evaluate
the current model, as well as several alternatives, including proposals in which a Dean of the
GSAS or the GSAS&E would report directly to the Provost.

We believe that the future of the Graduate School requires long-term, strong support from the
entire Administration. Without this, a change of the financial structure between A&S and the
GSAS may not by itself lead to a desired increase of support for the GSAS. However, we feel
that it is very important to modify the currently inadequate level of representation of the GSAS
in the higher administration, and to ensure an ongoing independent voice for the Dean of the
GSAS. We would support an equivalent representation for the Deans of School of Engineering,
should they so desire. Therefore we recommend:

The GSAS Executive Committee recommends keeping the current financial
structure of the GSAS within the School of A&S intact. At the same time, we
request that the Dean of GSAS, together with other Deans, be present at
any and all meetings at which financial issues and matters of policy priorities
are discussed and decided. We believe that this "seat at the table" will
ensure that graduate programs are well-represented and that the graduate
and undergraduate programs will continue to be mutually supportive and
integral to the overall goals of our University.
To: AS&E Executive Committee  
From: David Garman, Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid Committee (UAFAC)  
Date: November 24, 2014  

Re: UAFAC Review of Reorganization Proposals for AS&E Admissions from Provost Harris

The UAFAC held four meetings in September and October to consider the implications of the Provost’s reorganization proposals for AS&E admissions. The discussions were wide-ranging but the primary issues were: the administration of admissions and financial aid budgets, where primary policy-making responsibilities should reside, and the role of the administrative position currently identified as the AS&E Dean of Admissions and Enrollment Management.

The committee benefited from the participation of many administrators with intimate knowledge of the relevant issues. Vice Provost Kevin Dunn participated in the first two meetings as an invited guest. Dean James Glaser and Dean Linda Abriola each attended a meeting as invited guests. Dean Bruce Reitman attended several meetings as an invited guest. Dean John Barker, Dean Lee Coffin, Dean Carmen Lowe, Director of Financial Aid Patricia Reilly, and Associate Provost Dawn Terkla are all ex officio members of UAFAC and actively participated in the discussions. The student members of the committee were not appointed by the TCU Senate until after this set of four meetings and their views were not solicited for this report. The faculty members on the committee thank each of the administrators above for their willingness to give forthright and thoughtful answers to our questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the current organization.

During the AS&E committee bylaw revisions of two years ago, the Executive Committee changed the status of the ex officio members from nonvoting members to voting members. This was a surprise to all current members of UAFAC since it had not been requested by the committee chair of that year. The ex officio members generally felt that it would be inappropriate for them to vote on any resolutions related to their administrative or supervisory roles and behaved accordingly.

At the end of the committee’s information collection and discussion, committee members were polled on the primary issues. This allowed members to respond privately and to elaborate in a way that would not have been possible on up or down votes on formal resolutions. The questions and a brief summary of the responses follow.

1. Should the AS&E Dean of Admissions be responsible for “coordinating” or “improving” admissions practices in schools other than A&S and E?

All respondents were opposed to expanding the role of the AS&E Dean of Admissions to cover any aspects of admissions practices at the other schools. It was thought AS&E admissions, especially undergraduate admissions, is too important to Tufts and too large a responsibility to take the risk of disrupting an organization and process that is currently working so well. One respondent suggested that one of the current vice provosts could be assigned to work on coordinating or improving graduate and profession school admissions (as one part of his or her overall responsibilities.)

2. Should the budgets for AS&E admissions and financial aid be set and controlled by the Provost’s Office or by the Deans of A&S and E?

All but two of the respondents felt the budgets should be set and controlled by an equal collaboration of the Dean of A&S and the Dean of E. It was deemed important to keep the decision making in the hands of the two deans directly responsible for A&S and E, and to allow those deans to have the budget authority to make spending trade-offs or to use the saving from improved efficiency. One respondent felt that budgets should be decided by an equal collaboration of the Dean of A&S, the Dean of E, and the Provost – with the qualification that the authority should remain within AS&E “if equal voting power is not enforceable.” One respondent felt that central budget control in the Provost’s Office would be better if the new process had: transparency and accountability to the two schools, some “rules or law” on how the budget would be allocated, and an enforceable prohibition on diverting the savings from any reduced expenditures to cover the needs of other schools.
3. Should the AS&E Dean of Admissions report to the Deans of A&S and E (solid lines to both deans and dotted “informational” line to the Provost’s Office) or to the Provost’s Office (solid line to the Provost’s Office and dotted “informational” lines to both deans)?

All respondents felt that the AS&E Dean of Admission should have a solid line reporting relationship to both the Dean of A&S and the Dean of E. All felt that adding a dotted line representing “informational” reporting to the Provost’s Office would be acceptable if it improved the flow of information without adding unnecessary complications or added interference in AS&E policy making. Several respondents noted that Dean Coffin has always acted “as if” he had solid line reporting relationships to the Deans of A&E and E and that this system has worked very well. One respondent suggested that major policy changes should be carried out in joint consultation among the Dean of A&S, the Dean of E, and the Provost’s Office.

4. What other points should be covered in the report to the Executive Committee?

Only three members of the committee responded to this question. Two members asked that future proposals from the Provost’s Office be vetted by the relevant school administrators and the Executive Committee in advance of being sprung on the AS&E faculty-at-large. This would allow concerns to be raised and proposals to be modified in a way that might avoid the rush and frenzy of this semester. One member admonished the committee to see through strategic considerations and to focus on the best interests of the university.
To: AS&E Executive Committee  
From: FAB, Joseph Auner (chair), Juliet Fuhrman, Kyongbum Lee, Margaret McMillan, Albert Robbat  
Re: Report on the Proposed Reorganization of Dowling  
Date: Dec 4, 2014

This report reflects a series of meetings with the following senior administrators and many of the key players in the proposed reorganization:

- Dean Linda Abriola  
- John Barker, Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Students  
- Michelle Bowdler, Sr. Dir. of Health and Wellness  
- Associate Provost Kevin Dunn  
- Dean James Glaser  
- Provost David Harris  
- Kim Knox, Dean of Students, SOE  
- Carmen Lowe, Dean of Academic Advising and Undergraduate Study  
- Mary Pat McMahon, Dean of Student Affairs  
- Bruce Reitman, Dean of Student Life and Leadership  
- Paul Stanton, Dean of Student Services  
- Prof. Vickie Sullivan, co-chair A&S Strategic Plan Committee

All meetings except for the meeting with Harris and Dunn were individual.

FAB is grateful to everyone who met with us; we were consistently impressed with their openness and their dedication to Tufts. In no case did we feel that anyone was resistant to change simply because it would represent new ways of doing things; nor did we feel that anyone was proposing change just for the sake of change. We are also grateful to the Budget and Priorities Committee for sharing some of their preliminary findings. Our special thanks go to Jillian Dubman and Maxine Bisazza for outstanding logistical support.

What follows are the main areas of concern expressed by the individuals we interviewed about the reorganization proposal and its possible unintended consequences. With the exception of the Provost, we did not hear from anyone who was strongly in favor of the reorganization as currently articulated. While challenges were identified in the operations associated with Dowling Hall, people did not identify the current split reporting structure between the two Deans as the most important challenge they faced. On the contrary, several administrators in Dowling noted that, were their operation to be moved to the Provost’s office, they would still be required to triangulate between the two Deans.

We regard these findings as provisional, because crucial aspects of the proposed reorganization have not been not fully spelled out. These include:

a) the justifications for and specific benefits of the proposed changes beyond an
appeal to “best practices” at other schools.

b) which specific sectors of Dowling would move and which would stay under the Deans.

c) how the roles of Provost as Chief Academic Officer or the Associate Provosts who are academics would be operationalized in the reporting structure for Dowling.

d) the impact on the role of the Deans. Everyone agrees that putting large parts of Dowling under the Provost would impact the budgets and budget flexibility of the two Deans, though the Provost argued that the Schools would lose both revenue and expense. The budgetary matter is the central concern of the B+P committee, which will issue its own report. Along this vein, it is not clear how the new reporting structure would reduce the structural tensions between the Deans, since they would still be in competition for funds, albeit from a significantly smaller overall budget.

e) the impact on AS&E faculty committees which, according to bylaws, may interact with or exert oversight for parts of the Dowling operation. Would that relationship change if those sectors of student services/affairs moved out of the schools and into central administration?

The following sections contain our interpretation of the key issues surrounding the reorganization as articulated by those interviewed for this report.

1) DOWLING
These interviews made clear that what is referred to as “Dowling” represents a large and complex operation, including seven branches (Student Affairs, Student Services, Student Life, Academic Advising, Orientation and Transitions, Study Abroad, Health and Wellness). Each of these branches operates with various degrees of autonomy and faces different challenges, but they all also interact in complex and productive ways with each other, the schools, central administration, and the broader university. A strength of the current structure is that the physical and administrative proximity of the offices makes it easy to help students with issues that cross these categories (as, for example, in the case of a student issue involving accessibility services, study abroad, ARC, and the health and wellness office). We were impressed by the commitment of everyone to a model of integrated academic, co-curricular, and residential student life supported by student services, student affairs, and the other segments of the Dowling operation.

In what follows the word “Dowling” should be understood as referring to this overall complex operation currently reporting to the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Students.

2) THE VOICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS/SERVICES
The biggest problem that was articulated is the challenge of giving Dowling a stronger voice at the level of senior administration in terms of communication of important everyday issues and problems, as well as short and long range budget planning and decisions related to facilities, building (e.g. dormitory) construction, enrollment etc. that
have major impacts on student life. There is a clear consensus that lack of adequate attention to the student experience can have a detrimental impact on the “core business” of the school in delivering the highest quality academic and campus-based residential experience. Yet, we also heard that there were aspects of the current structure in which important issues could be readily addressed (such as OEO matters). Some also noted that it currently seems easier to be heard at the presidential than at the provostial levels.

We heard of the need for a better mechanism to provide appropriate support for graduate students. One suggestion was for a graduate student alpha dean to help with the complex issues facing graduate students (such as medical leaves, problems with advisors who are acting inappropriately, etc.)

3) ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRATION
There is a fear that centralizing components of Student Services and Student Affairs and moving these operations away from the two Deans would weaken the integration of Dowling with academic planning and oversight by faculty, and would instead allow business/finance concerns to drive planning (as with the recent discussion of potentially expanding first year enrollments). A major strength of current operations is the way in which faculty are engaged as part of an integrated model of academic, co-curricular, and residential student life supported by student services and student affairs. Conversely, there are concerns that there are already tendencies toward marginalizing faculty input, as for example with the creation of the transitional advisor program and the ways in which those positions were defined.

There are concerns that splitting off components of the Dowling operation would decrease efficiency and further interfere with communication among the various parts, thus complicating the experience for students dealing with problems that involve multiple offices (as we learned is often the case).

Many argued that it is problematic to draw clear distinctions between “academic”/“non-academic,” “grad”/“undergrad,” and “A&S and SOE” in connection with any of the seven branches. Even those parts of Dowling that serve the whole university and, thus, could conceivably benefit from a move to central, such as Accessibility Services and Health and Wellness services, would still require mechanisms to preserve close cooperation with the rest of Dowling.

4) STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS VS COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS
Based on our interviews, current challenges relating to Dowling seem to result less from the current split reporting structures and more from problems with communication and oversight of the schools. Since Dowling operates as a shared service center between the schools, cooperation between school Deans is essential. When the school Deans cooperate as they did in the past and do again now, tension between the schools can be minimal. Some offices have been very responsive to both Deans. Problems have arisen when others have been less responsive in honoring the dotted line to SOE. In some cases SOE has developed parallel structures to those already existing in Dowling, such as advising and career service.
Most of the people we spoke with indicate that the challenges stem less from the administrative structure than from problems in communication. Similarly, any positive impact of structural changes would be minimal without improvements in communication. There is a clear need for:

- more open and ongoing communication, in particular more efficient ways of getting information up through the Deans to the Provost and President,
- new mechanisms to get more people from the various sectors at the table at the provostial and presidential levels more regularly, and
- more time in the Provost’s schedule for the school Deans to discuss student affairs.

Several of those interviewed suggested that there were other mechanisms besides the large scale restructuring for achieving this goal. For example, regular meetings to address concerns regarding communication could put more people around the table. It was suggested that the two school Deans, the EAD(s) for those schools, the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Education, the Dean for Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions, the Vice Presidents for Finance and Operations, the Executive Vice President, the Provost, and the President could meet regularly to discuss issues such as resource allocation, student expectations, financial aid, enrollment, housing, and dining.

Success stories we heard, such as the ability for Accessibility Services to hire a new person dealing with the skyrocketing expenses of accommodations and the growing numbers of students needing them, demonstrated the benefits of facilitating communication between Dowling, the Deans, the EAD(s), and central finance.

5) BUDGETARY CONCERNS
We heard of significant concerns about accountability and checks and balances on the budgets for Dowling operations if they were removed from reporting structures responsible for the academic mission of the schools. Comparisons were made with what happened when TTS moved to central administration, with a growth in budget and staff and corresponding new charges to the schools.

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the budgetary process at every level. While this does not relate only to the reorganization proposal, it was a consistent theme among all those interviewed. People spoke of the lack of flexibility for revenue-neutral changes with their own budgets, the lack of any regular budget process that would allow mid- and long-range planning, and a lack of transparency about budgets with central administration.

6) SHORTCOMINGS OF THE “BEST PRACTICES” MODEL
Several commented on problems of applying “best practices” when evaluating the academic placement of Dowling in comparison to other universities. While our administrative structure for student affairs and students services at Tufts is atypical, so is our unusual combination of schools, the way in which we integrate student-centered schools with a strong teaching mission within a research university, and the history of
limited central coordination. Unlike peer schools with strong central operations who need to coordinate undergraduate programs in multiple schools and professional programs, Tufts only has undergraduates in the two schools, and prides itself on the absence of barriers between the two schools for the students. Several pointed out that Dowling operations (with the exception of accessibility and health and wellness) are generally not set up to serve students in other schools either on the Medford campus or at the Grafton and Boston campuses.

In conclusion, it is impossible to predict the consequences of the proposed reorganization as key details are missing. Some individuals were not strongly opposed. However, the interviews do not give strong support for the proposed move of oversight of Dowling activities from the two schools to central administration.
To: AS&E Executive Committee  
From: Fiorenzo Omenetto – Chair, Budget and Priorities Committee  
Re: B&P Review of Reorganization Proposals for AS&E Admissions from Provost

Over the past few months the Budgets and Priorities Committee has met 4 times on October 17, October 31, November 6, and November 20, 2014. During these meetings, the committee has heard reports on the present structure and expenditures of the AS&E budget. Key representatives of the administration joined the B&P committee meetings - namely Scott Sahagian (10/17, 10/31, 11/6, 11/20), Jonathan Dudley (10/31, 11/20), and Kevin Dunn (11/6).

An overview of the budget for AS&E has been also redacted.

As a consequence of these meetings, a series of questions were redacted, presented to Kevin Dunn on 11/6, and addressed to Provost Harris. The questions are included in the appendix of this document. The questions address different themes that pertain to the budgetary implications and the financial planning associated with the reorganization proposed.

Responses to these questions will be addressed by the Administration beyond the November 21st deadline since it is the Administration’s opinion that these budgetary issues need to be addressed thoughtfully.

It is the opinion of this committee that the Administration is working earnestly to define a Budgetary Plan for the reorganization, and that, to date, such plan has not been defined.

It is also the opinion of the committee that it is impossible to assess or predict the possible consequences on the operational budget of the schools without having more details on what the future Budgetary/Financial Plan or Budgetary Evaluation/Projection will be.
Compiled and redacted questions

With the change in management structure, decisions on the use of funds that are currently generated primarily by AS&E undergraduate tuition and applied to AS&E operations from the “shared” budget (such as academic costs, student services, athletics, admissions, etc) will now be made in the Provost’s office rather than at the level of the academic Deans.

In the new structure:

1. What budget will the two Deans have control over? How does it compare to the budget over which they have control in the current administrative structure?

2. How do the proposed changes impact the discretion of the A&S and SOE deans to allocate funds?

3. In the new organizational structure, what formal roles, if any, will the new Deans have in contributing to decisions about the use of shared resources, managed at the Provost’s office level, for their respective Schools? Will they only have the chance of asking the Provost for additional or re-directed use of money for their Schools, or will they actually sit at the table where budget decisions that impact their Schools are made?

4. How will the new structure guarantee that these funds will continue to be applied to benefit the AS&E students, and not (partially) diverted to other Schools?

5. In the new organizational structure, what opportunities will the two Deans have to attract funds to their School over which they will have full control? Will there be about the same, more, or less opportunities with respect to the current administrative situation? In what way will there be more, less, or about the same opportunities for the two Deans to identify proactive approaches to generate funding for their School over which they will have full control?

6. Are there any identified financial inefficiencies of the current system and how is the new plan going to mitigate them? How is this new plan going to benefit the schools financially? Are there *specific* budgetary issues that have arisen in the recent past which motivate the proposed reorganization effort?

A large fraction of the budget for the two individual schools (A&S and E) comes from the 80/20 split on the funds remaining in the shared budget after all costs have been met. Under the new management structure, with all shared funds under higher administrative control, the two academic Deans will need these funds “up front”; that is, as a revenue stream in their budget from the beginning removing some of the “fluidity: and “adaptability” of the process.

7. What changes (if any) will be made to the budget structure to place additional funds from undergraduate tuition directly into the budget streams for the two schools, rather than splitting remaining funds at the end of the process?
8. How will the new organizational structure change the balance between the central administration and the School-level administration with respect to costs (maintenance, upgrades, expansions, new opportunities, etc.) associated with buildings, infrastructures, lab/classroom/administrative space, etc. within each School? What role, if any, will the Dean play in decisions that will involve funds managed at the central administration level that will directly impact the facilities and infrastructures in their respective schools?

---

Elected student representatives attend the BnP committee meetings – they submitted the following questions

Questions from the student representatives attending the BnP committee.

How will the reorganization of the budget affect the balance of power between the provost and the dean of a&s, and will the process of petitioning for money by the deans become increasingly arduous as a result?

How will the power of the Deans be affected by the proposed reorganization?

With all control of resources allocation lying with the provost, will deans have any impact on the budgetary decisions being made?

If competing entities are vying for resources, who will mediate the decision?

What control over resource allocation will the dean of a&s have after the reorganization?

Will there be any check on the power of the provost to allocate resources were he or she to hypothetically feel it necessary to prioritize the budget to another campus?
Executive Summary of Housekeeping Changes to Statement 11

The 2014-15 T&P Committee has reviewed Statement 11 and implemented revisions as detailed below.

Minor procedural changes and updates:

- Letters from External Evaluators as well as the requisite Confidential Letters from tenured faculty within the candidate’s department may now be submitted via email (with electronic signatures).
  - pg 11 (Step 13) and pg 22 (Step 13)
- The case provided to the T&P Committee will now include the Candidate’s 4th year review report from the Dean.
  - pg 11 (Step 12 ii) and pg 22 (Step 12 ii)
- Whenever the recusal of a T&P member for a particular case leaves no representative on the committee from the School of Engineering or from an area of A&S (humanities and arts; social sciences; natural sciences and mathematics), then a replacement will be made from a pool of faculty members with T&P service. This replacement procedure now provides compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article 4, section 2, part c).
  - pg 13 (Step 16) and pg 23-24 (Step 16)
- For promotion-only cases, candidates’ teaching information is now requested for the past 8 semesters of teaching (rather than from the past 5 academic years, which often include leaves).
  - pg 3 (Step 3)
- English translations are now required for titles of candidates’ publications and for letters received from External Evaluators when these are written in another language.
  - pg 10 (Step 12 b, d and f) and pg 21 (Step 12 b, d and f)
- If any tenured faculty member cannot be present in person (or by videoconferencing) at the departmental discussion and vote, revised procedures now ask for a detailed explanation for such absence in the written department statement.
  - pg 9 (Step 9) and pg 20 (Step 9)
- Language now clarifies that in the following unusual circumstances, two distinct departmental votes (one for tenure, one for promotion) are needed: 1) when an assistant professor is being considered for both tenure and direct promotion to professor, or 2) when an untenured associate professor is being considered for both tenure and promotion to professor.
  - pg 8 (Step 8) and
- Language has been added to provide compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article IV, section 2, part c) concerning the right for any T&P subcommittee member to request a meeting with the full T&P Committee.
  - pg 12 (Step 14)
- The committee no longer needs paper copies of course evaluations and correspondence; they will only be submitted electronically.
  - pg 11 (Step 12 iii) and pg 22 (Step 12 iii)
- For cases with an External Subcommittee, the committee requests that departments distribute the dossier within 2 weeks of signing the department statement, but no later than 2 weeks before the External Subcommittee Meeting.
  - pg 11 (Step 12)

Formatting changes:

- To help facilitate use of Statement 11, descriptive subheadings are now provided that indicate each step’s intent.
- What were previously 23 steps have been condensed and thematically re-organized into 18 steps.
STATEMENT #11 Tenure and Promotion Process, 2015-2016

Before beginning the process described below, prospective candidates and preparators should familiarize themselves with university and school policies on tenure described in the Statement on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Retirement (http://provost.tufts.edu/policies/academic-freedom-tenure-retirement/) and Chapter 4 of the Arts, Sciences and Engineering Faculty Handbook (http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/handbook/tenure/index.htm).

GUIDELINES FOR THE APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

CONTENTS

Calendar p. 1

Part 1: Standard Tenure and Promotion Procedures p. 2

Part 2: Interdisciplinary Tenure and Promotion Procedures p. 14

Part 3: Expedited Lateral Hires p. 14

Part 4: Non-expedited Lateral Hires p. 24

The following sequence of steps summarizes the application and review procedures for tenure and promotion. Article IV, Section 2 of “The Bylaws of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering,” states the rules for the faculty concerning the operation of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (T&P). Additional practices, which are consistent with the bylaws, have been recommended by vote of the faculty or have been established by the Committee in order to carry out its functions. These procedures, designed to ensure that every case is treated equitably, represent guidelines to be followed in each case. Exceptions to these guidelines, made to meet unusual circumstances, must be made in consultation with the T&P Committee.

Calendar

In mandatory tenure cases for present Tufts faculty members, the process begins on March 1, when the candidate meets with the preparator to review the application.
requirements. All candidates and preparators should refer to the detailed timetable for the various steps to be completed, which is included in the preparators' packet.

In promotion-only and non-mandatory tenure cases, the candidate should declare his/her intention to apply in writing to the chair of T&P (with a copy to the appropriate dean) by March 1. At the request of the appropriate dean, the calendar for such cases may be negotiated with T&P.

The department should meet to discuss tenure and promotion cases early in the fall semester. Since the T&P Committee normally discusses promotion cases first, all case materials for promotion cases should be delivered to the appropriate individuals listed in Step 12 by the second week of October.

For lateral hires, the calendar may be negotiated with T&P. If due to late notification, the elected T&P Committee cannot review the case within the usual time frame, the chair of T&P, in consultation with the chair of the Committee on Committees and the Secretary of the Faculty, will form a 6-member *ad hoc* committee, consisting of available present members of T&P supplemented, if necessary, by former T&P members (preferably from the past five years) to review the case, following all requirements in the bylaws and this statement. For additional information regarding lateral hires, see Parts 3 and 4.

**Procedures for Tenure and Promotion**

The procedures detailed below are divided into four parts, which correspond to the four different kinds of cases. Part 1 pertains to all internal tenure and/or promotion cases, with the exception of interdisciplinary appointments, which are covered in Part 2. Lateral hires are covered in Part 3 (expedited) and Part 4 (non-expedited).

**Part 1: Standard Tenure and Promotion Procedures**

1. *Choosing the preparator:* A preparator is chosen by the department from the ranks of the tenured faculty by March 5. The preparator and the department chair jointly manage the application process on the department’s behalf.

   The candidate and the preparator together review the materials forwarded to the candidate by the Secretary of the Faculty, including the Bylaws of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (Article IV, Section 2 c) and this statement.
2. *Preparing the application:* The candidate and the preparator prepare an application for tenure and/or promotion. If a candidate facing a mandatory tenure review decides not to apply for tenure, he or she must notify the appropriate dean in writing by June 1. If a candidate for tenure or for promotion-only wishes to withdraw the application after it has been submitted to T&P, the candidate must notify the T&P Committee and the appropriate dean in writing before the Board of Trustees makes its final decision on the case.

3. *Compiling teaching information:* It is the department’s responsibility to prepare a summary of the candidate’s teaching, including the following materials:

   a.) A tabular summary of the average rating for questions “overall rating of the professor,” the “overall rating of the course,” and, when available, “compared to other courses at Tufts, I learned…” for each course the candidate has taught at Tufts. **In promotion only cases, this summary should include teaching evaluations for the most recent eight semesters of teaching, or for all semesters since promotion, whichever is shorter.** The table should include course title and number; semester and year; enrollment; number of students who filled out the evaluation; and averages for the above specified course evaluation questions. The table should also provide comparison averages from other faculty teaching those same courses when the scores are available.

   b.) Accompanying the tabular summary of the candidate’s teaching, the department should also prepare a narrative statement on teaching that provides relevant information on the following: the teaching load of the candidate vis-à-vis the department; reasons for reduced or expanded teaching responsibilities, such as grants, released time, or leave of absence; and types of teaching (required vs. elective courses, labs, recitations, undergraduate vs. graduate courses, co-teaching, teaching in other programs). This narrative must be prepared prior to the department meeting.

   c.) The Secretary of the Faculty provides the chair of the Tufts Community Union (TCU) Senate Education Committee with a list of all candidates to be reviewed during the coming academic year. This chair arranges for a TCU senator to review and summarize the written commentary and statistical data on the candidate's teaching, but not to render a recommendation for or against tenure or promotion. The data, but not the mentee letters, are made available to the senator by the candidate’s department. The senator provides the department – if possible before the department meeting – with a written report signed by the chair of the Education Committee of the TCU Senate, which becomes part of the record. The candidate receives a copy of this report with its author’s name redacted. In the case of candidates who teach only graduate courses, the teaching record is reviewed by a representative of the Graduate Student Council (GSC).
d.) One copy of the full set of teaching evaluations for the candidate should be included in the electronic case sent to the Secretary of the Faculty (see step 12(h) below).

4. **Compiling information on mentorship:** With the help of the department, the candidate prepares an annotated table of all closely mentored individuals with whom he or she has worked either in one-on-one or small-group settings, e.g., Ph.D. advisees, master’s thesis advisees, senior honors thesis advisees, Summer Scholars, lab and research collaborators, and participants in directed performances and creative projects. The candidate should annotate this list by indicating whether the mentee is currently at Tufts, was previously at Tufts, or was never at Tufts. The candidate may also lodge any objections to soliciting a letter from a particular mentee. These comments should be included with this list, which becomes a part of the case going forward. In consultation with the candidate’s department, T&P decides whether an objection should be honored and a letter not be solicited.

The department administrator is responsible for finding contact information for each mentee. Once the table is complete, it should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty, who will send out letters requesting evaluations of the candidate and organize the letters as they are received. Letters from mentees no longer at Tufts or who were never at Tufts are sent to the candidate’s department for their consideration prior to the department meeting. Only T&P and relevant administrators see letters from mentees who are still at Tufts. Any mentee who is not currently or who never was at Tufts, upon request, may also be granted confidentiality from the candidate’s department.

5. **Choosing External Evaluators:** External evaluation of a candidate’s scholarly contributions is an important component of the tenure and promotion process. To this end, the department is ultimately responsible for compiling and forwarding a list of suitable External Evaluators for a given case to the T&P Committee for consideration, keeping in mind the process outlined below. The list should include names of evaluators who can objectively assess the quality of the candidate’s research while outlining the candidate’s individual contributions to the discipline. The majority of the names on the list must be individuals with whom the candidate has had no more than an arm’s length relationship and who can provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s scholarly contributions. There must be no perception of a connection that might compromise the objectivity of the letter. Evaluators may not be people who have a personal stake in the candidate’s career, such as close mentors, dissertation advisors or colleagues who within the last seven years have taught in the same department as the candidate, collaborated on a grant, or co-authored publications. Unless a substantial financial honorarium is involved, an invitation to speak in a departmental colloquium, or to speak at or participate in a conference or
workshop, would not typically be assumed to compromise an "arm’s length"
relationship between a candidate and a proposed External Evaluator; all such
interactions between the candidate and the proposed External Evaluator must be
disclosed in accordance with 5a iii below.

The process for assembling the list of External Evaluators and, in tenure cases, for
choosing an outside expert for the External Subcommittee, is as follows.

a.) The candidate and the department should independently produce their own lists of
potential External Evaluators who could provide an objective evaluation of the
candidate’s scholarship, creative works and other professional activities. These
External Evaluators should consist primarily of senior scholars in the candidate’s
field from prominent research universities. In some cases, scholars at colleges and
experts from other institutions are appropriate. The letters should represent a wide
range of institutions in the United States and, where relevant, abroad.

The candidate’s list should include a description of his or her personal and
professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. Neither the preparator
nor the department should see the candidate’s list until after the department has met
and discussed their own choices for potential External Evaluators. Departments are
couraged to secure the participation of all tenured members, including those on
leave, in this and all subsequent deliberations.

The preparator provides the combined list of potential External Evaluators to the
candidate, who then adds a description of his or her personal and professional
relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. In consultation with the tenured
members of the department, the preparator should eliminate any scholars whose
objectivity might potentially be compromised by a close personal or professional
connection to the candidate, as described above. This list (hereafter called “List of
External Evaluators”) should include enough names to achieve a yield of at least eight
External Letters in a tenure case and at least five External Letters in a promotion case.
At least half of the names on the combined list should have been suggested either by
the department alone or independently by both the department and the candidate.

The List of External Evaluators now forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion
Committee for approval should include on the template provided in the preparator's
packet the following information:

i.) label each name as having been selected by the candidate, the department or
both;
ii.) provide the institution, department, rank, research specialization and specific qualifications of each External Evaluator;

iii.) provide a description written by the candidate of his or her personal and professional relationship to each External Evaluator.

An electronic record of all communications between the preparator, the department chair and the candidate pertaining to the preparation of the list of External Evaluators must be included in the case (see 12).

b.) For tenure cases, the department indicates on this list an outside expert to serve on the External Subcommittee. The choice should be made in consultation with the candidate. Keep in mind that the T&P Committee expects this person to be a knowledgeable, objective scholar who can comment on the External Letters. Unlike the other External Evaluators, this outside expert should not be asked to write a letter of evaluation, but to serve instead as an impartial interpreter of the case. The outside expert should not have a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate.

c.) The preparator must consult with the chair of T&P to finalize the list of External Evaluators and the choice of the outside expert. The candidate’s CV must accompany the proposed list (see (a)) that is forwarded to T&P. T&P works with the departments to produce a mutually agreeable list of potential External Evaluators. The approved list and, in tenure cases, the name of the outside expert, are given to the candidate. If the candidate objects to any of the department’s choices, the candidate may submit written objections to T&P, which are included in the internal administrative record (not sent to External Evaluators or outside expert). The department is not required to make changes in response to the candidate’s objections to the list. If any changes are made, the list must be resubmitted to T&P for consultation.

6. **Requesting Additional Letters:** The department may request additional letters – over and above the External Letters – from other evaluators, some of whom may be close collaborators with the candidate, colleagues, or administrators at Tufts. These letters are treated as a separate category, hereafter called “Additional Letters,” which need not be vetted by T&P. Also in the category of Additional Letters are letters not formally requested by the department, including those solicited by the candidate or members of the candidate’s department, and those not solicited. Prior to requesting Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate and the Secretary of the Faculty of the identity of these letter writers. Candidates can lodge a written objection to the chair of T&P, which becomes a part of the case going forward. These written objections should be directed to the chair of T&P and sent to the Secretary of the Faculty.
All Additional Letters received by the department shall be included in the dossier of the case. Additional Letters sent directly to the Chair of T&P and/or to the Secretary of the Faculty will not be shared with the department.

If the candidate’s department is in receipt of unrequested Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate of the author of the letter within a week of its receipt, keeping the content confidential. If the candidate wishes to submit an objection, this must be done within a week of notification. Both the letter and any objection are included in the internal administrative record (not sent to External Evaluators or outside expert). If the Secretary of the Faculty is in receipt of such a letter, the same protocol applies.

If the candidate holds a joint or adjunct appointment in another department or program within the university, the candidate and the preparator or department chair are encouraged to seek Additional Letters from relevant faculty to assure an appropriate review of the candidate's total contributions to the university.

7. Soliciting letters from External Evaluators: The preparator solicits a confidential written evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work from the list of External Evaluators using a standard letter; a template for this letter may be found in the preparator's packet. Prior to sending out the formal letter of solicitation, the preparator may make initial contact with potential referees by phone or e-mail. Care must be taken in all contact with potential evaluators not to use language that might prejudice the objectivity of the reviews. As per 12(f), all written communication becomes part of the permanent record.

Those who agree to serve as External Evaluators are sent the candidate's application and CV and provided with enough material as determined by the candidate and preparator to allow assessment of the candidate's scholarship. All Evaluators should receive the same materials. The objective of the External Letters is to obtain an accurate assessment of how the candidate and the candidate’s research are perceived by leaders in the field. In a case where the candidate has stopped his/her tenure clock, the preparator consults with the candidate concerning whether the standard letter will include language, as provided in the preparator’s packet, to guide External Evaluators consistent with university policy. Such language is included only with the approval of the candidate. If, in the opinion of a majority of the tenured members of the department, a candidate for tenure who holds the position of assistant or associate professor has an exceptional record of scholarship, teaching, and service, the External Evaluators can be asked to assess the candidate’s potential for direct promotion to professor.
8. **Departmental discussion and vote:** After receiving the requisite number of letters from External Evaluators as specified in Section 5a, and examining the opinions of these External Evaluators, all tenured members of the department must meet to assess the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service, and shall vote on a recommendation of tenure and/or promotion for the candidate.

In those exceptional cases where the department has sought an assessment of the potential for direct promotion of an assistant professor to the rank of professor there must be two votes: the first on tenure and promotion to associate professor and the second on promotion to professor. In those cases where the department has sought assessment for a tenure-track associate professor to the rank of professor, there must be two votes; the first on tenure as associate professor and the second on promotion to professor.

All votes must be taken by secret ballot. The numerical vote(s) must be reported in the Department Statement. Only department members who were present at the meeting(s) may vote. In cases where the provost or a dean who participates formally in the tenure process at the administrative level is a tenured member of the same department as the candidate, he or she will participate in neither the department discussion nor the department vote. In cases where a member of T&P belongs to a department with a tenure and/or promotion case, that member participates in the departmental discussion and vote(s), but recuses him or herself from the T&P Committee discussion and vote (see Step 16).

In tenure cases, after the vote the tenured members of the department will select two members to serve on the External Subcommittee. The department informs the candidate of this choice by letter or e-mail. The candidate has a right to object to the choice of the department members on the Subcommittee, but the department is not obligated to make a substitution. The candidate’s objection may be filed in writing with the department, or confidentially with T&P, and becomes part of the administrative case going forward. If the department has fewer than two tenured members, T&P will direct the dean to work with the department chair to find a suitable substitute or substitutes to serve on the External Subcommittee.

If the department vote is not unanimous, T&P expects the reasons to be explained in the Departmental Statement(s) (step 9 below). Department Subcommittee members should represent the full range of opinions addressed in the Department Statement(s). For this reason the department Subcommittee members should not be appointed before the department meeting, and the Subcommittee meeting should be scheduled with this requirement in mind.
9. **Department statement:** The department prepares a statement reflecting the full range of its tenured members’ opinions as expressed in the departmental discussion, to be signed by all members of the department who took part in the discussion and vote. If extreme circumstances prevent any tenured faculty member from participating in this discussion, the Department Statement must describe the reason for non-participation of each tenured member not present. The Department Statement(s) must preserve the confidentiality of all letter writers and all participants in the discussion. The content of this statement plays a major role in subsequent deliberations. Therefore, under the circumstance that the department cannot agree on one statement that adequately reflects its discussions, it should submit two statements signed by all voting members. For tenure cases, the statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case; this dossier should normally be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be delivered no later than two weeks before a scheduled Subcommittee meeting. For promotion-only cases, the signed statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case by the second week of October.

10. **Candidate’s response to Department Statement:** The department makes its statement(s) and an alphabetized list of all signers available to the candidate as soon as these are ready. The candidate must acknowledge receipt of the statement in a written response addressed to the chair of T&P (on departmental letterhead with an original signature) and sent to the Secretary of the Faculty within two weeks of receipt. This response becomes part of the administrative case going forward.

11. **Selecting the T&P Subcommittee:** The chair of T&P informs the candidate, the candidate’s department chair, and the preparator via e-mail which two members of T&P will serve on the External Subcommittee for his or her tenure case or on the Internal Subcommittee for promotion-only cases. The External Subcommittee consists of the outside expert, the two representatives from the department chosen after the department vote, and two T&P members. The Internal Subcommittee, for promotion-only and for expedited lateral hire cases, consists of two members of T&P. The Subcommittee is chaired by one of the two members from T&P. See step 14 for procedures to be followed if a meeting with the full T&P committee after the regular subcommittee meeting is to be requested.

12. **Contents of the candidate’s dossier:** The dossier for each case is assembled by the department and transmitted to T&P, and should contain the following materials:

   a.) The candidate's Application for consideration by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, signed by the candidate and preparator;
b.) A current CV which includes publications categorized according to 1) refereed or non-refereed status, and 2) type, e.g., book, book chapter, articles, reviews, and so forth (Note: the bibliography and professional activities in the CV and Application should be identical); the titles of any publications in another language should be translated into English;

c.) Reprints and other evidence of the candidate's scholarly and creative work (these should be the same works sent to External Evaluators);

d.) Letters from External Evaluators and a sample of the letters sent to them; any letters in a language other than English should be translated into English;

e.) A complete table of all considered External Evaluators, indicating which names were supplied exclusively by the candidate, exclusively by the department, and by both candidate and department; which potential External Evaluators were contacted and which were not; and the responses;

f.) An electronic record of all email and other correspondence with potential External Evaluators, and all correspondence pertaining to the case, including email between the department chair and the candidate and between the preparator and the candidate. This correspondence should not be included in the packet sent to the outside expert. Correspondence conducted in any language other than English must be translated into English;

g.) The Department Statement(s) pertaining to the candidate's scholarship and other work, teaching, and service;

h.) The teaching materials listed in Step 3 (the tabular summary, department’s narrative, TCU (or GSC) report);

i.) Any Additional Letters (as defined in step 6) received by the department;

j.) A CV of the outside expert in tenure cases (not to be included in the outside expert’s packet).

The department delivers paper copies of the dossier containing the above materials (excluding the electronic record of all correspondence described in (f) and course evaluations described in Step 3(d)) directly to each of the members of the appropriate subcommittee. In tenure cases this includes the two T&P members and the two department representatives; in promotion-only cases this includes only the two members of the T&P Internal Subcommittee.
At the same time, the following additional information must be delivered to the Secretary of the Faculty:

i. The original of the dossier, including all signed letters;

ii. A copy of the confidential dean’s report to the candidate from the most recent review (generally 4th year); this report becomes part of the internal administrative record of the case going forward;

iii. One electronic version of the entire dossier, including the electronic record of correspondence as described in (f) above, and a full set of course evaluations as per Step 3(d).

In cases requiring an External Subcommittee meeting, this dossier should normally be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be delivered no later than two weeks before the scheduled Subcommittee meeting. In promotion-only cases, it should be delivered no later than the 2nd week of October.

Updates to the dossier can be submitted to T&P until the Committee votes on the case.

13. Confidential letters from the department: The bylaws require that each tenured member of the candidate’s department write a confidential letter addressed to the chair of T&P (but sent to the Secretary of the Faculty) even if the tenured faculty member did not participate in the department meeting; this includes faculty members on leave. The bylaws permit but do not require such a letter as well from non-tenured members. All such letters must be signed on departmental letterhead and can be sent via email to the Secretary of the Faculty. These letters, and any other letters not already in the file, must be received within two weeks after the Department Statement is signed. The candidate should be notified of the existence of all letters from non-tenured members by the Secretary of the Faculty on behalf of the T&P Committee, and this should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. All letters become a part of the case going forward. Letters, including those from students and other mentees, will be kept secure and confidential by the Secretary of the Faculty and will be destroyed after three years, unless otherwise required by law. In cases that did not lead to tenure or promotion, all of the case materials, including letters, are kept for 12 years and then destroyed.

No additional letters or communications of any sort received after the final vote of the T&P Committee will be considered by T&P as a part of the case.
14. **T&P Subcommittee meeting:** For tenure cases, the preparator consults with T&P Subcommittee members and the outside expert immediately after the department vote to schedule a time and place for the Subcommittee meeting. At this meeting, the External Subcommittee reviews and discusses all of the evidence presented in a candidate's case. The Subcommittee does not vote on the qualifications of the candidate. The deliberations and the written report of the Subcommittee are confidential and only available to the T&P Committee and the administration (not to be seen by the candidate or the department). When the Subcommittee Report is approved as accurate and signed by all members of the Subcommittee, it is sent to the Secretary of the Faculty and becomes a permanent part of the case going forward.

   At the request of any single member of the External Subcommittee, the External Subcommittee shall meet with all of the voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for further deliberations. Such a request may be expressed prior to the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may take place immediately following the External Subcommittee meeting (for the convenience of the outside expert). Such request may also be expressed at the conclusion of the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may have to take place on a later date. Following the External Subcommittee meeting, and, if requested, the larger meeting with all voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion also present, the Subcommittee Chair will prepare a written report that reflects the discussions and findings of these meetings.

For promotion cases, which have no External Subcommittee meeting, Internal Subcommittee members will review and discuss all the evidence presented in a candidate’s case with the full T&P Committee, whose members will also be familiar with the case. No written report is produced.

15. **T&P option to request additional information:** If T&P requires the advice of additional evaluators (including, if deemed useful, research collaborators of the candidate), Tufts faculty members, and/or mentees, the T&P Committee informs the candidate, the department chair and preparator of the names of any such evaluators. This should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. Letters thus received by the Committee, along with any objections filed by the candidate, are forwarded to the administration as part of the case.

   On behalf of the Committee, the Secretary of the Faculty notifies the candidate of any unsolicited written communications that come directly to the Committee.
16. **T&P discussion and vote:** T&P discusses the case, and its members vote on a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. In cases where a T&P member is from the same department as a candidate, that member does not participate in the tenure and promotion proceedings in any way other than as a member of the department. Prior to taking a final vote, T&P meets with members of the administration to discuss the merits of the case.

In the event that this recusal results in no representation from the School of Engineering or from one of the three bylaw-designated areas of A&S (humanities and arts; social sciences; natural sciences and mathematics) on a particular promotion or tenure and promotion case, then the Chair of the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Chair of T&P and the Secretary of the Faculty, appoints a replacement from faculty members with previous service on T&P (preferably in the last five years) in order to maintain compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article 4, section 2, part c).

T&P transmits its vote and its findings in writing by letter to the appropriate dean. At the same time, the chair of T&P reports the Committee’s vote in writing to the candidate and the candidate’s department chair and the preparator.

Prior to making its recommendation to the administration, if T&P fails to support or divides equally on a recommendation of a candidate who was supported by two-thirds or more of the members of the department who voted, then T&P must meet with the preparator, the department chair (if different from the preparator) and, in the case of tenure cases, with department Subcommittee members. The purpose of this meeting is to explain the position of the Committee (while respecting the confidentiality of all participants) and to hear any comments from the department.

17. **T&P recommendation to table a case:** In a non-mandatory case, T&P may choose to table. The chair of T&P will report such a recommendation in writing to the candidate, department chair and preparator. If the candidate rejects the recommendation to table, the candidate must inform the chair of T&P in writing within two weeks of receiving T&P’s recommendation. In that event, T&P will vote on the case according to the usual procedures described in this document. Otherwise, the case is tabled, without prejudice, and no vote is taken. The decision to table is reported to the appropriate dean, and the Secretary of the Faculty retains all case materials for one year.

A tabled promotion-only case may be reconsidered only upon the request of the candidate, which must be submitted in writing to the chair of T&P in accordance with the standard calendar. A tabled non-mandatory tenure case may be reconsidered upon the written request of the candidate if it remains non-mandatory or it must be
reconsidered once it becomes mandatory, unless the candidate withdraws the case as per step 2. If the case is reconsidered the following year, the case materials of the tabled case are used, but the candidate and department may provide updated information. The chair of T&P should be consulted well in advance if there is a substantial amount of new material, under which circumstances it may be preferable for the candidate to file a new application. If a case has been tabled for more than one year, a new application must be filed to ensure the currency of all submitted materials. T&P may not table the case a second time.

When a new application is filed in a previously tabled case, the sequence of steps described in this statement, including the timetable, must be followed in detail, unless otherwise approved by T&P.

18. Discussion and vote by university administration and trustees: When the above steps have been completed, the deans of the School of Arts and Sciences or the dean of the School of Engineering, the provost, and the president consider the matter. A recommendation is then sent to the Board of Trustees. Tenure and promotion become official only through trustee action. This action is reported by the Office of the Provost, via e-mail to the appropriate dean. The dean communicates with the candidate's department chair, who then communicates with the candidate. In addition, a letter notifying the candidate of the trustee decision is sent from the appropriate dean as soon as possible after the trustee vote. The Secretary of the Faculty notifies the chair of T&P.

If the administration fails to support the recommendation of T&P, then the president of the university or his/her designee meets with T&P prior to any further action.

Part 2: Interdisciplinary Tenure and Promotion Procedures (Forthcoming)

This portion of Statement 11 will be available no later than March 1, 2015.

Part 3: Expedited Lateral Hires

There are two types of lateral hires: expedited and non-expedited. Expedited cases are meant to determine only the tenurability of someone coming to Tufts from another institution. Note that all proposed lateral faculty appointments must go through this process regardless of whether or not the person already has tenure at another institution. Non-expedited cases are concerned with tenure and possible promotion associated with an appointment (from assistant to associate, or associate to full professor). In either case, all lateral hires are handled on an ad hoc schedule negotiated by the chair of T&P and the appropriate deans.
Criteria for expedited review (calendar to be negotiated with T&P):

1. The candidate must already hold a tenured position at another university with standards comparable to those at Tufts;

2. The proposed Tufts appointment must not be at a higher professorial rank than is already held at the candidate’s home institution;

3. Both the department and the appropriate dean must request the expedited process.

Process for expedited review:

Please note that the steps described below differ in many instances from those described above in Part 1.

1. Choosing the preparator: A preparator is chosen from the ranks of the tenured faculty as soon as is feasible after the decision to hire. The preparator and the department chair jointly manage the application process on the department’s behalf.

   The candidate and the preparator both review the materials forwarded to the candidate by the Secretary of the Faculty, including the Bylaws of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (Article IV, Section 2 c) and this statement.

2. Preparing the candidate’s statement: The candidate is not required to submit an application, but should provide a statement on research, teaching and service, including service to the profession.

3. Compiling teaching information: It is the department’s responsibility to prepare a summary of the candidate’s teaching, including the following materials:

   a.) A tabular summary of the average rating for questions equivalent to the following: “overall rating of the professor,” the “overall rating of the course,” and, when available, “compared to other courses at [insert institution], I learned…” for each course the candidate has taught at another institution the previous five years. The table should include course title and number; semester and year; enrollment; number of students who filled out the evaluation; and averages for the above specified course evaluation questions.

   b.) Accompanying the tabular summary of the candidate’s teaching, the department should also prepare a narrative statement on teaching that provides relevant information on the following: the teaching load of the candidate vis-à-vis the department; reasons for reduced or expanded teaching responsibilities, such as grants,
released time, or leave of absence; and types of teaching (required vs. elective courses, labs, recitations, undergraduate vs. graduate courses, co-teaching, teaching in other programs). This narrative must be prepared prior to the department meeting.

c). The preparator requests from the candidate the fullest available record of teaching evaluations from the last five years. The Secretary of the Faculty contacts the chair of the Tufts Community Union (TCU) Senate Education Committee with the name of the candidate to be reviewed. This chair arranges for a TCU senator to review and summarize the written commentary and statistical data on the candidate's teaching, but not to render a recommendation for or against tenure or promotion. The data, but not the mentee letters, are made available to the senator by the candidate’s department. The senator provides the department – if possible before the department meeting – with a written report signed by the chair of the Education Committee of the TCU Senate, which becomes part of the record. The candidate receives a copy of this report with its author’s name redacted. In the case of candidates who teach only graduate courses, the teaching record is reviewed by a representative of the Graduate Student Council (GSC).

d). One copy of the full set of teaching evaluations for the candidate should be included in the electronic version of the case sent to the Secretary of the Faculty (see step 12 below).

4. **Compiling information on mentorship:** With the help of the department, the candidate prepares an annotated table of all closely mentored individuals with whom he or she has worked either in one-on-one or small-group settings, e.g., Ph.D. advisees, master’s thesis advisees, senior honors thesis advisees, lab and research collaborators, and participants in directed performances and creative projects. The candidate may lodge any objections to soliciting a letter from a particular mentee. These comments should be included with this list, which becomes a part of the case going forward. In consultation with the candidate’s department, T&P decides whether an objection should be honored and a letter not be solicited.

The department administrator is responsible for finding contact information for each mentee. Once the table is complete, it should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty, who will send out letters requesting evaluations of the candidate and organize the letters as they are received. Letters from mentees who were never at Tufts are sent to the candidate’s department for their consideration prior to the department meeting. Only T&P and relevant administrators will see letters from mentees who are expected to follow the candidate to Tufts from the candidate’s prior institution. Any mentee who is not currently or who never was at Tufts, upon request, may also be granted confidentiality from the candidate’s department.
5. **Choosing External Evaluators:** External evaluation of a candidate’s scholarly contributions is an important component of the tenure and promotion process. To this end, the department is ultimately responsible for compiling and forwarding a list of suitable External Evaluators for a given case to the T&P Committee for consideration, keeping in mind the process outlined below. The list should include names of evaluators who can objectively assess the quality of the candidate’s research while outlining the candidate’s individual contributions to the discipline. The majority of the names on the list must be individuals with whom the candidate has had no more than an arm’s length relationship and who can provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s scholarly contributions. There must be no perception of a connection that might compromise the objectivity of the letter. With the approval of T&P, however, two outside letters may be included from those obtained during the hiring process. In this case, the letter writers should be asked explicitly to address the candidate’s qualifications for a tenured position: would the candidate be tenured at the writer’s institution? If this question was not asked at the time of the search, an addendum should be requested. Evaluators may not be people who have a personal stake in the candidate’s career, such as close mentors, dissertation advisors or colleagues who within the last seven years have taught in the same department as the candidate, collaborated on a grant, or co-authored publications. Unless a substantial financial honorarium is involved, an invitation to speak in a departmental colloquium, or to speak at or participate in a conference or workshop, would not typically be assumed to compromise an "arm’s length" relationship between a candidate and a proposed External Evaluator; all such interactions between the candidate and the proposed External Evaluator must be disclosed in accordance with 5a iii below. As with internal promotions, the list of outside evaluators must be sent to the T&P Committee for approval. The process of choosing External Evaluators should yield at least five letters, including the two letters that were obtained during the hiring process.

The process for assembling the list of External Evaluators is as follows.

a.) The candidate and the department should independently produce their own lists of potential External Evaluators who could provide an objective evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship, creative works and other professional activities. These External Evaluators should consist primarily of senior scholars in the candidate’s field from prominent research universities. In some cases, scholars at colleges and experts from other institutions are appropriate. The letters should represent a wide range of institutions in the United States and, where relevant, abroad.

The candidate’s list should include a description of his or her personal and professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. Neither the preparator
nor the department should see the candidate’s list until after the department has met and discussed their own choices for potential External Evaluators. Departments are encouraged to secure the participation of all tenured members, including those on leave, in this and all subsequent deliberations.

The preparator provides the combined list of potential External Evaluators to the candidate, who then adds a description of his or her personal and professional relationship to each proposed External Evaluator. In consultation with the tenured members of the department, the preparator should eliminate any scholars whose objectivity might potentially be compromised by a close personal or professional connection to the candidate, as described above. This list (hereafter called “List of External Evaluators”) should include enough names to achieve a yield of at least eight External Letters in a tenure case and at least five External Letters in a promotion case. At least half of the names on the combined list should have been suggested either by the department alone or independently by both the department and the candidate.

The List of External Evaluators now forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for approval should include on the template provided in the preparator's packet the following information:

i.) label each name as having been selected by the candidate, the department or both;

ii.) provide the institution, department, rank, research specialization and specific qualifications of each External Evaluator;

iii.) provide a description written by the candidate of his or her personal and professional relationship to each External Evaluator.

An electronic record of all communications between the preparator, the department chair and the candidate pertaining to the preparation of the list of External Evaluators must be included in the electronic version of the case (see Step 12).

b). For tenure cases, the department indicates on this list an outside expert to serve on the External Subcommittee. The choice should be made in consultation with the candidate. Keep in mind that the T&P Committee expects this person to be a knowledgeable, objective scholar who can comment on the External Letters. Unlike the other External Evaluators, this outside expert should not be asked to write a letter of evaluation, but to serve instead as an impartial interpreter of the case. The outside expert should not have a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate.
c). The preparator must consult with the chair of T&P to finalize the list of External Evaluators and the choice of the outside expert. The candidate’s CV must accompany the proposed list (see (a)) that is forwarded to T&P. T&P works with the departments to produce a mutually agreeable list of potential External Evaluators. The approved list and, in tenure cases, the name of the outside expert, are given to the candidate. If the candidate objects to any of the department’s choices, the candidate may submit written objections to T&P, which are included in the internal administrative record (not sent to External Evaluators or outside expert). The department is not required to make changes in response to the candidate’s objections to the list. If any changes are made, the list must be resubmitted to T&P for consultation.

6. Requesting Additional Letters: The department may request additional letters – over and above the External Letters from other evaluators – some of whom may be close collaborators with the candidate, colleagues, or administrators. These letters are treated as a separate category, hereafter called “Additional Letters,” which need not be vetted by T&P. Also in this category of Additional Letters are letters not formally requested by the department, including those solicited by the candidate or members of the candidate’s department, and those not solicited. Prior to requesting Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate and the Secretary of the Faculty of the identity of these letter writers. Candidates can lodge a written objection to the chair of T&P, which becomes part of the case going forward. These objections should be directed to the chair of T&P and sent to the Secretary of the Faculty.

All Additional Letters received by the department shall be included in the dossier of the case. Additional Letters sent directly to the Chair of T&P and/or to the Secretary of the Faculty will not be shared with the department.

If the candidate’s department is in receipt of unrequested Additional Letters, the department must notify the candidate of the author of the letter within a week of its receipt, keeping the content confidential. If the candidate wishes to submit an objection, this must be done within a week of notification. Both the letter and any objection are included in the internal administrative record (not sent to External Evaluators). If the Secretary of the Faculty is in receipt of such a letter, the same protocol applies.

7. Soliciting letters from External Evaluators: The preparator solicits a confidential written evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly work from the list of External Evaluators using a standard letter; a template for this letter may be found in the preparator's packet. Prior to sending out the former letter of solicitation, the preparator may make initial contact with potential referees by phone or e-mail. Care must be taken in all contact with potential Evaluators not to use language that
might prejudice the objectivity of the reviews. As per 12(f), all written communication becomes part of the permanent record.

Those who agree to serve as External Evaluators are sent the candidate's application and CV and provided with enough material to allow assessment of the candidate's scholarship. All evaluators should receive the same materials. The objective of the External Letters is to obtain an accurate assessment of how the candidate and the candidate’s research are perceived by leaders in the field.

8. **Departmental discussion and vote:** After receiving the requisite number of letters from External Evaluators as specified in Section 5a, and examining the opinions of these External Evaluators, *all tenured members of the department* must meet to assess the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service, and shall vote on a recommendation of tenure and/or promotion for the candidate.

All votes must be taken by secret ballot. The numerical vote(s) must be reported in the Department Statement. Only department members who were present at the meeting(s) may vote. In cases where the provost or a dean who participates formally in the tenure process at the administrative level is a tenured member of the same department as the candidate, he or she will participate in neither the department discussion nor the department vote. In cases where a member of T&P belongs to a department with an expedited lateral tenure case, that member participates in the departmental discussion and vote(s), but recuses him or herself from the T&P Committee discussion and vote (see Step 16).

If the department vote is not unanimous, T&P expects the reasons to be explained in the Departmental Statement(s) (step 9 below). Department Subcommittee members should represent the full range of opinions addressed in the Department Statement(s). For this reason the department Subcommittee members should not be appointed before the department meeting, and the Subcommittee meeting should be scheduled with this requirement in mind.

9. **Department Statement:** The department prepares a statement reflecting the full range of its tenured members’ opinions as expressed in the departmental discussion, to be signed by all members of the department who took part in the discussion and vote. If extreme circumstances prevent any tenured faculty member from participating in this discussion, the Department Statement must describe the reason for non-participation of each tenured member not present. The Department Statement(s) must preserve the confidentiality of all letter writers and all participants in the discussion. The content of this statement plays a major role in subsequent deliberations. Therefore, under the circumstance that the department cannot agree on one statement that adequately reflects its discussions, it should submit two statements
signed by all voting members. The statement(s) must be submitted to T&P along with the complete case; this dossier should normally be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be delivered no later than two weeks before a scheduled Subcommittee meeting.

10. **Candidate’s response to Department Statement:** The department makes its statement(s) and an alphabetized list of all signers available to the candidate as soon as these are ready. The candidate must acknowledge receipt of the statement in a written response addressed to the chair of T&P (on departmental letterhead with an original signature) and sent in care of the Secretary of the Faculty, within two weeks of receipt. This response becomes part of the case going forward.

11. **Selecting the T&P Subcommittee:** The chair of T&P informs the candidate, the candidate’s department chair, and the preparator via e-mail which two members of T&P will serve on the Internal Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is chaired by one of the two members from T&P.

12. **Contents of the candidate’s dossier:** The dossier for each case is assembled by the department and transmitted to T&P, and should contain the following materials:

   a.) The candidate's Application for consideration by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, signed by the candidate and preparator;

   b.) A current CV which includes publications categorized according to 1) refereed or non-refereed status, and 2) type, e.g., book, book chapter, articles, reviews, and so forth (Note: the bibliography and professional activities in the CV and Application should be identical); the titles of any publications in another language should be translated into English;

   c.) Reprints and other evidence of the candidate's scholarly and creative work (these should be the same works sent to External Evaluators);

   d.) Letters from External Evaluators and a sample of the letters sent to them; any letters in a language other than English should be translated into English;

   e.) A complete table of all considered External Evaluators, indicating which names were supplied exclusively by the candidate, exclusively by the department, and by both candidate and department; which potential External Evaluators were contacted and which were not; and the responses;

   f.) An electronic record of all email and other correspondence with potential External Evaluators, and all correspondence pertaining to the case, including email between
the department chair and the candidate and between the preparator and the candidate. 
This correspondence should not be included in the packet sent to the outside expert. Correspondence conducted in any language other than English must be translated into English;

g.) The Department Statement(s) pertaining to the candidate's scholarship and other work, teaching, and service;

h.) The teaching materials listed in Step 3 (the tabular summary, department’s narrative, TCU (or GSC) report);

i.) Any Additional Letters (as defined in step 6) received by the department;

j.) A CV of the outside expert in tenure cases (not to be included in the outside expert’s packet).

The department delivers paper copies of the dossier containing the above materials (excluding the electronic record of all correspondence described in (f) and course evaluations described in Step 3(d)) directly to each of the members of the appropriate subcommittee. In expedited lateral tenure cases this includes only the two members of the T&P Internal Subcommittee.

At the same time, the following additional information must be delivered to the Secretary of the Faculty:

i. The original of the dossier, including all signed letters;

ii. A copy of the confidential dean’s report to the candidate from the most recent review (generally 4th year); this report becomes part of the internal administrative record of the case going forward;

iii. One electronic version of the entire dossier, including the electronic record of correspondence as described in (f) above, and a full set of course evaluations as per Step 3(d).

In expedited lateral tenure cases, this dossier should be delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed

Updates to the dossier can be submitted to T&P until the Committee votes on the case.

13. Confidential letters from the department: The bylaws require that each tenured member of the candidate’s department write a confidential letter addressed to the chair of T&P but sent to the Secretary of the Faculty even if the tenured faculty
member did not participate in the department meeting; this includes faculty members on leave. The bylaws permit but do not require such a letter as well from non-tenured members. All such letters must be signed on departmental letterhead and can be sent via email to the Secretary of the Faculty. These letters, and any other letters not already in the file, should be sent to T&P within two weeks after the Department Statement is signed. The candidate should be notified of the existence of all letters from non-tenured members by the Secretary of the Faculty on behalf of the T&P Committee, and this should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. All letters become a part of the case going forward. Letters, including those from students and other mentees, will be kept secure and confidential by the Secretary of the Faculty and will be destroyed after three years, unless otherwise required by law. In cases that did not lead to tenure or promotion, all of the case materials, including letters, are kept for 12 years and then destroyed.

No additional letters or communications of any sort received after the final vote of the T&P Committee will be considered by T&P as a part of the case.

14. **T&P Subcommittee**: For expedited lateral tenure cases, which have no External Subcommittee meeting, Internal Subcommittee members will review and discuss all the evidence presented in a candidate’s case with the full T&P Committee, whose members will also be familiar with the case. No written report is produced.

15. **T&P option to request additional information**: If T&P requires the advice of additional evaluators (including, if deemed useful, research collaborators of the candidate) and/or mentees, the T&P Committee informs the candidate, the department chair and preparator of the names of all additional evaluators. This should be done in sufficient time to permit written objections from the candidate to be considered prior to relevant actions by the Committee. Letters thus received by the Committee, along with any objections filed by the candidate, are forwarded to the administration as part of the case.

On behalf of the Committee, the Secretary of the Faculty notifies the candidate of any unsolicited written communications that come directly to the Committee.

16. **T&P discussion and vote**: T&P discusses the case, and its members vote on a recommendation for or against tenure. In cases where a T&P member is from the same department as a candidate, that member does not participate in the tenure and promotion proceedings in any way other than as a member of the department. Prior to taking a final vote, T&P meets with members of the administration to discuss the merits of the case.
In the event that this recusal results in no representation from the School of Engineering or from one of the three bylaw-designated areas of A&S (humanities and arts; social sciences; natural sciences and mathematics) on a particular promotion or tenure and promotion case, then the Chair of the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Chair of T&P and the Secretary of the Faculty, appoints a replacement from faculty members with previous service on T&P (preferably in the last five years) in order to maintain compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws (Article 4, section 2, part c).

T&P transmits its vote and its findings in writing by letter to the appropriate dean. At the same time, the chair of T&P reports the Committee’s vote in writing to the candidate and the candidate’s department chair and the preparator.

Prior to making its recommendation to the administration, if T&P fails to support or divides equally on a recommendation of a candidate who was supported by two-thirds or more of the members of the department who voted, then T&P will meet with the preparator and the department chair (if different from the preparator). The purpose of this meeting is to explain the position of the Committee (while respecting the confidentiality of all participants) and to hear any comments from the department.

17. Discussion and vote by university administration and trustees: When the above steps have been completed, the deans of Arts and Sciences or the dean of Engineering, the provost, and the president consider the matter. A recommendation is then sent to the Board of Trustees. Tenure becomes official only through trustee action. This action is reported by the Office of the Provost, via e-mail to the appropriate dean. The dean communicates with the candidate's department chair, who then communicates with the candidate. In addition, a letter notifying the candidate of the trustee decision is sent from the appropriate dean as soon as possible after the trustee vote. The Secretary of the Faculty notifies the chair of T&P.

If the administration fails to support the recommendation of T&P, then the president of the university or his/her designee meets with T&P prior to any further action.

Part 4: Non-Expedited Lateral Hires

The process for non-expedited lateral hires is similar to the process described in Part 3, above.

In addition:
1. External Evaluators must be asked if the candidate would receive tenure and if they would be promoted to associate or to full professor, as appropriate, at his/her own institution.

2. A full External Subcommittee, as per Part 1, steps 5(b), 11, and 14 above, will be formed if the candidate does not already have tenure elsewhere, or if the candidate is being promoted from assistant to associate, or from associate to full professor. In this case, the dossier is normally delivered within two weeks of the department statement being signed; it must be delivered no later than two weeks before the scheduled meeting of the External Subcommittee.

This version of Statement 11 was approved by the T&P Committee on 12.19.14.