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PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Welcome to our last meeting. I think we're going to start on time. People can help themselves and eat while we talk. The first of business is an announcement, and I call on Nancy Bauer.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

COURSE EVALUATIONS

DEAN BAUER: Hi everybody. I hate to start this meeting with an announcement of a problem but that's what I'm going to do. It has to do with course evaluations. I found out about this problem about a half an hour ago, so I'm doing some things on the fly. I just wanted to give everyone a heads-up and let you know what the problem is and how we're trying to deal with it. I just looked at Linda Abriola, I am not even sure actually if it's affecting engineering. I think it's just affecting arts and sciences.

Through a series of glitches that we cannot understand how these happened because our office in the dean's office does nothing other than oversee this process than on high basically. There were a number of courses that were left out of the evaluation process this year that should have been evaluated. There are probably some people who know that their course was not evaluated. I'm seeing some heads being nodded. This didn't come to the attention of our office, or the magnitude of this problem didn't come to the attention of our office until about a half an hour ago.

The way that the people in TTS who run the course evaluation system are going to solve the problem, they told us was by, in these instances, having instructors be able to send out Qualtrics surveys that ask the same questions and allow students to respond. We've now found out that that system is not going to work. Some of you may have already done that and that's fine because people can get access to -- first of all, only the person who sends out the Qualtrics survey has access to the results, and they have access to the results whenever they come in, which doesn't follow at all our course evaluation process. Again, I must apologize. We simply did not know that this was going on till a half an hour ago.

So let me tell you the steps that I've already taken in consultation with Bárbara Brizuela and Jim Glaser that we are going to do. First of all, we are asking the course evaluation people in TTS to send out all of the evaluations for courses that have not yet been evaluated where there was this glitch. We are then going to talk with Anne Mahoney and Montserrat about whether or not we can extend the course evaluation deadline in this unfortunate situation because course evaluations close tomorrow night, and I don't know how quickly TTS can fix this problem.

We will then hold back if any -- what we're doing is, we don't have to hold back anything. We will evaluate only those courses that should've been evaluated that weren't. This is going to cause some complicated things. I don't know what quite to do about the Qualtrics survey yet. I'm going to do the best I can. I welcome your comments, questions, and advice. Thank you for your patience. Anybody have a question or a comment?
PROFESSOR FOSTER: Liz Foster, history. I'm so surprised because our department has known about this for over a week. We had eleven courses affected. Our department administrator has created a Qualtrics survey, and she is sending them out, and she will not release them to faculty. I find students aren't going to do an evaluation now if I tell them again to do --

DEAN BAUER: We will send a communication to the students saying, “If you've already filled out a Qualtrics survey, blah, blah, blah, blah.”

PROFESSOR FOSTER: Yes.

DEAN BAUER: And that was what was supposed to happen but our understanding is the communication that got sent to the department administrators explaining all of this was in some cases misunderstood, might not have been as clear as possible. The other thing too is still those Qualtrics surveys will go back to your department administrator but then nobody else has -- we will have to get them somehow from the department administrator. So there are still some glitches but I appreciate it. That's how they wanted it to work, but we were not even clear about that. We knew there were some problems but not the magnitude.

PROFESSOR ATHERTON: Tim Atherton, physics. It's almost ironic given that I'm teaching a course on computational physics our key component which is good program design. My course evaluation was one of the omitted ones. I use that as a teachable unit in my class. I say this is what happens when you screw up your program design. So I think I'm hoping to see in the future is a greater attention to robustness and excellent program design. You know, these are industry standards. So I look forward to hearing how that's going to be implemented.

DEAN BAUER: Our system was built internally and obviously we don't have a say in how this system -- I shouldn't say we don't have a say, but this was just how it got done. I've already been since 11:30 AM in conversation with TTS about A, working with outside vendors. We've reviewed the process with them. A lot of times there's too much room for human error all the way along and we've been very lucky up until now that something like this did not happen. I agree with you. I think every individual involved is trying their best, but the system doesn't work. Obviously, they care very much about, and understand that the value of this data in so many ways and the comments that we'll do everything we can.

PROFESSOR LEE: We were notified more than a week ago, and we stressed it's an importance of tenure and reviews. So I don't know, based on your comments, we did the Qualtrics method because they told us it's impossible to have course evaluations. So I'm not hearing something different --

DEAN BAUER: I don't know. I was told -- I don't know why they said it's impossible. I'm afraid I'm standing here with about as much -- I have told you everything I know. All I can tell you is I've asked them, you know, 20 minutes ago to do this, this, this, and this. I'm going to leave this meeting at one o'clock, and I hoped they've resolved all the problems. But we'll be sending
out a communication now to the AS&E faculty to make sure, and I'll try to make this
communication as clear as possible, and I invite you to ask questions if you have them. Thank
you for letting me know that.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Michael Romero, biology. I understand the importance of protecting
the students by not having them send them back to the faculty, but we also need to be careful of
protecting the faculty.

DEAN BAUER: Absolutely.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Because if we extend the deadline for this, a lot of faculty who don't
give final exams, all of their grades are already going to be up by the end of this week and the
students will be evaluated after knowing their final grade in the class and that's the one thing every
survey shown effects evaluations.

DEAN BAUER: I've been told by Christiane that I have to stop now, but I think this is an
extremely important point so can I please say something. My inclination, I was thinking on my
feet in response to what you've said, which I'm happy to take back, is to say that we should think,
EPC might want to think also about holding back student grades until whatever the last day we
decide the evaluations are. In other words, what I was thinking is we extend them to Friday, the
8th, which is the last day of exams, which by the time they set this all up we'll probably be
somewhere around there so people will wait. They can disagree. What we would do is have the
grades not show up until after the evaluations are closed. Forget about the date. Will that solve
the problem you're concerned about? Great, thank you so much. If you have further questions
I'm going to be standing around. I'll stand by the door and you can come and ask me what is going
on. Otherwise, I'm going to do something about this at one o'clock.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Thank you, Nancy. I'm sorry to cut you short. You can
always be in contact with her. The next item of business is the report from T&P for
Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary Tenure and the need to vote on the proposal for bridge hires.
Vida Johnson.

OLD BUSINESS

REPORT ON PROPOSED T&P PROCESS FOR
INTERDISCIPLINARY/MULTIDISCIPLINARY TENURE AND VOTE ON PROPOSED
T&P PROCESS FOR BRIDGE HIRES

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: I'm going to try to make it very short, and I'll talk very fast. First
thing I want to say is that this is my last official duty as chair of T&P. That if I were a Soviet
leader I would be farmed out to (inaudible) somewhere in (inaudible). President Monaco, I just
want you to think about that. Mark Devoto, is he here? Not Mark Devoto -- Mark
Cronin-Golomb. There's Mark. Mark is going to be as of May 1 the new chair. So you might
have submitted a list to me, but you might end up getting a response from Mark. We all work
together so there should be no problem. I just wanted to let you know.

We've got two things. Last time we had made a proposal and handed out, we had called interdisciplinary tenure. In other words, basically, these were appointments we turn out from re-framing them and you don't have the final version. We're not going to take a vote on it because we have made some adjustments that I want you to sort of think about and we will, not we, but Mark, will be putting this up for a vote first faculty meeting in the fall. But these are cases where you have primary department and a secondary unit, whether it's a department or program, et cetera. You've gotten some feedback about the statement we had made. It didn't seem to be broad enough and cover all the eventualities of MOUs that are being written. So we want to consult a little more with both the engineering team and the deans in arts and sciences to make sure that whatever is voted on does cover all eventualities where you have one primary department which is where you will basically vote tenure and have voting rights and then a secondary unit. We have to make sure that each unit has the appropriate input into the tenure process. So that document will come first thing in the fall. So Mark, are you writing down all the things that you're going to have to do?

Secondly, this is a case where this is the bridge professorship which we will ask you to vote on today, which was sent out a couple weeks ago. This is a case of a shotgun wedding. The baby is coming, and we need to make it legal. So the shotgun wedding part is we actually have some bridge professorships and these are different from the ones I've talked about. These are, in fact, appointments and they're called bridge professorships. Appointments where the faculty member will have full voting rights in effect, quote, unquote, tenured in two departments. Right now what we're proposing is the procedure for doing this in arts, sciences, and engineering across our schools. There is a case that's going to be going forward right now. This is the shotgun part.

But what we have done, and this I think is in a sense much simpler. What we have done is basically created a procedure for input for two preparators from each department across schools or maybe within A&S or engineering if the person has sort of equal appointments in two departments. What we've done is to create one case, rather than two departments with two separate tenure letters, two departments, et cetera. What we have is one case that will go forward. There will be actually two -- each department will receive the same case which will be put together by the preparators with the letters from two different schools and that case will go to each department. Each department will take a vote, write up the statement, make a recommendation.

So each department will have full access and full domain on the case. Then if, for example, since these are expedited lateral hires there are no sub-committees. There are people who are in high rank or even have tenure elsewhere. So we don't have all of the issues that come up when we're talking about a tenure case. So the thing I'm going to stress is that each department will have full input into the creation of the list, external evaluators list, et cetera, and will have full vote and make a recommendation from that department.

We're not expecting because the hire itself ends up practically being a guarantee of tenure. You
only hire people that you want to be successful in this process. In the eventuality that I think one
department says yes and one department says no, I think the provost will then make a decision on
whatever event. I don't think this is a very problematic issue because I think it addresses what is
of most concern to faculty is that they have a vote their tenure and full representation in the process
that appoints them. Any questions?

So could I ask for a vote?

MARK DEVOTO: Vote on?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: On the bridge professorship.

PROFESSOR MANZ: From the information we have, are we voting on this specific and this
specific case only?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: No, no. We're voting on bridge. There will be a bridge
professorship part of statement eleven and there will be other cases. These are expedited lateral
hires, yes.

PROFESSOR MANZ: (Inaudible).

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Basically. We already have procedures for the expedited lateral
hires. This is making sure that the two departments have equal input. Second?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: All opposed? Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I call on Vice President Campbell to introduce a new hire.

NEW BUSINESS

INTRODUCTION OF JULIEN CARTER, VICE PRESIDENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
VICE PRESIDENT CAMPBELL: Julien Carter. I'm very pleased to introduce to you our new
vice president for human resources. Julien comes to us after having been the founding vice
president for human resources at Khalifa University in United Emirates and the chief human
resource officer at University of Texas, Austin and at Louisville and the commissioner for
employee relations in the state of Minnesota. I always forget the M's, I get them confused. He's
been here three months. He is off to a fabulous start. He has a lot of knowledge, a lot of
experience, creativity, and is just wonderful with people. So let's welcome Julien. (Applause)

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I call on President Monaco.

INTRODUCTION OF MARK BRIMHALL-VARGAS, CHIEF DIVERSITY OFFICER

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Would you please explain his role? Some people have asked, for example, how his relationship (inaudible).

PRESIDENT MONACO: So this position of chief diversity officer was one of the major recommendations that came out of the Diversity Council. He will report to the provost's office because we felt it was important to have it close to the academic mission. I will continue to chair a diversity council that's a leadership group and Mark will be part of that. We'll look after policies and how things are going across for faculty, staff, and students. Mark will chair what is going to be titled the Diversity Inclusion Working Group and on that working group will be individuals such as Margery and others from different schools who are taking the lead in their school's diversity and inclusion. His role will be to help coordinate that, share best practices through that working group and the operation group.

Just as way of background, he's not here to welcome him, but Mark was the deputy chief diversity officer at University of Maryland in College Park for fourteen years. He has a master’s in public policy from the Harvard Kennedy School as well as a Ph.D. from Maryland in social foundations of education. It's a very important role, and I hope you'll all welcome him and we'll work together on this issue of diversity inclusion. Thank you. (Applause)

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Now we come to a discussion and a vote on the units we use or will use in the future to assign to individual courses which will take us quite some time. I ask Anne Mahoney and Montserrat to introduce the EPC voice on the matter.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE UNIT TO BE USED TO ASSIGN CREDIT TO TUFTS COURSES
PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: So you might remember that we voted in the past meeting that we would be assigning credit to courses proportional to the amount of work required for the courses. Now we have to come up with which of the two proposals on units we are going to use. I would like to remind you that a credit hour, a semester credit hour is equivalent to approximately one hour of meeting time and two hours of work outside of class, and there could be different proportions depending on the courses so there could be more outside work and less in class depending. It could be not just in class, it could be online, it could be in many different ways.

Now we have to decide which way we assign credit to courses. So there are two possible units.
One unit is approximately equal to a course and it will be equal to three credit hours. That could be subdivided into four pieces so it could be in multiples of .25 units, which we would expect that most courses would be more like one unit and some other courses could be more or less depending on the amount of work required.

The other option is that we adopt the unit, which is essentially equal to the credit hour. So under that proposal an average course would be worth three units instead of one.

There are several reasons why people might prefer one or the other. We have heard that the engineering school really goes for the three units per course and some people go for something else. So is there any discussion?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: We should also point out that whichever unit we choose it's going to be the exact same amount of work to get from where we are to where we're going. We're still going to have to verify the value for every course, make sure EPC and so forth will come up with some guidelines that if your course looks like this it's probably worth such and so many units. But we'll have to check because guidelines are just guidelines and if they don't get the right answer for a particular course, we'll put the right number on that course based on how the faculty member designed it. We're still going to have to verify every hour for a particular course, and so forth. It doesn't really matter whether the old or new values, both look like one, or one looks like a one and one looks like a three. It's the exact same procedure. So neither one of these proposals is more difficult, more arduous, more complicated, or more expensive than the other. So we can freely vote on which one you think is going to work better for us.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: I have a mathematical question. The way that I'm looking at it is each hour, if you decide to give the .25, et cetera, each hour in a three-semester course rank is worth .333333. The fourth hour is worth .25. Whereas, when we had three, four, and five, each hour was worth one credit so that the fourth hour is worth the same amount of credit as the third, second, and first hour. Could you explain?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: I don't think all the hours are worth the same. For example, if you are taking a class which meets three hours a week it's probably not the same if you are taking some other course and meets three hours a week but you have to go work outside the class. So not all the hours are the same. That keeps the 1.25 would give you the option if you teach four hours, maybe your course is 1.25 or maybe it's 1.5 depending on how much outside work you are doing. If the fourth hour is not as much as the others, for example, for recitation which less is required from the students then it should be 1.5. If it's something that requires a lot of writing and somebody will be checking the writing outside the class then maybe it's 1.5.

The system has a disadvantage that all hours might look the same unless you want the fourth hour not to count for anything.
DEAN ABRIOLA: Hi, Linda Abriola, dean of engineering. Some of my colleagues asked me to speak to our point, some of our points of view. So we share somewhat of Vida's concern about the math, being engineers. So I guess one of the major reasons we're supportive of the 3, 4, 5 is first of all that would put us in line with most of the universities in the country. Most universities have the Carnegie system and one credit hour is one Carnegie unit. Regardless of the answer that we heard, I believe that if you get a credit it's a Carnegie unit and it counts for one Carnegie unit. So we have to be able to transfer to Carnegie units for this system. So it makes it very easy. The second is if you have transfer courses from another university you can transfer the credits. You don't have to worry about how to convert them because most other universities use this system, so you can just transfer them directly. This will allow courses to have full Carnegie units. In the rare case that there's a huge amount of work it can be even be five Carnegie units and the math is very easy to do. I have heard that the argument about the cost in SIS to implement, I'm glad to hear that that is off the table because that is one of the major arguments I heard for not going with the 3, 4, 5. Regardless of which system we go to, we're going to have to make a huge change here. We're going to have to evaluate every class that we teach. So from some of those perspectives it's much better to go with a system that's mostly universal other than going to a system that I'm not sure, I think there may be one or two institutions in the country use. So that doesn't seem to make sense. So thank you for letting me speak.

PROFESSOR BERNHEIM: Harry Bernheim, biology. I agree with Dean Abriola because if you have students who apply to graduate schools and professional schools very often they ask you once they receive the transcript from Tufts, what does this all mean. They look at the value of one credit here equals four semester units but nonetheless if we adopt the 1.25, 1.5, et cetera, it's going to create more chaos. They see no reason to adopt a system which is almost semi-genuine as far as what it represents. So it's much better to try the majority of this case to make the translation much more for the user.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Roger Tobin, Physics. I want to reiterate all of those comments. I think going with 3, 4, 5 just makes sense. It's what everybody else uses and it avoids all these translation problems. Frankly, I prefer dealing with integers. I would much rather add 3, 4, 5's than add 1.25 and 1.75. I think it's going to be much more confusing and it's going to be a lot more hassle for all of us regardless.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Thank you, EPC. We asked EPC to explain the advantages of one system versus the other and you decided you couldn't do that. But in all fairness, is there anybody that wants to speak on behalf of the fractional system?

PROFESSOR PROCTOR: David Proctor, history department. I don't see actually that moving to the 1, 1.25 is actually going to be particularly more difficult than moving to the 3, 4, 5. I think in addition for me the benefit of the 1, 1.25 is there's a little bit more flexibility, maybe not a huge amount, but a little bit more. From my familiarity, the courses in arts and sciences, not engineering, but arts and sciences. It would seem to me that actually for art courses the 1, 1.25
would give us significant flexibility in how we figure out what's a 1, what's a 1.25.

I also disagree as far as the equally ease of implementation. I could be wrong but my personal view is that going to 1, 1.25 in some ways is going to be easier because courses that are currently one credit for the most part will stay one credit. There will be a handful that will be bumped up to the 1.25. As an advisor with a large number of advisees I don't necessarily see it more difficult to compute a 1, 1.25 as opposed to a 3, 4, 5. My personal view is that I actually would rather deal with 1, 1.25 than 3, 4, 5.

Lastly, as far as everybody else doing that, I can't argue with. Pretty much everybody else does do it. My experience has only been at Tufts, all my degrees are from Tufts, so this is the system that I'm used to. So that plays in to this as well certainly, but more broadly I think that overall the 1, 1.25 is going to be more effective for us.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: I would like to say I agree with David in terms of the 1.25 would benefit a lot of the courses that have recitation. The full might be a little bit too generous with them. As a mathematician I would say that the fractions are not that bad. If anybody needs help, I will be glad to help.

PROFESSOR GOLDSTEIN: Gary Goldstein, physics and astronomy. What are some examples of a 3 credit, 4 credit, and 5 credit course, and what about P.E. courses that are now half credit?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: Well, an example of a 3-credit course might be a course I'm teaching this semester. It's a literature survey course. It meets three hours a week. Students do X amount of reading, write a few short papers, take a final exam. Three semester hours, basically three class meetings, two hours a week of outside work. That would be one Tufts credit or three semester hours on either system.

Example of a 4-credit course or 4 semester hour course might be something that has one recitation in which the students are doing perceptible work. Say I'm taking an example from my department, classics -- Introductory to Classical Archeology, say where you've got three meetings of the preliminary group and one meeting of a break-out session. You've got papers, you've got the occasional field trip. That sort of thing.

An example of a 5-credit course, we don't have those in my department --

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Some courses have recitation, some not.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: It will be up to the department to figure it out. On the other hand, you asked about P.E. courses. Say a half credit yoga course, which people seem to be using as the definition of a fluff ball course. I'm working with a student who's majoring in religious studies and working on Hinduism and believe me, it's related to his thesis. Not a fluff ball course. But
that course or say a studio art course or a music performing ensemble where essentially all of what happens in class that will get less credit because less credits happen outside of class, just like we do now. So a course that's presently one half Tufts credit would probably still be a half of Tufts credit under the 1 system, could go as 2 credits or 2 semester hours or one semester hour under the other system depending on -- it's all going to be up to the individual departments.

PROFESSOR GOLDSTEIN: what about graduate courses?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Graduate courses, the master’s degrees still goes through the credit hours so they still have that requirement. Each department will have to evaluate both the undergraduate and the graduate courses and then they have to submit whichever evaluations they have for approval to the corresponding curriculum committee. In the case of 200-hour cases they probably would go to the graduate programs committee. But anything will have to be discussed and then approved by the committee, which is not different than what we are doing right now. It's the same thing what we are doing at the moment except that most courses go by one credit at the moment.

PROFESSOR ALLEN: Hi, Jennifer Allen, community health. I think I raised this at one prior meeting. It might've been in the A&S meeting but I think that the next logical discussion, or certainly related discussion, is faculty workloads and whether or not we move to one or the other system would affect that. I know that there is a faculty workload committee within A&S. I'm not sure if it's also in engineering. But it seems to me there should be cross-talk with that committee.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: So our committee doesn't deal with faculty workloads but I don't see that this should affect faculty workloads because you should teach the same courses you are teaching now. There is no reason why you should be changing your course. You are just going to get the credit that the course requires. Then if the deans decide that if you teach a course with more credits, than you have to teach less, then that's something that we don't discuss here. You have to discuss it with the deans (inaudible).

PROFESSOR ORIANS: The dean wants to talk.

DEAN GLASER: So I'm actually okay with either of the two options. I just to remind people why we're doing this, which is as a part of our NEASC accreditation – we are moving the finish line in arts and sciences from at present 34 courses to 40 courses. We're going to have to do it. So as a result we're trying to make it possible for the strides towards that finish line to be variable so that students will have the ability to cross that finish line. One of the things that I'm most concerned about is our retention and our ability to rush students to get their degrees.

So whatever it is that we do we're trying to make it possible for this to happen. Many of the four and five Carnegie unit courses or the 1.25 and 1.50 are courses that have laboratories, which right now are not counted as part of the progress toward degree, or recitations, which are not -- in some
places it is maybe, chemistry, I think, in one or two chemistry courses. But for the most part it's not the case. Those courses are taught independently or recitations are taught independently of the courses taught. So I think, Jennifer, the issue that you raised is something that Nancy, Bárbara, and I think about, faculty workload. We will take it into account but I'm not sure that it's going to have a real big impact on the outcome of what we do.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: Laura Rogers, education. I just want to say that I think one of the good reasons that I would advocate for the 3, 4, 5 mainly because it's transparent, not just because everybody else does it. There's actually a reason why everybody else does it, and I think that that level of transparency would make a lot of our jobs a lot easier, particularly when we are trying to translate Tufts credits and what students do here in to other arenas.

PROFESSOR FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. This is just a strange, historical note. About four or five years ago a group of students came to many science chairs and asked that the introductory science courses, in fact, reflect the lab component of that course and the credits counted towards the course. So they wanted it to count for one and a half versus one credit. Admittedly, these are very taxing courses, in terms of the time commitment, but in trying to figure out why on earth we have a system where every introductory science course does, in fact, count as a single credit despite that extra lab time.

It turned out that every school that I found that used the one credit system, and most of these were, in fact, Ivy League, though there were some others including us. Every school that used the one credit system for some reason counted all introductory science courses as a single credit even that lab component. You might ask, “Why? How did that ever come about?” And it may have changed now if, in fact, NEASC, is pressuring different schools to change their credit system. It may no longer be the case. But you might also think about it as the impact of those introductory courses, those classic gateway courses, on a student's final GPA.

Am I counting it as a single credit and does it minimize that terrible hit to the GPA. But every system we move forward with I think we should consider that waiting perhaps there are other fields where those introductory courses do, in fact, entail a larger time commitment, but maybe you don't want those gateway courses counting so heavily in terms of the GPA.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: That's exactly why we're going to let the departments determine how much each course is going to count for. If you guys know things like that that no committee knows. So that's why this is in our hands.

PROFESSOR FISHER: I just wanted to make one comment about the transition period. If we transition from the current system to the 1, 1.2, when you look at a grade or a credit you're going to be confused which unit system you're talking about or as we transition from the 1 system to the 3, 4, 5 system in addition to all the other benefits we've talked about, it will be very clear what you're talking about. I think that will be an advantage.
PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Except for the fact that when you translate courses they are going to be counted as four, but if you take it after the transition they are going to be counted as three. So that's going to be a real nightmare.

PROFESSOR ROSENBERG: Joel Rosenberg, Department of German, Russian, Asian Languages. I want to basically address the situation of film courses, which one of my courses involves a three-hour session one day a week, which includes a screening. I want to require that of students and therefore, it would be more plausible if we offered extra credit or at least credit hours or whatever fraction that is under either of those two systems. It requires all the departments that offer film classes to achieve some time of unanimity on that, and I just wanted to put that out there.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: We're getting towards discussion of things that are kind of not related to the question at hand because a question like Joel's comes up with whichever system we go with. It's a legitimate question. It needs to be discussed. You guys who teach film courses will work that out. But we're going to have to work it out the same way whether we're going with one Z or with three Zs.

So unless there were further questions about the merits of ones versus threes maybe we should start thinking about moving in the direction of perhaps voting.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Let's have a discussion. We have a little more time.

PROFESSOR GUTE: David Gute, civil and environmental engineering. I'd like to speak in favor of the semester hour option with some anecdotal data. My daughter recently graduated from a Canadian University and is applying to U.S. graduate schools. She had to submit her transcript for interpretation to beat out the lack of rate inflation in Canada. The grades are so inflated in Canada, unless you submit it to be re-interpreted into American grading standards you're not considered fairly.

The last thing I would like to see is a Tufts transcript being submitted to similar interpretive body to handle the Tufts credit system.

PROFESSOR SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. This question does not matter to the two systems but it's about some information you had on here about implementation. If you could clarify. The first bullet point says that during the next two years the committee will put together guidelines that departments can use for figuring out what's a three, what's a four, or whatever. But then the last bullet point says that students entering in fall of 2015 will have all the new credits on their transcripts and it's not clear how that will happen if we haven't yet decided what courses count towards what, unless you just give everything fours.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: They won't until their senior year. In the first three years they'll be on the present system, and then senior year -- the dates are unclear right now. That's going to be
worked out in a discussion with NEASC over the summer. So the dates are provisional and they (inaudible) by a year. There will be a class that will come in under the old system for three years and then their fourth year as seniors things will be new. That's all we intended to say by that.

PROFESSOR GOLDSTEIN: One more question. Are the decisions going to be left to the departments whether it will be 3, 4, 5 or 1.25?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: That decision gets made right here right now.

PROFESSOR GOLDSTEIN: I mean our Physics 11 is a 1.5-credit course. Will that be reviewed?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: That's right. It will be reviewed by the Committee on Curricula, the same as if you were decidedly right now -- if you had decided six months ago to change the value of that course to 1.4873 Tufts credits that would go to the Committee on Curricula. The Committee on Curricula would say; “Yes, of course they could do that,” and would approve it.

PROFESSOR GOLDSTEIN: How many thousands of courses are we talking about?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: Not many but presumably most of them will not change by that much. They'll be multiplied by three and then they -- if it's a department, all these courses have these credit hours. All these courses have a little bit more credit value because they have this or that component. Then all these courses have (inaudible) I don't think it's going to be that difficult. It's going to be a lot of work but it's not going to be that difficult. It's not going to come from the instructor. It's going to come from departments.

PROFESSOR THOMAS: Sam Thomas from chemistry. I just want to, not really speaking on behalf of either of the two systems, but just reminding folks what Dean Glaser said that basically what we're doing is it's important for departments I think to make sure there are enough courses in their catalog that are worth more than three credits because what will happen is if each course is currently worth one credit than to being worth three then that sort of stays as the status quo. Then each student will have to take five classes per semester as opposed to four. I wasn't at the previous meeting where we voted. I don't know if that was brought up, but I think that it is important for folks to recognize that departments should really consider carefully what sort of work could in some courses could lead to additional academic credit over the three or the ones so that student workloads aren't being increased because of what is really just the way we count hours. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can we call the question?

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: All in favor of closing debate?

ALL: Aye.
PROFESSOR MAHONEY: Any opposed? Now this is an unorthodox vote because in theory and principle you can't have a vote on something other than with a nay or yay.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR I BIGAS: We'll have to do one and then abstentions.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: Exactly.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Let's vote on one of the proposals first and see how many.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: That isn't going to work.

(Discussion without microphones amongst faculty)

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: What I propose, and this is unorthodox, so Mark is going to kill me but...I propose that we give you two options. Option one is to go by Tufts credits, the course is worth one or a fraction. Option two is to go by semester hours, the course is worth three or four whatever. Or you may abstain from voting. Is that clear to everyone? Does anyone object to an unorthodox procedure?

Then all in favor of Tufts credits, counting our courses as 1, 1.25, and so on, please raise your hand.

(Laughter and Applause)

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: All in favor of semester hours counting courses 3, 4, 5 please raise your hand. The threes have it.

(Applause)

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: If you wish to be recorded as abstaining from voting please raise your hand. I count eight. Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Thank you, EPC. We all have a lot of work ahead of us. The last item of business is, I don't know who wants to talk, Jeff Zabel and Shelly Krimsky, on faculty salaries, just a short report.

SUMMARY OF AAUP FACULTY SALARY ANALYSIS

PROFESSOR ZABEL: So Tufts has a history under auspices of AAUP collecting faculty salary data for AS&E and using this information to run regressions, which I'll talk about in a second. We've been doing this for many, many years. Shelly and I in particular did it for 10, 15 years. We took a break for three years because we were tired and now we're back again rejuvenated.

So we have done a report for academic year '14, '15 and we wanted to talk about this briefly. We don't have time to do a full report, which we usually do. We're hoping to do that in the fall where we have a screen and can show you some slides and things like that. But we're just going to talk
right now.

So we have an internal report which I talked about which deals with actual Tufts salary data, and
we have an external report that Shelly does which uses data in comparison to our peers. So we
want to talk briefly about that and then have a much longer discussion potentially sometime in the
fall. If you want a copy of the report, which is here, it's two parts, you have to pay for it, ten
bucks. Join AAUP. Anil is back there. He's our secretary. You give him ten bucks you get
the report. Ten bucks is not a bad deal.

We also are hoping to meet with the provost actually to talk about this in the near future as well.
If you have any input you are welcome to meet with Shelly or I about this.

So what I do is I'm the regression guy. I get the salary data for AS&E and historically what we've
done with this data is to run regressions. We're trying to predict individual salaries based on a
number of characteristics, those being gender, race, rank, years in rank, chair, lateral hire. Then
we have four area indicators, whether you're in humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, or
engineering. The original purpose was to look for gender and race disparities. For many years
we really haven't found large disparities either in the statistical sense or even in a practical sense in
that regard.

One use of this regression is you can put in your own characteristic, get the value, compare that to
your actual salary, and decide if you're underpaid or overpaid.

Now the one thing that we do not include in these regressions is any measure of productivity other
than rank. So that's something to take into consideration when you're looking at these
regressions.

We also have, for example, we calculate the average annual increase in salaries. And between
academic year '13-'14 and '14-'15 the nominal increase for all faculty was 2.55 percent. If you
look at continuing faculty and rank it doesn't take promotion into consideration compared to
people who were there in both years it was 3.2 percent. That is a nominal amount. The real
amount we don't know because the year is not over so we can't calculate inflation, maybe one or
two percent, so you can subtract that and get the real increase is somewhere in the vicinity of one or
two percent.

So I also have a beautiful graph on wage inversion if you want to see what years in rank compares
by rank. It's pretty flat. We know that in academics there's not much of an increase relatively
wages over time. But you can look at my graph if you pay ten bucks. So I'm going to pass this
over to Shelly so I don't have to talk anymore and he's going to tell you a little bit about the external
analysis.

PROFESSOR KRIMSKY: So for the past 15 years or so we've used three indicators and we've
used them pretty much the same way. We collect the data, we get the data from the AAUP, which
produces it every year. They poll about 3,000 universities. They maybe get 1,500 or so responses from the universities. We've used three indicators. New England category one research institutions as one. Private independent category one research institutions, the second. The third are the eleven Tufts selected peer institutions. We have continuing data, as I say, running over 15 years. So let me -- we also look at the so-called percent rankings for all category one research institutions. The hope was many years ago that we could ever reach the 80 percent ranking including public and private institutions that was something the faculty had (inaudible).

The good news is that we do better than public institutions. Whereas, that's not what our comparison group is, but anyway that's the good news. The not so good news is that in every one of these categories; private independent, category one New England, and Tufts eleven peer institutions, we have always fallen behind the average in each of the categories. That's been true for many years. What's different, however, between 2010-11 and 2013-14 is that we have fallen behind faster or larger. Let me give you an example. In the private independent category the professors in 2010-11 were $17,778 behind the average private independent. In 2013-14, I use that year because the March data just came out. I didn't have a chance to integrate the March data. So using 2013-14. So between 2010-2014 the deficit, let's say, from Tufts professors, $17,000, went to 30,000. Associates from $340, which was the deficit, to 5,800. Assistants from 3,000 to 7,400.

So we are falling behind in those three categories. For a category one New England institutions it's even worse. The deficit from the averages for professors was 10,800 and it's risen, I know it's hard to understand but I kept checking the data, to $63,000 for professors. It's almost unconscionable. I mean, I don't know how either they do it or we do it. One or the other but it seems kind of strange. Associates from 4,000 to 32,000. Assistants from 1,000 to 28,994. For Tufts eleven peer institutions we are also seeing a decline. Professors 32,800 went to 37,780. Associates 10,000 to 14,000. Assistants 13,000 to 13,800. That was the closest, an $800 difference on the assistant professors at the eleven peer institutions.

I have about 20 of these extra copies that I'm happy to pass around.

UNKNOWN PERSON: For free?

PROFESSOR ZABEL: A dollar twenty-five.

PROFESSOR KRIMSKY: I have to say one other thing and that is these comparisons of other institutions is not perfect because every institution has different programs that are included in the AAUP survey. For example, in our survey we include the Fletcher School. We include the Dental School, it's normalized to nine months. We don't include the medical school. Other institutions may have business schools that they include. So we're not comparing departments by departments or even schools by schools. But these data that are recorded are (inaudible) and they talk about trends. So there's something in the trends that are changing. Even if the comparisons are not perfect for each institution there is a trend shift that does look concerning.
There is another, Dawn Terkla told me there's another database that has not department, but discipline by discipline comparisons. I looked at that database. I downloaded all the universities associated with it. Not a single one of our peer institutions is in that database. And for the private institutions the majority of the private institutions are religious affiliated institutions. I didn't feel it was a good comparison. Maybe in a few years they'll be growing in their number of universities that participate. I notice new universities are participating and Tufts participates in that particular database. But anybody can go on to that database and look and check their own discipline if they so would like.

That's all I can say right now.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Thank you both of you. Are there any questions.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, German, Russian, Asian. As someone who participated on many of these, looked at these salary information. A couple of things, and I'm surprised to find myself announcing something in defense of the administration and to explain something that may have caused part of this disparity. Sitting on T&P the last few years we've seen a lot of promotion cases, which means if you notice that the group back in 2010 that had the smallest disparity between us and our other cohort, those were the associate professors because we had lost senior associate professors. Now there's been a lot of push in the administration to get associate professors promoted to full professor, of course, the requisite credentials et cetera. So a lot of those more senior, perhaps associate professors, have become the junior full professors with lower salaries. I don't know whether you've considered that, but that seems to me like a relevant thing that has happened because we've also seen the biggest disparity in the senior professor in full professor cohort, which this would explain (inaudible).

But the other thing, I just want to make sort of an overall comment about what all of this means. First, to remind us that we all took a pay cut, that is, our salaries were frozen, what year was that, '08-'09, and it was at that time, as I understood, a promise to try and catch up with that. We all kind of reset our salaries and I'm thinking now, let's see, even the two percent over five years even without any compounding effect would've been quite a lot more money to each of us would have had in our pockets. So I think that issue has to be addressed because there was a kind of promise that, you know, when times were better we would see some of that come back to us.

Finally, the overall picture. Salaries are a big part of the budget. You're talking about tenure ranks. We're not talking about part-time and we're not talking about lecturers. Right now part-time salaries are going up leading to kind of a perfect storm. Part-time salaries are going up. Full-timers are trying to negotiate higher salaries as well, and the full-time lecturers and then the full-time tenured faculty I think will need to have some serious negotiation with the administration to make sure that they're appropriately paid considering our status among universities, faculty status within the profession, et cetera.

PROFESSOR MIRKIN: Thank you so much for doing this. It's really incredible. You know
the numbers based on my conversation with my peers and other institutions around here we are actually underpaid compared to most research universities certainly in this area in New England. This is really a serious issue for me as a department chair. How do you retain your best effort. Because with the disparity, which you find here, what happens here at Tufts is you have a relatively small bump when a person is promoted to associate professor. It's more than a merit increase but it's not huge. Then another relatively small bump when a person is being promoted to a full professor. Compared to many other institutions they increase your salary by usually 40 to 50 percent. We have not come near to that. They have a lot more endowed chairs so if they can do it, we should too. There are other reasons. But for me as a chair, probably a discussion that should be on the floor, is how can we retain our best effort here if our peer institutions would gladly recruit them and pay them more. We are in big trouble. That's what I wanted to say.

PROFESSOR ZABEL: Way back in the olden days 20 years ago we actually got adjustments, that is, when the salary went up for entry level assistant professors department-wide we got increases comparable to that. Twenty years ago, you may remember, 25 I've been here now. We've gotten those a couple of times. We haven't seen anything like that in 20 years. So that might be a way of adjusting that.

PROFESSOR MAHONEY: Following up on Vida's question. Anne Mahoney, classics. So those figures don't include full-time non-tenure track faculty and another important factor is what percentage of the full-time faculty is on the tenure-track and what percentage is not. We've fallen behind in that.

PROFESSOR ZABEL: We only get data on tenure-track faculty so we can't answer that question.

DEAN GLASER: About three-quarters of the full-time faculty are on the tenure track. We have about 280 tenure stream faculty in arts and sciences. 300. Some of it varies of course month to month. 360 is full-time faculty, that's not tenure stream. But bottom line is three-quarters of the faculty roughly are tenure stream.

PROFESSOR KRIMSKY: AAUP produces data on this and they have data from 1975 to 2011. The full-time tenure and tenure faculty at all universities increased by 23 percent. The full-time executives increased by 141 percent. The full-time non-tenure track faculty increased by 259 percent. Part-time faculty 286 percent. And full-time non-faculty professionals 360 percent. So university-wide there seems to be increases everywhere except full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty across the United States.

PROFESSOR ART: David Art, political science. I was hoping someone else would raise it but the big elephant in the room is the high cost of living in the Boston area as well. So when AAUP compares other universities that point is often left out to account for the cost of living.

PROFESSOR KRIMSKY: One indicator we use is New England private institutions and that's
the closest we can get to the Boston area. We look at those trends and realize they are trying to account for the cost of living.

PROFESSOR ZABEL: Would it be possible to come up with a cost of living adjusted wage in comparison?

PROFESSOR ART: I guess the point I would make is that compared to San Francisco, I mean, Boston faces -- Tufts faces two problems behind our peers and we're lost in that overall part of the calculation. So in some ways I think the numbers are worse than they look, unfortunately. Thanks.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: It was stunning how far behind we are in two of your comparative groups, though we weren't nearly as far behind or falling nearly as fast compared to our nominal competitors. So it sounds like there's something about our nominal competitor group that is systematically different from the other comparison groups here we're talking about and I wonder if you guys have any idea what that common denominator is? It seems to me we've only fallen a little bit over the (inaudible) compared to that group, whereas, we've fallen (inaudible) compared to the other two.

PROFESSOR KRIMSKY: We were pretty far in that group to begin with. We were in 2010, we were 33,000 already behind. So then we got to be 38,000 behind. So we were so far behind that maybe, you know, we didn't quite score as well as the other groups did. That's the only thing I can think of.

PROFESSOR CELICHOWSKA: If there's any way we could consider trying to get data on part-time and full-time salaries in comparison to other institutions I think it might be useful in the future. It seems like you guys are already doing an immense job, but I don't know how that could happen.

PROFESSOR ZABEL: We can certainly do that and request it of the administration.

PROFESSOR CELICHOWSKA: I just think because it seems to be on the increase at this institution and other institutions it would really fill out the whole picture. So that would be a request that I'd like to make.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Thank you very much. I mean, you do that all on your own time.

(Applause)

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Thank you, all. This is our last AS&E faculty meeting. I thank you on behalf of Fulton Gonzalez and myself and the Executive Committee for your cooperation and help. I want to say next year it will be Judith Haber and Roger Tobin who will chair the Executive Committee and hopefully we'll have a quiet time. Thank you.
(Meeting adjourned)

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Jillian Dubman
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering
AS&E Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, April 29, 2015

Schedule and Location

Wednesday, April 29, 2015, 12:00 PM – 1:20 PM
Coolidge Room, Ballou Hall
Light lunch, coffee, and water served at 11:30 AM
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Announcements

Old Business

   Vida Johnson, Chair of T&P Committee

New Business

Introduction of Julien Carter, Vice President of HR
   Patricia Campbell, Executive Vice President

Introduction of Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Chief Diversity Officer
   Tony Monaco, President

Discussion and vote on the unit to be used to assign credit to Tufts courses
   Montserrat Teixidor I Bigas and Anne Mahoney, Co-Chairs of Educational Policy Committee (EPC)

Summary of AAUP Faculty Salary Analysis
   Shelly Krimsky, Professor of UEP, and Jeff Zabel, Professor of Economics

Adjournment

For Reference
*Please print all attachments and bring them with you to the meeting; a limited number of hard copies will be available at the meeting.

- Briefing Information
- Proposed T&P process for Bridge Hires
- EPC Proposal

Listings of future faculty meetings as well as the agenda and attachments for this meeting are online at http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/meetings/.

Below the Line Announcements

AS&E Diversity Fund Proposals due May 15, 2015 for Fall events and activities.
Briefings

Announcements

Old Business


*Speakers:* Vida Johnson, Chair of T&P Committee

**Summary:** Statement 11 update on T&P Procedures for:

1. “Bridge” Professorships in AS&E
2. MOU hires with a primary department and secondary unit (former Interdisciplinary hires....)

**Key issues:** How to make sure that there is appropriate input from all relevant units in the tenure process for hires with responsibilities in more than one unit/department/school.

**Action Required:** Vote on #1. Update on #2.

**Further Information:** See attached document on “Bridge” Professorships

New Business

**Introduction of Julien Carter, Vice President of HR**

Julien C. Carter is the Vice President for Human Resources. In this role he collaborates with the university community to ensure that human resource practices, policies, and systems at Tufts are aligned with institutional priorities, attuned to changing workplace demographics and supportive of individual employees.

Julien joined Tufts University in January, 2015. Prior to Tufts, Mr. Carter served as the founding Vice President for Human Resources at Khalifa University for Science, Technology and Research in the United Arab Emirates, and Chief Human Resource Officer at both the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Louisville. In addition, he was the Commissioner of Employee Relations for the State of Minnesota in the cabinet of Governor Jesse Ventura.

Julien holds a B.S. from Missouri State University, M.A. from Truman State University, and J.D. from the University of Missouri-Columbia. He is also is a former Captain in the United States Army Reserve.
Introduction of Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Chief Diversity Officer

For the past 14 years, Dr. Brimhall-Vargas has served as the Deputy Chief Diversity Officer (DCDO) at the University of Maryland, College Park. In this role, Dr. Brimhall-Vargas served as a leader for faculty, students, and staff across the university on all diversity and inclusion issues. He helped the institution implement projects outlined in their Diversity Strategic Plan and led a university-wide effort to overhaul Maryland’s search process to assure equity, diversity, and efficiency in its hiring practices. Prior to this appointment, which began on April 6, 2015, Dr. Brimhall-Vargas managed the University of Maryland’s Words of Engagement, which developed into one of the nation’s most successful intergroup dialogue programs.

Dr. Brimhall-Vargas has faculty teaching experience at the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) in Washington, Loyola University of Maryland, and the Jaypee University of Information Technology in India. Dr. Brimhall-Vargas was recently selected by USIP leadership to provide facilitation training services to conflict resolvers in Israel and the West Bank. Originally from Albuquerque, NM, Dr. Brimhall-Vargas earned his B.A. from Pomona College in 1990, a Master’s Degree in Public Policy from Harvard University in 1992, and received his Ph.D. in Social Foundations of Education from the University of Maryland in 2011.

Discussion and vote on the unit to be used to assign credit to Tufts courses

Speakers: Montserrat Teixidor I Bigas and Anne Mahoney, Co-chairs of Educational Policy Committee

Summary: During the last AS&E faculty meeting on March 25, 2015, faculty members approved a proposal that Tufts courses should be awarded credit proportional to the amount of work required to complete them. We now need to decide which one of the two proposed systems we will use.

Action Required: Discussion and vote of the two possible units of credit

Further Information: See attached descriptions of the two options

Summary of AAUP Faculty Salary Analysis

Speakers: Shelly Krimsky, Professor of UEP, and Jeff Zabel, Professor of Economics

Summary: The average salary increase among continuing faculty in rank in Arts & Sciences over the most recent two academic years was 3.2%. There is evidence that Tufts is falling significantly behind salaries of Private-Independent Category 1 Universities and when compared to peer institutions.

Key issues: Competitiveness of Tufts faculty salaries compared to peer institutions

Action Required: Meeting with members of the administration to discuss salary issues

Further Information: A copy of the full report is available to dues-paying members of AAUP (contact Anil Saigal)
Proposed changes to Statement 11 for “Bridge Professorships” within AS&E

April 9, 2015

Rationale for these changes
The AS&E Tenure and Promotion Committee was charged with providing a new set of guidelines outlining the tenure and promotion review process for faculty who will be seeking tenure and promotion in more than one department. Hereafter, such positions will be called “Bridge Professorships.”

According to the Office of the Provost, “Bridge Professors will hold tenure (or its equivalent) in at least two units. During the initial five years of their appointments, Bridge Professors will be partially supported by funds from the Provost’s Office. The goal is to have at least 5 to 10 Bridge Professors on campus once the program reaches maturity.” Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that the procedures described in this memo will apply to a very small number of cases, all of which are likely to be lateral hires in which the candidate already has tenure at another institution. For this reason, subcommittee meetings with outside experts are not included in these procedures.

Although Bridge Professors could seek tenure in AS&E and outside of AS&E, the procedures outlined here apply only to Bridge Professors whose departments fall within AS&E. The T&P committee has discussed what procedures in more complex cross-school appointments might look like, but discussions with other schools has not yet begun.

All references to Statement 11 in the procedures below refer to Part 3: Expedited Lateral Hires.

PROPOSED BRIDGE PROFESSORSHIP TENURE PROCEDURES INVOLVING TWO OR MORE DEPARTMENTS WITHIN AS&E

These tenure and promotion procedures will apply to any faculty member who was hired as a “Bridge Professor” within AS&E. A Bridge Professor will hold tenure (or its equivalent) in at least two units.

1. Development of joint preparator panel: A joint preparator panel will be formed with one member from each department. The preparators will work together to prepare the case, following the procedures outlined in steps 1-4 in part 3 of Statement 11.

2. Choosing External Evaluators: In consultation with their departments, the preparators will work together to compile a joint list of external evaluators. The list should balance the disciplinary concerns of the departments. They will each present this list to their own departments, along with a set of names offered by the candidate independently. The procedures should follow those outlined

---

in steps 5-7 in part 3 of Statement 11. At departments’ meetings, the departments will consider the external evaluators suggested by the preparatory panel and the candidate and suggest changes, if necessary. After each department has discussed the list and provided feedback, the preparator panel will meet to finalize the list and forward it to T&P. A total of 5 letters is needed for the dossier. With the approval of T&P, 2 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. If this issue was not addressed at the time of the search, an addendum should be requested.

3. *Information given to departments:* The departments will have access to all of the usual materials involved in tenure cases (outlined in Statement 11) and will use that material in their evaluations. The procedures for department meetings, voting, department statements, and confidential letters outlined in Statement 11 (steps 8-13 in part 3) will apply.

4. *T&P meeting:* All procedures regarding how the T&P Committee operates outlined in Statement 11 apply (steps 15 & 16 in part 3).

5. *Dean and Provost Evaluation:* The Deans will make their individual recommendations on the case to the Provost and President. If T&P recommends tenure, but one of the participating departments or deans does not, the Provost may recommend that the tenure sit only in the department and/or school that recommended tenure.

6. *Promotion to Full after Having Tenure across Schools:* For a faculty member hired in more than one school as an associate professor, subsequent promotion to full professor will proceed in a similar fashion, with a joint preparator panel formed across departments.
Assigning Credit to Courses

Proposal from EPC, 29 April 2015

On 25 March the AS&E faculty voted to change the requirements for graduation so that they conform to federal requirements, and in particular to assign credit to courses in a way that reflects the amount of learning time that the course requires.

Today's proposal is to choose a specific unit of credit for AS&E. There are two options:

**Option 1: Use the Tufts Credit.** One Tufts Credit will be worth 3 semester-hours. Courses will be assigned a multiple of .25 Tufts Credits, from 0.25 up to 2. Students will need 40 credits to graduate.

**Option 2: Use the Semester-Hour.** Courses will be assigned a whole number of semester-hours, from 1 to 6. Students will need 120 semester-hours to graduate.

After this choice is made, implementation will get started. This summer, AC3 and EPC will bring the faculty’s decision to NEASC and check with them on the implementation timeline. Any dates in the present document are provisional and may change based on consultation with NEASC. Changes will be announced to students and to the AS&E community as soon as they are approved, but will not take effect immediately. The new credit requirement for graduation will be phased in gradually for classes that will matriculate during the transition (and so will have some of their courses under the old system and some under the new system).

Though we’re not discussing the implementation at today’s meeting, we include some information below.

During the next two years:

- EPC and the Curricula Committees of the two schools, consulting with other faculty, the Registrar, and the Deans, as necessary, will write guidelines for assigning the credits to courses.

- Departments and programs will review their courses in light of the credit guidelines. For courses that are worth something other than the “standard” value given by the guidelines, the department will supply the correct credit value to its school’s curriculum committee, with justification. The curriculum committee will approve or contest the request, according to our existing procedures. The design of any particular course does not need to change. Courses will be labelled based on what they actually consist of, as designed by the faculty who teach them.

- Departments and programs will also review the definitions of their majors and minors. For example, a major may allow 3 elective courses — should that be 3 courses, or 3 Tufts Credits (or 9 semester-hours)?

- Faculty committees (including EPC, Academic Standing and Honors, Academic Review Board, and so on) and the Deans will begin review of all academic policies that currently assume one course = one credit, such as the definition of full-time status, the rules for Deans’ List honors, the
rules for academic probation, distribution requirements, and all the rest. Any non-trivial changes will require a vote of the faculty.

In Fall 2018 (probably):

- All courses will take on their new credit values.
- Students matriculating that fall will be subject to the new requirements: an undergraduate degree will require a minimum of 40 Tufts Credits or 120 semester-hours.
- New graduation requirements will be phased in gradually. Students who enter between Fall 2015 and Fall 2018 will have both new-style and old-style credit values on their transcripts. A transition plan will determine the requirements for graduation for these entering classes. For GPA calculations, under the Tufts Credit system, courses taken under the old system will still count as 1 Tufts Credit, and under the semester-hour system, courses taken under the old system will count as 4 semester-hours. There will be a “hardship committee” to which students can appeal if they believe these changes have made it difficult for them to graduate.