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PRESIDENT MONACO: Welcome everyone. The meeting is now open, and I hand it over to the chairs of the Executive Committee.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Hello, I'm Christiane Zehl Romero, one of the co-chairs of the Executive Committee. Fulton Gonzalez, wherever he is; is another one. We'll share on the pleasure of presiding, or whatever you call it over these meetings. I want to start right away by calling on Amy Schlegel, the Director of the Tufts Gallery, to make an announcement about an upcoming event.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

UPCOMING TUFTS GALLERY EVENTS
DIRECTOR SCHLEGEL: Hi everybody. Amy Schlegel, Director of Galleries and Collections, for those who maybe do not know. I just wanted to take a minute to invite you all personally to two events coming up on September 30th and October 15th that we've designed for you, for faculty. It's really just a social get together with our new educator Liz Cantor. We'd love to introduce you to some artful thinking strategies that may help you in your teaching and in utilizing objects in your teaching if that's of interest to you. We're going to focus on our current exhibition, which is called Manna, Masterworks from the Tufts Permanent Art Collection that just opened last week along with the Jumbo show, which I know you all know about curated by Professor Andrew McClellan.

I'd like to invite you September 30th, October 15th, again 4:00-5:15 PM. Liz Cantor is an experienced educator. She's also a Jumbo class of '98 and a 2001 grad of the Harvard School of graduate education, so she is really ready to go. We have reached out to a number of you for one-on-one meetings. Your participation and feedback are really going to help us figure out what strategy to take in the future. So we'd love to see you all at one of these wine and cheese receptions. There's some flyers around the table just as a reminder.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Any new business announcements to be made? Okay, then I call on Yannis Ioannides for committee elections for T&P.

NEW BUSINESS

OPEN NOMINATIONS FOR T&P COMMITTEE ELECTION
PROFESSOR IOANNIDES: Thank you very much, Christiane. So I'm here on behalf of the Committee on Committees. Our chair, Ioannis Evrigenis, could not be here today and he's apologizing. Our committee will facilitate an election for a member of Tenure and Promotion Committee who has to be from arts and humanities. This will be a full term on the committee starting May 1, 2015 and this ending April 30, 2018. As I said a full term for three years. The Committee on Committees will use Qualtrics to conduct the election even though the election is normally in the spring. The balloting will be open during October 1st to 3rd. What we expect faculty to do and urge faculty to do is to go on our site, the committee site. There will be two nominations there. The nominated faculty there now, Christopher Schmidt Nowara and Susan
Napier, from history and GRALL. The site also contains the full list of eligible faculty for this election. So please do try and nominate good people and you should write Ioannis Evrigenis by September 25th, that's when the nominations will close. The results will be announced on October 8th. Thank you.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: The next agenda item is a discussion, not a vote yet, a discussion of the EPC proposal on online course evaluations. I call on Montserrat Teixidor, did I say that right, to present it.

DISCUSSION OF EPC PROPOSAL ON ONLINE COURSE EVALUATIONS

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: So that's a proposal from EPC about a few changes to the course evaluation. The first change that we are proposing is to extend slightly the time in which course evaluations are being carried out. So right now, we still have one week before the end of classes until the end of the reading period. The proposal is, remember that usually classes end on a Monday so that means that they start filling out evaluations on a Tuesday. The proposal is to extend that so they will have the weekend, the additional weekend, before that. So they will have from Friday evening till Monday. That comes at the request of the students in EPC who found that they don't have enough time to fill out the evaluations.

We are trying to balance the request of some faculty who think that evaluations should not be done until the course is done. Because that means adding maybe one class to some courses, most courses the ones that start on Mondays, the others won't have any additional classes (inaudible) to fill evaluations and they have not met yet. So that should not have a big influence on what the students write. That's the first proposal.

The second proposal is that students should be able to revise whatever they submit during that period, not at any other time, in case either they make a mistake and they evaluate the wrong course or they want to come back, which happens; or they want to come back to the evaluations for whatever reasons, maybe because the instructor of the course ask some specific questions and they already filled their evaluation; or they have to stop in the middle to do something else and they want to spend more time on that.

Then there is a third proposal that is coming because of two different reasons. The proposal is to make the evaluations available, the numerical part of the evaluations, which would be the averages of course, available to the students. That would be done only in case the students fill out, their evaluations, the previous semester, all of them.

The goal of these change is two things. The first is that we would like the students and the students want to have these evaluations rather than check ratemyprofessor.com or more unreliable source of information that they are currently using when they choose their courses.

The second is that because filling the evaluations serves a civic purpose because other students will be able to see them they might feel encouraged just for good reason to fill them. Finally, some people who might not have such a civic consign they might want to see evaluations anyway, and
they might fill them so that they can themselves see them.

So the proposal is what I said, they will be able to see the evaluation only if they fill evaluations from the prior semester and every first-year semester student will have the right, automatically, like anybody who fills out evaluations the previous semester.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I'll open the discussion.

DEAN GLASER: Jim Glaser, dean of arts and sciences. Just a little background, about eight, nine years ago this faculty did vote to make course evaluations available to the students. In fact, we did in 2005 and 2006 because the student senate, they were pressing for this. One very energetic fellow on the senate acquired the data. We provided him the data on the basis of the scope and then he manually entered all the data so that the students could see it. He graduated and that no longer happens.

So the point is that there will be a more automatic process by which these data will be made available to the community.

The second point I want to make is that, just to add one thing to what Montserrat said, which is that this idea that you have to fill out the evaluations yourself in order to see the evaluations is a way to provide incentive for students to do this, to fill them out. Our response rates are about 66 percent I think right now, maybe a little bit lower than that. The first time we did it they were about 75, 80 percent. So they're going down, and we do have concerns as other places have experienced that the response rates go down and with the response rates going down the liability of the outcomes are less.

So we will make sure that there are incentives built in for students to participate in this. One of the ways that some other places do this is to withhold grades. We think that some of the administrators, particularly in Dowling Hall, object to that as problematic for a variety of reasons, but this seems to be a way that actually is very directly connected to the activity of filling out the form. The reward is that you do get to see the evaluation, so it is sort of a stick or a carrot, well, it's one of the two or maybe both, to participate.

PROFESSOR MESSNER: Hi, I'm Bill Messner. I'm the chair of mechanical engineering, and I fully support the idea of having students have access to the data. I came from Carnegie Mellon. We did it there forever. Very helpful I think for the students, also maybe a little bit helpful for faculty. I really like the idea of withholding the access from students unless they fill it out. I will say that my response rates are 100 percent. I provide a very strong incentive for them to fill out the evaluations. If I may, I'll describe that. I only require two things. I give a very generous drop-grade policy. I can tell you what this is some other time, but basically they only have to do two things. One, they have to show up for the last day of class because we have an in-class evaluation or feedback where we do on the board what I call, “good or not as good.” There's no bad in this class. Then the other thing is they have to provide to me a printout or an email that says they completed the evaluation. I don't know what they wrote obviously. So I get 100 percent and I feel then I really know how I did.
One of the problems with declining evaluations as you know is basically two kinds of people respond; the people who love you and the people who hate you. The people who hate you hurt you a lot more than the people who love you help you, because mostly we’re around fours, right, but you can give a grade as low as one. So that's a minus three as opposed to a plus one. So there are ways without having to require grades to do this, but I think without asking anything of the faculty you can do it with this requirement for them to see it. So thank you.

PROFESSOR PEPALL: Lynne Pepall, economics. Do you provide on the online evaluations any summary statistics, sort of, you know, what are averages across certain kinds of courses, large courses, small courses, any sort of statistics to the students about evaluations?

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I don't know what you mean, but probably –

PROFESSOR PEPALL: I know that for a course you get your summary statistics. I'm just wondering if students get an idea of overall what evaluations look like for large courses, small courses? I mean, just any summary statistics?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: I'm not sure, not as far as I know.

PROFESSOR ALLEN: Hi, Jennifer Allen from community health. I think that's an important concern. We do know from empirical data that there are differences across class size, across upper-level and introductory-level courses. So I think giving students some basis for comparison is important because if you teach very small classes to a particular group of students who are really interested in your topic area, of course, you're going to have skewed evaluations.

The other concern I have, and I did read the policy, but my concern is about extending the additional time. I just want to make sure I'm understanding this correctly. So this additional time would extend it into exam period?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: It would extend it to Saturday, Sunday, and Monday before the last day of class.

PROFESSOR ALLEN: So one of my concerns is that if you provide, for example, grades on papers prior to that time. For me, there is the challenge that a student who is angry about their grade on a paper is then evaluating based on that grade that they received during that period.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Right. That's the reason why we don't want to extend it into exam time. But really you are going to provide grades on papers during the whole semester, not just during the last week, right? So that's why we don't extend it more in the other direction, but a little bit, a little tiny bit, because most people won't see any difference in the number of classes.

PROFESSOR ALLEN: Do you know that this extension of time will actually result in higher rates of completion?
PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: So we don't know when we can check it, but that's what the students in the community ask for. So we hope -- and it's the weekend, and during the weekend they have other time than during the week when they are at the end of the semester and preparing for classes as well.

PROFESSOR PINDERHUGHES: Hi, Ellen Pinderhughes, child development. I have a question about the intersection between items two and four. Item two is the possibility that students can revise their evaluation, and four is that students can see the completed course evaluation averages, et cetera. Is it going to be the case that after seeing the other course evaluations that students can then go back and revise or seeing the course evaluation is something that will happen after it's all closed?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: They can only revise during the period in which they are open. So they won't have access to the information other than the prior semester that they would have had already before. So they won't have any access to the student evaluations during that same semester while they are completing. We are going to extend it beyond or revise it during the exam period or after that. Just that one period they can go in to that same evaluation several times.

PROFESSOR CARLETON: Greg Carleton, chair of German, Russian, Asian. What is the window of time that a student can actually look at another instructor's evaluations; is it open all semester or is it just the week during registration or week before maybe? Or is it public knowledge that is out there for everyone in effect? There might be some unintended consequences of this information. I can think of tenuretrack faculty who might get a little nervous and things along those lines. But how long can a student look at this information?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Once they are there, they are there forever, but we haven't discussed that, so my assumption was that.

PROFESSOR CARLETON: So all semester they could look at this and go back to it and whatever?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Yes. What I do expect is that students will mostly look at it when they are deciding on what courses to take or maybe to change from one course to another at the beginning of the semester. I don't expect that they are going to spend all their time looking at the evaluations once they choose their courses.

PROFESSOR GARMAN: David Garman, economics. I'm in favor of the proposals and the intent of the proposals. I do have another question about the implementation providing the course evaluations. Is this going to be a case where an enterprising student could write a little script, scrape all the evaluation numbers off, and then just post them? If so, that's going to undercut the incentive.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: I don't know if they can submit something without the numbers, but maybe it can be set up so that they need to fill the numbers before they can submit or otherwise it
doesn't count. I am not sure if that's possible technologically. We can try to look into that if that's what the faculty feels it should be.

PROFESSOR COUCH: Alva Couch, computer science. As the person who teaches those students, I can tell you it is well within their capabilities, and if, in fact, you want them not to do this, you're going to have to get up pretty early in the morning and design a system not to do it. I would suggest a system like the SIS system that keeps you from scraping the student records. You're going to need that because if you don't prevent that once it's out, it's out. Unless you make it quite difficult these students have been very well trained to do exactly what you're worried about doing.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I have a question. What's the incentive for seniors in their last semester because I will assume that they are sort of a valuable group?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: The incentive of contribution to the community is still there. I do expect that seniors will be more responsible than the others. The incentive of looking at other people's evaluations, of course, is no longer there. I don't know if you want to include another thing that they've done for the evaluations that they don't get their diploma or they cannot march. We could add this.

SR. LECTURER POTT: Hi, Martha Pott, child study and human development. Obviously, this changes the recipient and the point of course evaluations from something that the instructor can use to improve practice to one that the instructor can also use but now the students can use to select classes. So it seems to me that there's a fundamental shift now in the goal from one of improving teaching as the sole purpose to pleasing students for whatever reason. I'm not suggesting that they won't select courses for the right reasons. It just surprises me.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: I think the incentive to please students is already there because a lot of the evaluation of the instructor is made based solely so you're a good teacher if your teaching evaluations are good. In many departments and many areas you won't get tenure easily if your evaluation is a number one in average. So part of that incentive is already there of pleasing the students. I don't see that it's more an incentive of pleasing the students. Maybe right now the students who are dissatisfied go to a professor and write something really wrong, and the average student who is okay with the class won't say anything. I believe that now it's going to be more representative of what you are really doing in the class than before.

PROFESSOR GREENHILL: Hi Kelly Greenhill, political science. Two questions: number one, I wonder if it's worth considering tabling this until we have an answer to how to deal with the scraping issue because in some sense we're going to be asked to move forward when we know there's a potential issue. So I don't know how people feel about that.

Number two, I wonder if Jim can say anything about why Dowling is opposed to holding grades. I was not present at the previous discussion earlier.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Well, the tabling issue is not on the table because we're only
discussing. We're not going to vote. Jim, can you –

DEAN GLASER: So I understand it, the concern is that if you withhold grades that there are some students whose grades are withheld who need to see them to make important decisions about their next semester particularly between the fall and the spring semester. And sometimes financial aid or probation issues that come up in that period of time where students do need to see their grades. Is Jean Herbert here or any of the alpha deans here because I'm representing their objection?

PROFESSOR BISHARA: Amahl Bishara, Anthropology. About the first change, making the evaluations earlier, I wonder if there's been any discussion about actually extending the time in the other direction or even -- I mean, now that they're online we have much more control or options about when we offer the evaluations in general. I think a lot of times a course comes together in the last class for example, or even while students are doing their final exam. I mean, obviously they're learning throughout the class, but things can come into shape and a lot of learning can happen while they're doing the final exam. So, you know, now that we don't have to sit down and give them a paper copy in class, seems to me that we might actually get a deeper sense of what they've gotten out of the class if we wait longer rather than extending earlier.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: There was discussion about that and the general sense is that we don't want to because of the reason that came up here that the main reason why they fill an evaluation one way or another is the final exam. They still have the time, if it's the last day of classes and they fill the evaluation before and they change their mind, they can still go back if we approve the number or revising so that's not a big deal, but going beyond doesn't seem appropriate to some people.

PROFESSOR MESSNER: Bill Messner again, chair of mechanical engineering. I just, I'm sorry for speaking a second time. The only reason is the system that I have devised is very successful for me, and I think it would be very successful for people around this room. The most important thing about this last day when I take part of the last lecture and actually have an in-class feedback, I tell them there are basically two reasons. One is it will save them time because most of the comments that they want to make to me are going to appear on the board. So that's one thing that kind of gets them, it's a little faster for them. The other is I'm very honest with them. I say, “Look, you are probably going to feel better about this class after you speak with me at the end of the class and have this feedback because I'm going to hear three kinds of complaints; the ones I knew about that I'm planning to change; the ones I didn't know about, thanks for telling me; and the third kind which is yes, I know it's not good but the alternatives are worse,” and I explain why.

Generally, they feel, “Oh, yes, he does care; he understands.” So they go in to the evaluations generally with a better feeling about the class. I also request, but I cannot force them, to turn in their evaluations after that last class when we have the in-class feedback for just the reasons I explained to them. So whether or not this passes or anything, if you're interested in anything about the good not as good and all that incentive stuff, feel free to email me, Bill Messner, chair of mechanical engineering. Thank you.
PROFESSOR RIDGE: My name is Jack Ridge. I'm in earth and ocean sciences. I was the chair of the committee that assembled the current online evaluation form. I have some concerns about the proposals, but I fundamentally agree with them. One thing I do not agree with, however, is the last paragraph of the proposal which says that EPC wants to consider the possibility of making some comments publicly available as well as exploring the possible additional one question to the evaluation soliciting comments that the respondent thinks would be useful to perspective students. They further say that what they would like to do is add a question to the evaluation form. I would strongly encourage you not to add any more questions to the form. It is already too long. Perhaps altering one of the questions, which is a more general open-ended question would be a more appropriate way of dealing with this. I also think it is problematic to put written comments out there from courses because even the committee recognizes that they would be screened and any information that would violate privacy laws or be contrary to the laws that frame freedom of expression. Who does the screening and on what principle is that going to be accomplished? I would not be in favor of making the written comments public in any way.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: I would like to clarify that this is not part of the proposal that we plan to vote on. So that's something that is going to the faculty for discussion if nothing else and maybe not now unless we have extra time.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: We have to close the discussion. We will bring the discussion back to the committee, and I don't know if we will slightly modify, and then at another meeting there will be more discussion taken.

The next point here is a discussion, actually a presentation of the move from Tufts Educational Daycare to an outside company, Bright Horizons. I call on Elizabeth Remick and John McDonald, the co-chairs of the Committee on Faculty Work/Life, who have spent an enormous amount of time and effort on that issue already, which came up in the summer. We all got an announcement which sounded okay, and we had no idea what the background of it was. Elizabeth and John, please.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOVE FROM TUFTS EDUCATIONAL DAYCARE CENTER (TEDCC) TO BRIGHT HORIZONS (PRESENTATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WORK/LIFE)
PROFESSOR REMICK: Hi, thanks for everybody for showing up today. What we'd like to do today is just to address some of the issues that Christiane mentioned and also to discuss the issues that we presented in the open letter to President Monaco about the university's decision to cease operation of TEDCC and to lease the center to Bright Horizons.

What I want to do first is just to give you a brief narrative about the events to give you some background and maybe some information that you might not have seen in the letter. I'd like to highlight some of the things that I think are the main issues raised by those events.

First of all, I'd like to start by saying that during 2013-2014 TEDCC had a tough year. There was
a lawsuit. There was a complaint which was investigated by the state licensor and was held to be unfounded. Then as a result of some of these events the center lost its NAEYC accreditation. That does not mean it lost its license. NAEYC accreditation is sort of an honor that the top eight percent or so of child care centers around the country get. It doesn’t mean that the center would be unviable therefore to be closed or anything like that. All of these things together raise flags for the administration it seems to us and sometime, we don’t know exactly when, but perhaps in early 2014, a decision was made, by who we don’t know, to outsource the center. We hear concerns about liability and also we hear the capacity of the dean of arts and sciences in that office to manage the center, which is strangely enough the office to which the center director reported. The budget for the center also is on the A&S budget.

We also think that we’ve heard some things that indicate that this decision was partly about cost as well. And we think that these concerns around liability and management and cost are reasonable concerns. The thing that they didn’t take into account, however, is how to deal with these issues. Universities around the country and also in our region have lots of different ways of dealing with the issues of liability, cost, and oversight. But the university did not make an effort to find out about them, and instead they decided to take the most hands-off approach of leasing the center to a big corporation. They made this decision in secret without consulting any of the other stakeholders and without seeking input from the experts on early childhood education at the university.

When John and I became involved in this it was in early June when the university was in the final stages of negotiating the contract with Bright Horizons. In other words, the decision had already been made and what we could do is to sort of change things at the margins maybe.

At the time that we were brought in we were told that we could not discuss anything at all about the transition to Bright Horizons with anyone else. So we were not allowed to ask for information or to inform anyone else on campus who might be a part of our constituency about what happened.

At the time we strongly suggested that negotiations be put on hold, that benchmarking take place, and that they consider again what they were doing, which was destroying a valuable asset of the university, when all they could see in the center was liability.

All of our suggestions that they reconsider were rejected as were a number that would’ve made the contract more beneficial for the Tufts community with regard to cost to users.

Then on July 15th the decision was sprung on the TEDCC families and the staff of the center with only six weeks before the start of the new school year. Ken is going to talk more about the consequences of that. In response to this decision, parents marched and protested, although most of us did not see it because we were elsewhere during the summer. Faculty members wrote a letter of protest asking that the decision be reversed. But all of these protests were rebuffed and on September 1 the center became Bright Horizons at Teele Square. It does not have Tufts University in the name anywhere.

For us the big issues that all of these things raise are number one, child care is a crucial work/life
issue that's clearly within the purview of our committee according to the committee's bylaws, but we were not consulted in a meaningful way or in a timely fashion. This is a blow to the idea of shared governance, and it is not okay.

Because of the secrecy, this is point two, because of the secrecy around the decision, a poor choice was made because it was made first, without benchmarking data; second, without information about what users needed and wanted; and third, without the knowledge of our in-house experts. Poor process has led to poor decisions. In this case a kind of childcare that many of us find inferior and will not be the kind of tool in recruiting and retaining excellent faculty that TEDCC was.

The TEDCC decision cannot be undone at this point because it's already gone as of September 1. We experience this as a terrible loss of a beloved and important work/life support. We're calling on the administration to re-address this through making a strong commitment to work/life issues. In particular, we urge the provost to form a university level childcare task force that will bring together all the stakeholders to produce a data-driven, binding plan for childcare provision across all of the schools.

Our intention here is to deal with the substantive problem of childcare but also to deal with the process problem by creating a mechanism where faculty, staff, students, and administrators can work together in a collaborative fashion taking into account the needs of all of the stakeholders. To us, this is what shared governance really should be.

(Applause)

PROFESSOR MCDONALD: I'm just going to segway from Elizabeth's remarks with a few of my own and lead in to Ken Garden who is going to speak after I do.

Obviously, it's a privilege to work with Elizabeth on this issue. I want to say that this is a new committee, the work/life committee. We're just in our second year, and I think this issue shows why it's important that we have it and that is has some teeth.

This was a big summer as Elizabeth explained. So the work/life committee had work/life issues of its own. The main one was that Elizabeth ended up doing a lion's share of the work that we had hoped would have happened before this decision was made. We have that documentation. It's basically what I think is equivalent to a significant research article. Forty-three pages I think was the document that you have.

So this points to a larger faculty issue, and it places childcare squarely in the realm of our core academic mission. It is vital to faculty research support. And it's also viable to attracting new faculty. Adequate childcare, or lack thereof, affects our colleagues' productivity, especially women, and faculty parents are marginalized when their needs are shoved aside inadvertently or not.

So we need to be proactive in proving this at Tufts. The Bright Horizons' outsourcing solution is not adequate into the future. So that's what I wanted to say. I'd like to turn the floor over to Ken
Garden for his viewpoint from the faculty who've been jolted by this decision.

PROFESSOR GARDEN:  Thanks.  So I'll be speaking as a parent whose children attended the Tufts Educational Daycare Center for four years while I was an assistant professor and whose daughter was going to attend the kindergarten at Tufts until the closing was announced in July.

These days childcare is a 20,000 plus dollar a year decision that parents start to make in December or January.  Researching preschools, visiting them, applying to them, waiting to see if their children are accepted, and then signing a contract committing to a preschool is usually in March.

This is an important decision not only because of the enormous cost involved but also because during the work week our children spend more time at preschool than they do with us.  As parents we're not simply looking for some place to keep our kids while we're at work, but a school that shares our values and acting as a partner in educating and socializing our children.

For many of us in this room the Tufts Educational Daycare Center was that partner.  It was an outstanding preschool in many ways.  Having sent our son briefly to a daycare where his teacher started wearing her "Thank God it's Friday" tee shirt on Wednesday, it was a wonderful surprise to find when I arrived here that as Tufts' faculty I could send my children to a preschool whose teachers were committed educational professionals who have advanced degrees in early childhood education usually from Tufts or pursuing them at Tufts.

Turnover at Little Tufts was low and teachers and staff were excellent.  TEDCC fostered a community around the school with performances and events put on by the children, regular (inaudible), but also talks given on issues in child raising, education, usually given by faculty from Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study and Human Development.  Both of my children loved their teachers without exception and are still in touch with some of them after we left the center.

As junior faculty TEDCC is not simply a conveniently located daycare center.  It is a preschool to which we sent our children with peace of mind as we taught our classes for the first time and wrote our books and articles for tenure.

Our experience was unique.  There were faculty from Harvard and MIT who sent their children to our preschool because they felt it was better than the ones their universities offered.  So activities and metrics that we here at Tufts understand and Tufts, Little Tufts, every year turned away more and more Tufts parents who applied to send their children because their application exceeded the number of openings.  One of my daughter's friends at her infant home daycare, a friend of hers applied to TEDCC and didn't get in so had to go to the daycare at Harvard.  That's not something you hear very frequently outside of that context.

When we were told in July that TEDCC would be closing in six weeks none of us in the Tufts faculty with children at the center could understand why.  It was such an exceptional center that had been supporting Tufts families for over forty years and shouldn't be closed at all.

We heard the concerns of the administration with liability and cost and accept that these are valid
concerns. But a detail case was not and never has been made to us that these costs outweighed the
benefits of the center or that another solution could have been found such as affiliated non-profit
status that they have at Brandeis for example.

Even if the center needed to be closed, we still don't understand why it had to be done effective this
year, long after the deadline for application to equivalent preschools had passed. And from the
perspective of teachers who help raise our children long after their opportunity to apply for
equivalent positions at other preschools had passed.

As my colleague put, Tufts made this important decision about childcare for us. In responding to
this decision and looking into alternatives cost us our weeks of research time.

I'd like to close by echoing Elizabeth's call for a new commitment to respect for transparent
decision making and to faculty governance, and also to help meet the childcare needs of faculty so
that future faculty can have the same opportunities that I had while trying to balance being tenured
and raising a young family. Thank you.

(Applause)

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Any comments? Any input?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, German, Russian, Asian, who's expecting a grandchild
rather than having kids in the daycare, but remembers all too vividly the issues surrounding the
daycare and the importance of it when we were trying to get tenured, et cetera. What I wanted to
ask actually was this was all laid out and it's really, this fits into the larger scheme of things that we
all are feeling as faculty members, and that is that faculty governance and faculty input is eroding
in this university. Just the fact that no one understood the enormity of this and the way it affects
faculty is mind boggling to me.

So there's a famous Russian book in the 19th century and the title of that book is Who Is To Blame.
Everyone can repeat (speaks in Russian.) Right. Who is to blame? It's a question that is asked
throughout Russian history and Russian culture. But I actually do want to ask that question.
Who is to blame? It was made in secrecy. Who made the decision? Presumably, if it reported
to the dean it must've been the previous dean. Jim, I won't blame you because the decision was
obviously made before Jim became the dean. But it would be useful, maybe the president can
speak to it, maybe Jim can speak to it, to get an understanding of the process. Who is making
decisions in the university? I wish in a way that the provost were here -- oh, he is. Oh, great, the
provost is here because maybe he can -- I think that is the question. Not just who is to blame, but
who's making, who's responsible, who's making the decisions?

(Applause)

PROFESSOR EKBLADH: David Ekbladh, history department. I was one of the parents
affected. Not only was my daughter at the center at the time, my oldest daughter, I have a
younger daughter who's sixteen months who would be eligible in two years to have gone to what
we call around my house TEDCC, Little Tufts. Tufts Educational Daycare Center is a lot of
words so. Regardless, the daycare center. And we were shocked by this. I think one thing that
needs to be emphasized -- Oh, before I say anything else to Ken, to John, but particularly to
Elizabeth, and the number of other people who did an extraordinary amount of leg work on this. I
mean, a ton of work, showed up to meetings. Also, a lot of people, a lot of parents, because they
had no other choice went through a lot of transition meetings, did a lot of grunt work. The work
that Tufts did not do when it made this decision to try and make the transition from Tufts to Bright
Horizons better, I think all of those people should be recognized. There are a lot of people who
worked on this to clean up the mess that Tufts made.

I think one thing that is missed here too is we can talk about these in legal or evasive terms, but
approximately twenty members of the Tufts community were kicked to the curb. They were fired
in this with no deliberation. I mean, teachers, people I trusted my children with, many of who are
very nice people, but I also saw them as kindred spirits. They were teachers. They were just
fired with -- they got no chance for input. They got the word three hours before we did in July,
which is not only appalling, shocking, you can run out of words, but, you know, dastardly, in an
institutional sense where we talk about a Tufts community. And some people who had decades of
service. And that's part of the trouble here and part of the trouble that again, to underline what
other people are getting at that this is made and it's still secret. The work/life committee was
sworn to confidentiality. This was done behind closed doors. Direct requests at meetings. You
know, who decided this? When we were told by Scott Sahagian, who took over the portfolio of
this. One meeting with the parents. Again, direct questions. He said I'm going to meet. The
first week after the announcement came back we had a meeting. I asked him directly, “Who are
you reporting up to?" and he evaded the question. Right. Who's doing this, deans and other key
administrators.

That's troubling for the cost of this, right. You know, we can talk about the children. But for
people who got fired, their option was we're going to end your employment and Bright Horizons
can pick you up. The promise that followed all of that was, you know, you'll be kept at your
salary, not even benefits, but your salary for one year. Programs will continue at the center for
one year. This is a for-profit entity, which does, I mean, run good centers that many of us parents
had looked at and not fought the quality of the Tufts daycare, but it's a for-profit entity. I don't
want to sort of make that into an evil. We should be careful of just sort of dismissing that, but it
was at least owned, it's kind of nebulous, I did a little research, but it was owned at least until the
spring by Bain Capital. It answers to shareholders. This gets me, sorry, long-winded way
around -- you know, I just got promoted to associate professor, microphone is in my hand, but
some of you may not be applauding. I got the associate bump. Let me be uncomfortable here.
Salaries are competitive but they ain't great compared to our peer institutions and the institutions
we measure ourselves to.

But hey great, I got that extra bit of cash in my raise. I looked at one of these people who did the
leg work, some of the leg work, figured out what -- Bright Horizons has a number of centers very
close. One in Davis. Very close to the one in Teele Square. They all have significantly higher
tuition rates, hundreds of dollars a month. I thought wow, if I take just the option, right. And
Tufts has merely secured spots, not tuition rates. The tuition rates will last for that almost
medieval like a year and a day, right? This will last for one year and then it's up in the air. That's
all Bright Horizons will say, and fair enough to them. They've got to make decisions, right. But
I was thinking even if it goes up, what seems kind of mild, “200, “300, but maybe potentially compared to some of their other centers, $400, you're talking about, you know, three, four, $5,000 a year.

For a junior person in humanities and social sciences that's ten percent of their total pay, not even their take-home pay. It gets me to some of these things that are in the strategic plan about recruiting and retaining faculty. Not merely how the people in this case felt like they were treated, and we weren't treated well, but also the cost that this potentially unleashes on faculty. This doesn't seem like it was discussed and it doesn't seem like it was even considered. That's the troubling part. It's not just about process in the formal sense of it, process in the sense that somebody, namely this guy, would have raised a question like that. This is going to cost people money, and it wasn't considered. And it goes to maybe, I don't know if I can make this motion to the Executive Committee, but maybe we could request the administration, particularly the office of the individual who made this decision, to put together a comprehensive report on how the decision was made and implemented. I think that, that would be shared with the entire faculty, I think that's a worthy request to be made. I don't know if the Executive Committee can make it, but if we can I would put that on the floor. Thank you.

(Applause)

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Well, it so happens that my understanding is that the person who made the decision in a major way has left. But -- go ahead.

PROFESSOR EKBLADH: Regardless if they made the decision, right, we're going to storm this beach. Somebody else had to implement it. Other people were involved in it. There still should be an ability for the institution to account for that.

(Applause)

The bandit has left and therefore there's no problem. I feel like there is a little bit of a fall guy or gal perhaps, but we don't know. Forgive me for innuendo and doing what the administration did. We don't know and that's not a good thing for a university to be walking around saying, “We have no idea.”

PROFESSOR GROSSMAN: I don't have children at the daycare center obviously. I mean, I now have grandchildren who are in school, but I certainly remember the challenge of trying to balance childcare and research and teaching. I think the issue you really hit on, Elizabeth, this is a community. We talk about a university community, and members of a community, however hierarchical it may be, need to work in an atmosphere of mutual respect. So I think it's shocking that, as you said, the teachers, many of whom had decades of service, were as you put it, kicked to the curb. We're all teachers. I don't think any one of us would want that to happen to us and certainly wouldn't want it to happen to people that we respect and care about and that our children love.

But I think what really is incumbent on us is that if we are truly a community and we do want to move forward positively that we absolutely have to make real the terms that people throw around everywhere. Whether they're running for political office or they're here. We talk about
transparency. We talk about communication. We talk about accountability. But we have to make this real, so respect for mutual discourse, honestly, openness. Obviously, there are factors that the administration deals with that we are not privy to, but I also feel that decisions that have such a profound impact on the lives of so many people in this university really need to be discussed in an open forum with true transparency and not avail the secrecy which has no place in a university community.

(Applause)

SR. LECTURER POTT: Just one quick addition. Martha Pott. Because it hasn't been mentioned, but this impacts our undergraduate and graduate students quite significantly. The Tufts daycare center had a policy of having special friends for each child in the daycare center and these were Tufts undergraduates who visited once a week and participated in events at the center. Some Tufts undergraduates had one special friend for all four years they were here and that was a lifelong, you know, continuing relationship. It also was a research site and they had on staff a research coordinator who helped faculty members who wanted to collect data and do research. And the number of thesis students just recently I've had personally have done their work there at the daycare center and collected data. So it has been much, you know, bigger than serving the parents and children at the center.

I want to make one other point is that there's a philosophy at the daycare center of inclusion and there are many children at the daycare center who have identified special needs and this was seen as a benefit not only for those families but everyone at the center and other parents. That's a philosophy and a commitment that does not exist certainly in the same way through corporate daycare.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: We have sort of two suggestions. One is to find out who to blame, the central European and Russian way of going. I'm also central European. The other is how to go forward. I think most of us have a suggestion. I don't know if you want to present it as a motion and if you want to discuss that. How do you want to go forward?

PROFESSOR REMICK: Well, I think that the way that we have framed this issue in our letter is to ask the provost to form a task force that would address this. To that degree, we're kind of waiting for his response. We sent him the letter yesterday so I don't assume that you have a response already formulated so we can't expect to have that today. I think it's reasonable to wait a certain amount of time to hear from that. But I'm not sure whether we can move independently on this without cooperation from the administration especially since what we're asking for is true collaboration with the administration. That's what I would like to see here is a model for how we can work together instead of working in secrecy.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: So is there a motion? Should we vote on it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There's not a motion.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Then we wait to hear. As far as finding out that could be probably be part of the task force. What I'm wondering is your committee able to deal with those
issues?

PROFESSOR REMICK: Well, we are already dealing with them, with some of the issues. Let me just explain that in the spring of this past year we asked for some support from the deans of arts and sciences and engineering and also the dean of the Fletcher School to fund a dependent care needs assessment survey, which we hope to administer early next semester on the entire Medford/Somerville campus to survey faculty, staff, and graduate students as well as a small group of undergraduates who have children to find out what their needs are in terms of childcare but also adult dependent care. Because when you think about all of those things as part of a life course and a career course issue. It's not only about people who have no children. We face a lot of care giving situations throughout our lives and our careers.

So that was already underway at the time that this decision was made. It would've been really nice for this decision to have been informed by the results of this study, but it preceded the study. The point is we're going to be going ahead with our study in the coming year and we think that the results of our study will be important in informing a task force and the plans that it might produce if there is a task force. However, we are only looking at the Medford/Somerville campus, and I think that if we're going to look at childcare really comprehensively we'll need to be looking at the whole university because there are people at the other campuses who have these kinds of needs too.

There is a Bright Horizons daycare center at Tufts Medical Center which is accessible to some of the faculty and staff at the Boston campus. As far as we know there's nothing going on in Grafton. But the issue also is that we don't know what's going on in the other schools, and if we are going to move forward with the task force that would be university wide looking at childcare as a benefit that's available to everyone at every campus then some additional leg work will have to be done to do a childcare needs assessment study or maybe hopefully a dependent care needs assessment study on other campuses too, and that's not something that we can do in our arts, sciences, and engineering committee.

PROFESSOR SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. So presumably the study that you're talking about would come to many of us in the form of an email with a survey that we're supposed to do. So let me just say that then in the age of Tufts acquiring Qualtics we are all bombarded with surveys it seems like, but given the level of emotion that people feel about this issue just a plea then that when that survey actually does come that you actually fill it out because it will be important moving forward on this discussion. So keep an eye out for it, I would say, and don't fall into survey fatigue of all the surveys that we get all the time.

PROFESSOR REMICK: Also, as the survey is being developed we're going to be doing a pilot study and probably some focus groups, but we will publicize the heck out of this survey before it goes out so this will not be the last thing that you hear about it.

PROFESSOR ROBERTS: Hugh Roberts, history department. I'm a little puzzled, Madam Chair. It seems to me that we do need to table some sort of resolution at this meeting. It seems to me that there's, from what I've heard, a consensus of strong support for the speakers who have told
us about this. It seems to me that in the document dated the third of September there is a clear proposal, and I would like to suggest that at least the meeting be given the opportunity to record its support for that proposal concerning the task force. Number one. So I would like to suggest that that be put to the vote and therefore become a proposition that has the support of this meeting. I would also suggest that since this same document was addressed to senior university authorities it might be appropriate for the Executive Committee to contact those authorities to express the Executive Committee's concern about this and to convey to them the feeling of the meeting that some sort of a response to the facts that have been made before us is called for precisely in the spirit of promoting forward the kind of collaboration between faculty and administration that we wish to see in order to ensure good governance at this university.

I'd like to suggest that those two matters be put to the meeting for a vote.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: So do you have a concrete motion for the first point?

PROFESSOR ROBERTS: The motion would be that this meeting endorses, fully endorses, the proposition and the document from, how do we define the document, Liz, the document from the third of September, that a task force be set up?

PROFESSOR REMICK: It's the open letter to the administration.

PROFESSOR ROBERTS: You want to endorse the whole open letter? It seems to me there are two points. One is the setting up of the task force. I think it would be a good idea for that to be specified. I think it would also be a good idea that some response from the university authorities concerning this affair be solicited firmly by the Executive Committee. That's my suggestion. Maybe people have got better ones, but I think we should consider something to vote on to record the feeling of the meeting.

PROVOST HARRIS: If you have to deal with the motion first then –

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There's two different motions so we need two different votes.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: The first motion is to go ahead and ask

PROFESSOR ROBERTS: Could I suggest the first motion is that this meeting fully endorses the proposition that a task force be set up as specified in the document of the third of September. Perhaps Liz would like to improve on that formula but it shouldn't be more than one sentence.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: So there's a second? Help me because I've never done this. (Inaudible conversation amongst the floor)

PROVOST HARRIS: So let me first thank Elizabeth for the wonderful work she has done and also thank her for being kind. She said I got this yesterday. That's not true. I got this on Thursday along with everybody else. That was the first time I saw it although it was dated September 3rd. At that point I walked to Elizabeth, she has the misfortune of being visible, her
office from mine, and I saw her walking back to Packard, and I followed her over and I talked to her for a while. We had a good conversation about what's in this resolution, why, what we think we ought to do moving forward.

What I shared with her, which is what I'm happy to share with the rest of you, is there's really two things, two modifications I would make to the request. Let me just pull up the document so I get it exactly right. The first is, if you have the document, the paragraph on page three that starts with "in order to further these two goals." It ends with the following sentence. "The task force's membership should include a variety of stakeholders at Tufts including, of course, relevant administrators, but also the minimum faculty and staff who are parents of young children, department chairs, members of the CSHD Department, junior faculty, graduate student representative, representatives from Boston, Grafton, Medford/Somerville campuses and members of the committee on faculty work/life. Sorry, that was the previous sentence. Most importantly, “The task force should be authoritative and all the stakeholders should commit to respecting its results and implementing its recommendations whatever they may be.”

So what I said to Elizabeth was there's no committee that has that power in the university that gets set up and we say, “Regardless of what it comes up with,” we say, “a priori that we are going to implement what the committee suggests.” So I would ask that that be changed for reasons I think everyone would understand. The second is that I suggest that we have a preliminary conversation that's broader than childcare, not because childcare isn't extremely important, but because I think Elizabeth and Hugh, when I first arrived they were just finishing up, along with others, this work/life report and were sitting down talking about this issue. I thought it was an important issue. It went from there, went to Patricia, and Leah, and Joanne ended up going through and they reported back to the faculty about here's the things we've done, here's the things we haven't done, here's the things we're still thinking about. What I had suggested to Elizabeth is what I think the first step might be is to sit down and have the group say, “All right, where are we, what are those issues, and what's the first thing we should go after?” and not say, “Childcare is the issue that we have to go after because of what happened in the last several months.” It may be what we decide after a half hour, an hour, but I was just suggesting that we have that preliminary conversation. Other than that, completely on board and that's what Elizabeth and I talked about on Friday. Thanks.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Any other discussion? Anybody want to do an amendment?

PROFESSOR MANZ: Thank you. I just want to say that as I'm always saying to myself the perfect is the enemy of the good and we have a motion on the floor. This is a motion to endorse a move and that obviously there will be some modification as things are implemented, but I would like to see this motion go forward on the floor as it stands and not be held up by trying to fine tune the outcome to exactly.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Call the question.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: All in favor of the motion as it stands?
ALL: Aye.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I don't think we have to make a count. All those opposed? Abstentions? The motion carries unanimously. There was a second motion.

PROFESSOR ROBERTS: Well, the second suggestion was that the Executive Committee follow through on this document of the third of September by contacting the people to whom it was addressed and conveying to them the sentiment of this meeting, that some response, some formal and public response, from them is desired and would be in the interest of promoting a repair of relations between faculty and administration. I would suggest that the motion to be voted on is simply the Executive Committee convey the feeling of the meeting to the people to which this document was addressed and invite them to respond and then see what happens.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Second?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: Discussion? We don't have much time. All in favor?

ALL: Aye.


PRESIDENT MONACO: Thank you, everyone.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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