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PROFESSOR ROMERO: Hello again. I'm Christiane Zehl Romero. I'm the co-chair of the Executive Committee. As you know, we all are supposed to convene and plan the agenda and do everything else on behalf of the faculty.

Anyway, Fulton Gonzalez is the co-chair, and Roger Tobin, Harry Bernheim on the couch, and I don't know where Judith -- oh, here you are. I will chair this meeting again, and then when I have made all the mistakes you can make, then Fulton will chair the next meeting.

To begin with, we have announcements. First, the election results for T&P Committee elections. Ioannis.

ELECTION RESULTS FOR T&P COMMITTEE ELECTION
PROFESSOR EVRIGENIS: Thank you. So on behalf of the Committee on Committees, I'd like to thank Jillian for running the off-cycle election, and thank the candidates for running in it. I want to announce that Susan Napier has won the election and will be beginning a term. And just to give you some context, because this was an off-cycle election, we solicited 502 full-time faculty members, and we received 218 votes, which represents 43.4 percent (inaudible). To put that in contact, the spring results were 58.1 percent, so pretty good overall. Thanks to everybody.

INTRODUCTION OF MAXINE BISAZZA
PROFESSOR ROMERO: Next announcement, Jillian Dubman.

MS. DUBMAN: Hi, everybody. I just wanted to take the opportunity to introduce Maxine Bisazza, the new administrative assistant in the office to the secretary of the faculty. She'll be a fixture in my office, at these faculty meetings, working with the different faculty committees. So I just wanted to take the opportunity to introduce her to all of you. So I encourage you to welcome her individually and later on. Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Okay, nominations for the Wendell Phillips Award. Helen Marrow.

NOMINATIONS FOR THE 2015 WENDELL PHILLIPS AWARD
PROFESSOR MARROW: Hi, my name is Helen Marrow from the Committee on Student Life. I'd like to make an announcement. There are flyers for you to pick up out here as well. We had open nominations period for the 2015 Wendell Phillips Award, which if you don't know about it yet, it's a really wonderful exciting award that is given every year to a junior or senior either in A&S or Engineering who has best demonstrated both marketability as a speaker and a high sense of public responsibility.

What we do is provide a sample written question and also a sample oral question, and students who are nominated for this prize get to in their application respond very briefly to the written question and also put together a very brief, about four to five minutes, response to an oral question that we
then decide on four or five finalists, and they come back to us in the winter and answer the oral question, and they do it in public, in front of us.

So it's really wonderful. If you have students in your classes or who you know as advisees, work very closely, who you think carry this high degree of public responsibility or are good speakers or leaders in their community, please feel free to nominate them. We're doing a lot of advertising this year both among students to get more self nominations and student nominations, but we'd also like to do extra effort this year to encourage nominations from those of you who may know students well.

Again, it's one of the best parts of our job. The student gets a cash prize and becomes the baccalaureate speaker for the students. So they really enjoy it. You can pick up these flyers in the back. There's a website you can go to if you want to nominate a student. You might even want to see if the student is interested, because it does involve some public speaking.

The deadline is October 27 at 5:00 p.m, and if you forget where this website is, if you need any information, you can contact me, Helen Marrow in Sociology. You can find me there. Also, Joseph Golia, the Director for Campus Life. Thank you.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Are there any other announcements? Okay, we'll go to old business, and I call on Montserrat to talk about the Educational Policy Committee on student evaluations. We discussed that last time, and maybe you can give a short presentation once more, and then we'll discuss and have a vote this time.

OLD BUSINESS

VOTE ON EPC PROPOSAL ON ONLINE COURSE EVALUATIONS
PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: So there are three proposals here that we have to vote on. The first one is that we would make available the evaluations for a slightly longer period, beginning a little bit earlier. So they would have one extra weekend to fill all the evaluations. They would start on the evening of the Friday, have a whole week and one more day of time, plus that period to do the evaluations. Currently, what they do is they start on the Monday, exactly one week before -- or a Tuesday, exactly one week before the end of classes. So we'll have a little bit more time.

The second proposal is that during that period, not outside that period, a student could reopen the evaluation and add or change what they have written.

And the third proposal is that the numerical averages of the evaluations would be available to the students, so long as they have completed all of their evaluations for the prior spring or fall semester, or if they are new at Tufts, so any new students would also get it for one semester.

These are the three proposals. Is there any discussion?
PROFESSOR CARLETON: Proposal 3 says evaluations will be made available in Trunk to all faculty. Does that mean it's public information, all faculty evaluations?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: No. Everybody would be able to see just the numerical values, not the comments. The reason for including this is that it seems a little bit strange to let the students see it, and not their advisors see it.

So if a student comes to your office and tells you, “Oh, yeah, I want to choose that teacher because his or her evaluations are 4.8, and that other teacher has evaluations of 4.2,” I think the advisor should also be able to see these numbers. You wouldn't be able to see the comments, only the numbers.

PROFESSOR CARLETON: I just think there might be an issue here for tenure track faculty, and I'm not sure why, but just something -- I'm talking as chair of German, Russian, Asian. I don't know why, maybe I'm just -- maybe it's a delusion.

PROFESSOR IOANNIDES: Yannis Ioannides, Economics. I really don't see the merit of adding the weekend before, for two reasons. First of all, it's asymmetrical to Mondays, Wednesdays, and Tuesdays, Thursdays classes, because three Mondays where classes are affected by a change as opposed to two (inaudible) Wednesdays.

Second, whether you are a star teacher or not, it does have an effect for the end of the term. And I think extending it to give students more time to do it, in my opinion, is really one of the things that really don't have academic merit.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: It was at the request of the students.

PROFESSOR IOANNIDES: I know, but we don't always have to agree.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: I know, but the reason we agreed to -- at least EPC, and we might not agree here, is that it changes (inaudible) of the classes they have seen, and for them a weekend at the end of the semester might mean a lot. Because the end of the semester is a time when they should be very, very busy, hopefully.

PROFESSOR IOANNIDES: If I may, they will discuss in the meeting, and I think Kevin Dunn mentioned a very good idea, which is actually to hold part of the class and have the students do it at the time. And it seems to me that extending it just doesn’t --

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Well, it depends on the class. I would rather have the class to teach than have the students do the evaluations there.

PROFESSOR HOLLANDER: Justin Hollander, UEP. So I wanted to address the third item specifically. I think that we should all applaud the work of the EPC in addressing what's clearly a
real problem with the move to the online evaluations with these low response rates. I mean, it's a problem, and I acknowledge that, but I'm going to vote against number 3.

I think that course evaluations have been studied so well throughout academia. They are not valid, and they're not reliable to measure the teaching quality. And for us to put our rhetoric on these evaluations and send them back to the students and say, “This is basically how good the class is.” I think is a mistake, and I think we should look for alternative ways to solve the problem.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Okay. There was a hand next to you.

PROFESSOR RAMSEY: Norman Ramsey, Computer Science. I'd just like to say a bit about the issue of the weekend. We're very concerned not only about the low response rates, but of hearing primarily from people who are very happy or very unhappy, and the EPC felt that it was far more likely that your average -- neither delighted nor furious student would be far more likely to respond on the weekend before the last week of classes.

And I think, in our view, the value of having those additional responses outweighs the burden that it places on the classes happening at that time. Of course, each of us will have to make our own decision about what we value more, but that was where the EPC was concerned, that we want not simply more responses, but more representative responses, even though the whole notion of student evaluations is indeed very flawed.

PROFESSOR SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, Political Science. I just wonder for the numeral averages, is it your intent that the information would also include the sample size, the number of people that answered the question, because sometimes they're N5 or N6, and that's useful additional information to have to put the number in context. And if not, then I would propose that that be provided if this passes along with the numerical average.

PROFESSOR BEDELL: Gary Bedell, Occupational Therapy. Around number 1, I actually disagree with Yannis. I do think that for our students, they actually requested a longer period of time to respond for a course evaluation. So I saw the timing issue as maybe an adequate compromise, at least in terms of our students, who are graduate students. And I don't know if there would be anything different in terms of providing feedback from graduate students or undergraduate students. So I saw this as an adequate compromise.

PROFESSOR AFSAR: Mohammed Afsar, Electrical Engineering. The online evaluation I think is not working. Because if I have a student of 15 or 16, all I get is two or three responding, for a while now. So I think we have to find an incentive to do the vote -- you know, online and do it, or go back -- best to go back to the old way. I think there's no other way.

PROFESSOR DeBOLD: Joe DeBold from Psychology. Despite the limitations of student evaluations, student evaluations where we have a good response rate are far better than leaving the
students only with a choice of going to something like Rate My Professor, in which there are a few idiosyncratic comments from just a few students, and that's their alternative.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: And they are using it.

PROFESSOR MILLER: Eric Miller from electrical engineering. I had two questions. First was in addition to the number of the sample size, I think it's statistically relevant. The quantity would be the standard deviation. And the second thing is what exactly would they be able to find online and where? Are you talking about like every -- I know, I'm sorry, I teach statistics, so it's sort of a professional hazard.

Are you talking about being able to click and find like every class that I've taught, or would they be able to click and find for Physics 12, the reviews for all previous versions of Physics 12? What's the user interface? What system will this be on, and how will (inaudible)?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: We don't have complete answers, except that it's going to be on Trunk, and only the students. So only the Tufts students should be able to see it. It was suggested that somebody could steal the data, but apparently, there are ways in which this may not be done. So we will make sure that the people on Trunk make sure that they are on Trunk and nowhere else. That's the first thing.

And the idea was to display (inaudible) from now on for a few years. Maybe we can say how many years we want to display the data for. But we have not at the moment decided on that, and maybe in a couple of years, we can revise the policy once it has been in place.

And we have not been thinking about -- saying anything about the sample size or the percentage of students responding. If that seems relevant, we might try to include it. But one of the things that is part of the proposal is that any course that has fewer than a certain number of responses, any course which has fewer than a certain number of students does not even have evaluations.

PROFESSOR PEPALL: I just want to follow up on Eric's comment. I think it would be helpful for the faculty to sort of see exactly how this works, because in my view, I think it would be important if we do lend our imprimatur to the set, it's done in a way that makes sense. So having information like what's the average course evaluation in large classes, small classes, and even perhaps Natural Sciences versus -- it's useful just to frame it so that we kind of know what information we're putting out there. I have the feeling that just clicking on and just seeing a bunch of numbers, that all, if they're close to five look good, is perhaps not doing justice to the information that we're collecting. So I think it would be helpful just to see what it is that's going to be posted to students on Trunk.

DEAN COOK: I was going to follow up on Eric's comment that if we've got to be statistically accurate, it means we're probably more susceptible to outliers, and are appropriate for symmetrical
distribution, but these probably aren't symmetrical, so a median would probably be better (inaudible), just to be a stickler.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Any other comments?

PROFESSOR DHINGRA: Pawan Dhingra, sociology. I agree with all the comments about contextualizing the numbers with standard deviations and the course size and response rates, but given that we're saying, “The numbers themselves don't tell the whole story, please put all of this contextual information there,” I think at the end of the day, students are still going to look at the numbers. What we're saying is the numbers aren't lying. So please provide all the potential information to make sense of the numbers, which I don't think are going to be read that carefully, and it's going to be just a final number. And so I don't like the idea overall of posting the numbers, first for faculty, given in this room, but also for students.

PROFESSOR ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology. I just would like to suggest that we vote on the extended time they are offered to resubmit as a separate vote than the one about what we'll see, because I'm feeling uncomfortable voting on the last one. I like the idea of having them available, but I want to know exactly what I'm voting on. And so I don't know, is the sample size going to be there, is the median going to be there, what context. So if the EPC could come back with a specific set of maybe two proposals that we would decide on which one makes the most sense to this faculty, I feel would be much more comfortable.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: So make a motion.

PROFESSOR ORIANS: Thank you for moving this on me. I vote that we extend the period, and we allow for revision of resubmissions, as proposed by EPC.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Second.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: There was a motion, and it was seconded, motion for amendment.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Should we vote each of them separately or together?

PROFESSOR ORIANS: Let's do it together.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Is that what people want? Okay. So should we first vote on the amendment, and then go back?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: There is no amendment, we're just voting on the first two proposals. And then we'll discuss the third. Okay, fine. The proposals that we are voting on is two separate things, but we are voting them together.
First thing is evaluation will be available by the end of the Friday -- of the day on the Friday before the last full week of classes and through the period. That's the first one. And the second one is during the evaluation period, students will be allowed to revise their evaluations after submission. All in favor? Thank you. Against? Okay. Abstentions? I guess the motion carries.

So the second, it seems that most of the faculty either are against or want to know more. But before we go back to EPC and discuss what kind of data we should put in, should we vote on whether that's what we want, because if the vote is that we don't want any data made available, I don't think it makes any sense that we go back to EPC and try to figure out what data we are going to prepare.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. I have two comments. The first is that I believe it is already the policy of this faculty to make this information available to students. To change that, we would have to vote to revoke that policy voted on a long time ago. So the change here is not to make it available unless they have filled out their proper evaluations.

The other policy already exists. We just don't have a mechanism for implementing it. But it is actually the policy of this faculty adopted some years back that the students would have access to these data.

The other comment was with regard to the lack of validity and whether we should put our credence around this, we require these data to be provided in Tenure and Promotion cases. You want to talk about putting it in an agreement or saying that this is meaningful. So if we think it's that meaningful, then why shouldn't the students have some access to it? And if we really think it's totally not meaningful, then why don't we stop looking at it when we determine everybody's raise and whether they get tenure or promotion? And I don't think we can have it both ways. If we think it's important enough to be an important factor, and those things could affect our lives, why do we think the students shouldn't know about it?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Are we ready to vote or postpone?

PROFESSOR FREUDENREICH: I just want to put out there the idea that if we're going to put importance on these scores that it would be much better if we had a system where everybody had to fill out the evaluation. I think everybody would feel better once they go more public if they were as accurate as possible.

And we could easily in the future as part of this revision put something in where the students have to fill out the evaluations before they get their grades released, or something like that. Because I think what people are worried about is that people who are unhappy or very happy are more likely to fill them out, maybe not so many in the middle. If everybody filled them out, then I think they would be more accurate and be better.
PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: There are some questions with that. I think Jim Glaser said in the past that that would create some issues for students who are in financial aid or have to decide whether they are staying here for the next semester. So that's one issue.

The second thing is that maybe we should try it the way it is before we go to not releasing the course, the grades for the course, because that seems to be a problem, and see how it works. And if it doesn't increase substantially -- because not releasing the grade for the course doesn't matter -- not 100 percent of the students are going to participate. Some students do not want to see their grade for the course.

PROFESSOR FREUDENREICH: It's just another idea --

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: We thought about that idea already.

PROFESSOR ALLEN: Hi, I'm Jennifer Allen from community health. We haven't heard about this, but I'd like us to utilize our expertise in survey, research, and methodology, which suggests that actually, the bigger incentives to survey completion have more to do with not one time. In fact, some of our research suggests more time to give people the lower their response rate. But secondly, the greater the incentive and the shorter the evaluation period is going to result in a higher response rate.

I think what I'm hearing as a consensus that the response rate is critical. We don't agree about the validity of this information, but we certainly agree that it's most important that it be representative. And so I encourage us to think about the data that exists around how we maximize survey response rates, because there's a lot of information, and people in this room have that expertise, which is I assume on the committee as well. I just haven't heard that discussion.

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: Okay, we can have a motion to --

PROFESSOR HABER: Judith Haber, English. I just wanted to ask vis-a-vis that you had said that evaluations below a certain response rate would not be released, or below a certain class number. Do you have an idea of what that response rate would be?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: I think the class number is like six students or something, so it's very low.

PROFESSOR HABER: And the response rate?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: So if there were fewer than six responses, I think -- so it would be not the percentage, but an option (?). That could be changed as well. So if we decide that it's just ten percent, if we don't go below 30 percent --
PROFESSOR EVRIGENIS: Ioannis Evrigenis, political science. Do you know what percentage of courses enroll fewer than six?

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: No, I don't.

PROFESSOR HAMMER: David Hammer, education. It feels strange not to remark, the response rate by students on courses compares quite favorably, the response rate by faculty on tenure and promotion votes that occurred earlier in the meeting. I'd like to move that we table this discussion and run other items on the agenda.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: All in favor? Against? Abstentions? So it's moved --

PROFESSOR TEIXIDOR: We have to come up with a proposal (inaudible), I understand. So for the moment, the policy is that the students are able to see the evaluations. That's the policy we have right now.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Well, we have to go back and look at that. We never voted within this context of online evaluations that they have access to it.

DEAN GLASER: In 2005, we voted to allow the data to be put online. That required the Student Senate to acquire the data and enter it and put it up, which they did for one year, but it has not happened since, because that student graduated. So the question is whether we take the responsibility of making sure that it is presented every year.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Then you have to come back, and we have to take another vote, and perhaps answer some of the issues and questions that came up in the discussion now.

So the next item of business is a report from Elizabeth and John on the progress of childcare and work/life issues.

PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WORK/LIFE
PROFESSOR REMICK: Thanks for listening to us talk about this again. We're just going to do a quick update. First of all, we received the administration's response to our letter, and I hope that all of you saw that too, on September 29, and we're very glad to be moving forward on childcare issues together with AS&E and the central administration.

Pursuant to that, we met with Provost Harris on (inaudible) the Work/Life Committee. We met with Provost Harris on September 24 to discuss a university-wide work/life effort. At that time, we agreed that we would try to put together a university-wide task force, although I hear from people today that maybe what we'll end up with might be a little bit different, due to their committee wanted --
PROVOST HARRIS: I can speak when you want.

PROFESSOR REMICK: Okay. Anyway, the point is that we're going to be moving forward with this. One of the topics that any type of group that we put together on this will cover childcare. It may also include some other issues, if other issues are important to the faculty and staff at other schools. They may have different concerns than we do, and what we need to do is find out what those concerns are.

So to that end, during October and early November, the provost is going to be laying the groundwork for whatever we come up via meeting both with the president and the deans at the various schools, which he did today, and also by having some conversations about work/life with people at the Boston and Grafton campuses to try to find out what issues they're most concerned about.

Then we, the committee, and the provost will meet again the third week in November to talk about exactly what we're going to do. For example, if you put together a task force, we'll talk about the charge, the composition, the pace, and also the collaborative and transparent manner of operation in which we will work, and other salient issues.

So in anticipation of where we'll be heading next, we do invite any of you who think you might be interested in taking part in this process to contact us directly. Can I ask you to just give us a little bit of an update about what you talked about today, and after that, we'll have questions and discussion.

PROVOST HARRIS: What I mentioned to Elizabeth right when I walked into the room is that Arts and Sciences and Engineering is way ahead of the other schools in terms of the work you've done on this important topic, having the task force that you co-chaired and completed your work in 2012. And I talked with the deans this morning, and basically, some of the schools have done almost nothing on this issue.

And so what we need to figure out when we're having fall conversations about it is given the various stages the schools are, what makes sense moving forward. Does it make sense to pull together one group that's going to try and figure out how to address it, when some schools have had almost no discussions about it, and you're all way out on the (inaudible) distribution, or does it make sense to say let's take those schools who are quite mature, let's pull them together, and let's work with the other schools to get them up to speed on the issues.

So I don't know what's going to happen. We had a first conversation about it. But what I hope Elizabeth would agree to is we're very committed to trying to do something here. We just want to make sure that we don't create a university-wide process based on what's happening in Arts, Sciences and Engineering and assume that it's going to apply equally to all schools.
PROFESSOR REMICK: Thanks, David. If anyone has questions or comments at this point, we're happy to take them. Thanks.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Good luck. We go to new business, and the first issue is a report from Tenure and Promotion and a vote. We will need a vote.

NEW BUSINESS

T&P PROPOSAL REGARDING RECUSALS

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Vida Johnson, chair of T&P this year. And I'll try to be brief. This is not any major change that we're proposing, but rather it helps us clarify our current procedures and make sure that we follow what is in the university bylaws regarding the Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

About two years ago, Jillian tells me this faculty voted to make clear that the committee at all times -- and I'm reading from the bylaws -- "At all times, the committee membership shall include at least one member of the faculty of the School of Engineering and three members from the faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences. At least one member shall represent each of the following areas in the School of Arts and Sciences: the Humanities and Arts, the Social Sciences, the Natural Sciences and Mathematics. That's three areas, okay.

So what we're proposing in order to be in full compliance with that is some additional language and a change in our procedures, for sure, that at all times the committee will have representation both from the two schools and across the three designated areas from the School of Arts and Sciences.

So what you'll find is a proposal that is in bolded letters that when we have a recusal, and you have a case -- as this year, for example, in my department -- if there's a case, and I'm the only humanist who has to recuse himself or herself from the committee, it would mean that the committee that considered the case would not have representations from one of the areas.

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

I've had no legal training, but the committee crafted this and hope that it is clear. And again, why do we bring it up now, because we felt that we were not in compliance with the bylaws if we
simply recuse the person, and ended up with not full distribution across the areas of A&S and Engineering.

So we bring it to you. We, as a committee, have in the past, when there are minor changes and tweaking of Statement 11, we have not brought it to the faculty for a vote. But we felt that we should bring this to the faculty for a vote just for the sake of transparency so that you don't think that we're a subcommittee in a smoke-filled room somewhere on campus. We're actually in a freezing room in the campus center, and wondering why the university is wasting its money cooling us down to 60 degrees.

But in any case, we're bringing it for that reason. And the second reason is this is to get buy-in from all of you. What your vote means really is that then if you have served on T&P and are asked to step in on a case, that you do so. This is the most important work that we do, and unless we get the buy-in from everyone to do this, we won't be able to fulfill this requirement.

And by the way, just very quickly, on the lateral hires, we already created an ad hoc committee, but just a couple of small suggestions. One is that we would preferably -- we used to have in the past five years -- but for example, in my department right now, all the members who have served, who are available in the past five years, are from my department also. So we will have to go back farther than five years.

The idea is that if we can get recent members who are up on everything, we will do so. If we can't get recent members, we'll go back as far back. So no one is safe.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Any questions? Any points of discussion? If you go back very far, some training may be needed.

PROFESSOR MANZ: This is really a point of information. We're not actually voting, right? We're just expressing our opinions? Because Statement 11 is the purview of the committee itself?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: It is, but maybe we'd like a show of support from --

PROFESSOR MANZ: (Inaudible)

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Right. It is the purview of T&P, but it is also the purview of the whole faculty. So I think to err on the side of caution, I'd probably like to have a vote.

PROFESSOR MANZ: So a vote of support --

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: A vote of support, yes.

PROFESSOR MANZ: Okay. Well, I would certainly express my support.
PROFESSOR HIRATA: Hosea Hirata from German, Russian, Asian. So the replacement person gets a course release?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Only if the replacement person wants to sit in on the 26 cases that we have this year. No, this would be -- you can put it on the self-evaluation that you send to the deans, and maybe you'll get a one percent raise in your salary.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: But it may make sense, the people who do that work in the summer do get a very small stipend, and it may make sense to give that person a stipend. I don't know who would decide. I guess the dean would decide on that. But that would make sense. It would be the equivalent of people who are staffing in the summer.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: The summer is a different time here than the regular school year. I don't want to get bogged down on the money part of it, because I don't think it's really consequential, but rather that -- and we want to proceed with this right now.

PROFESSOR McCLELLAN: Hi, Andrew McClellan, Art History. Just a quick question. Would you have in mind, given the importance of the person stepping in to represent the field that's no longer there, that this person would also be on the subcommittee?

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: That would be probably negotiated, because we've already appointed the subcommittees right now for the coming year, and we don't always on the subcommittee, because of the distribution of cases, we can't always have somebody from the specific areas anyway. So I think that would be flexible if it seems, and if the person were willing, because the subcommittee's a lot more work, but the regular -- anyway, the subcommittee collects information, just to remind everyone.

The subcommittee with the members of the department and the outside expert, basically the five people who are on that subcommittee, they sort of thoroughly discuss every aspect of the case. They make no recommendations to the main committee. They kind of flesh out the case. And it doesn't necessarily need to be -- where it's on the subcommittee, it doesn't necessarily need to be the person from that specific area of A&S, etcetera.

But then I work out if people who are willing to actually be appointed for next year, we would know that earlier, and we would be able to proceed with maybe roping someone in who would be willing to also serve on the subcommittee. But the committee didn't feel that was necessary.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Okay, are you ready to vote in support of the proposal? All in favor, say aye. Against? Abstain? Thank you.
The last item of business is to report from the Executive Committee on the progress of the overwhelming faculty vote to have committees work on the proposal by the provost, and we ask Roger to speak on behalf of the committee.

**DISCUSSION OF AND UPDATE ON REVISED AS&E REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL**

**PROFESSOR TOBIN:** Thank you. So again, I'm Roger Tobin from physics and astronomy. So the first thing that I want to say is that this faculty spoke very loudly and clearly, and you were heard. Certainly, the Executive Committee heard you, and I think it's fair to say that the provost also heard you.

So on that side, as you know, there's been some modifications of the proposals, and there's been some relaxing of the time line, but I'm not going to speak to that side so much as to tell you what the Executive Committee has been doing.

So first of all, we've been meeting. We've been meeting a lot. And we've had several meetings with David and/or with Kevin. We've also had meetings with a number of committee chairs.

The faculty resolutions called for our standing committees to review the issues and the proposals raised on September 2, the document that David circulated, and have those committees report back. And so the Executive Committee sees it as our job to organize and coordinate that process, and ultimately, presumably to collate and collect and try to put together those reports into something sensible to bring before this faculty.

So let me just go through sort of the five areas and tell you where I think we stand. So one of the areas was tenure and promotion, and that has been put on pause for the time being. So there's no action happening about that. That proposal's not on the table at the moment, so we are not doing anything about it at the present time.

In the area of the graduate school reorganization, there were some changes to proposals, but also the GSAS Executive Committee has been working already very hard on the whole issue of whether and how the graduate schools might be reorganized, and they're also consulting with Karen Panetta and perhaps others in the School of Engineering, and I believe that that's already rapidly moving forward. So they're on it. As far as that's concerned, they're definitely on it.

The admissions and financial aid and the athletics issues have very clear, obvious standing committees that have jurisdictions. That's the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, and there's the Committee on Athletics, and those seem very clearly to be the committees that should take charge of those.

So the Executive Committee met with the chairs of those committees. I believe both of those committees have met, some of them more than once, and are in the process of taking this on and
working on it. I know David, you guys have been on it, and I think there's action happening. I know Steve Hirsch is here. But I know athletics has met also, and they're moving forward.

So those are moving forward, and we are hoping to get at least progress reports back from these committees by mid-November. I don't know if that will be possible, but that's the goal.

The student services piece is a little trickier. We don't have a standing Dowling Hall committee. And Dowling Hall is a complicated place that does a lot of things, so there are some parts of that that seem to belong to EPC, but those may be the parts that are largely being carved out of this proposal and left in the hands of the school, so that we don't exactly know where that dividing line is.

The Committee on Student Life sounds like the right committee for the other things, but that isn't really normally what the Committee on Student Life does. It doesn't occupy itself with housing, dining, health services, and things like that. It normally occupies itself mostly with disciplinary matters and the Wendell Phillips Award. So it's not really clear that that's the right committee, either.

So we're wrestling with this, and we're in discussions with the Committee on Committees about whether we should put together some sort of ad hoc task force to look at this or exactly what to do. And I think that's still a little bit up in the air. We are working on it. I suspect this is going to take a little bit longer, because we don't have an existing committee that's sort of immediate for anything on this board. So I can't be quite as clear about the data (inaudible).

The other piece I wanted to mention is that overriding or involved in all of these things are our budgetary issues and issues of the financial model and budgetary models for the schools. So we are also asking the Budget and Priorities Committee to try to take a broader look. I'm sure the individual committees will be looking at the budgetary implications at least within their specific area of purview, but there are also broader issues that go beyond any one of the categories to really address the whole school level.

So we're trying to engage Budget and Priorities to take that on. I think that is not as far advanced as the athletics and the graduate school and admissions pieces are, but we're working on that as well.

So that's what we're doing. Our hope is to start pulling this stuff together this fall, but I suspect that really getting the final product is going to take longer than that.

The other thing I wanted to say before I open this up for questions is okay, we said this is our job. This is our responsibility. Now we've got to do it. If we want shared governance, which is what we say, now we need to step up to the plate, and we need to show that our committee structure can actually deal with these issues effectively and in a reasonably, timely fashion.
Larry Bacow, I once heard him say that the faculty governance here is glacial, but that's pretty good, because in most places, it's tectonic. I think we might want to make it sort of climate warming. Glaciers don't move as slowly now as they used to, so we maybe want to accelerate our glaciers a little bit. But I really think the ball's in our court now. We've got the opportunity to really say something and do something on these issues. If we drop the ball, that's on us. I'm happy to take any questions.

PROFESSOR HASSOUN: Can you clarify exactly what these committees are charged with?

PROFESSOR TOBIN: No.

PROFESSOR HASSOUN: Not the committees in general, but specifically -- I mean, you said to look into --

PROFESSOR TOBIN: So there's the document, the provost put out a document last week, outlining what they perceive to be the issues, the problems that need to be solved in each of these areas, and accompanying that a possible proposal that they believe addresses that problem. So what we will be asking these committees to do -- we have not written a formal charge yet, but basically what we're asking them to do is look at the problems, look at possible solutions, including the solution that's proposed, and come back with some recommendations to this faculty, an analysis of the problems, and the implications of various possible solutions, and perhaps a recommendation about should we adopt the proposal as it's been proposed, should we not do anything, should we try to do something else, have a discussion of pros and cons of those. Is that a fair --

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Absolutely.

PROFESSOR FANTINI: Sergio Fantini, Biomedical Engineering. Just a question about the time scale. It seems that the time scale that you have mentioned is incompatible with the time scale set forth by the provost. How is this issue going to be addressed?

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Do you want to respond to that?

PROVOST HARRIS: I don't think it is. The memo said that we would try to get this done by mid-November. If we couldn't get it done by mid-November, then we keep talking, keep working on it. So I don't think it's inconsistent at all. I think what Roger said is they come back with some progress reports by mid-November, and then we reassess where we are. So I think that's consistent.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, German, Russian, Asian. The provost made this proposal with the revisions, etcetera, at the September 19 faculty forum. But I actually have a question to the provost about reporting structures that are proposed. I notice that again and again,
in the explanation that is sent out, there is a sense that the admissions, Athletics, student services needed to be reporting at a higher level and be sitting at the table with the president and senior administrators.

And I'm wondering where in this new revised structure does our dean, do the deans of Arts and Sciences and Engineering sit? Are they also at that table with the president and the provost, because if not, then we would have this really strange reporting structure where our deans are out there in the wilderness somewhere, and the admissions and -- people who are actually reporting now to the deans. I see this as a real diminution of the power of our deans, and I'd like to find out where do our deans sit, at which table in this new structure?

PROVOST HARRIS: Thanks, Vida. As I was talking about the other night, thanks for not saying it in Russian. So this is what the core question is. I'm very pleased that the committees are going to be doing this, and we've been working with the committees already. Kevin's in a meeting with them, and I'm meeting with them. The question is what should the responsibilities of the deans be? That's the core issue.

And we have a set of responsibilities for arts and sciences in particular, and somewhat for the engineering dean, but especially the arts and sciences dean, which is inconsistent with what we tend to see at universities that have more than one undergraduate school. And so we put out a set of proposals that we think address this, and we're asking the committees to take it on. So we didn't want to go any deeper in explaining, because we really wanted to pause and let the committees grapple with these issues that we put together.

But to answer your specific question, the senior staff meeting, my senior staff meeting that I have, these folks would be there at my senior staff meeting. They would also be at the meeting I had this morning, the provost's council meeting, which is the meeting I have weekly, pretty much with all the deans of the university and my senior staff, and they would be working with the schools in other ways, just like Diane Souvaine, who I think is probably the best model who I'm talking about. Diane Souvaine meets with the schools regularly now as Vice Provost for Research. So that's what you folks will be grappling with.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLOMB: Just a quick thing. Mark Cronin-Golomb from biomedical engineering. So I hope the discussions that we're having now are going to be reflected in the way that the search for new deans is going to be carried out.

PROVOST HARRIS: Can you clarify what you mean by that?

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLOMB: Generally, when we have a job opening, the candidates aren't (?) informed of what their responsibilities will be. So it seems that there's some uncertainty
as to what the responsibilities and expectations of the new deans will be, and I just want to know whether that's going to be handled effectively in the searches.

PROVOST HARRIS: So my approach is to be up front and tell them. The search firm asked me -- Dawn's here somewhere. Dawn's working with me. The search firm has asked us to write a paragraph telling what the final structure is going to be. And what I said to them is, “No, I can't do that, because I don't know what it's going to be.” I can tell you what right now I think is the best structure, but we haven't worked through the whole process. So it would be premature for me to tell them what the final state's going to be.

First of all, for Engineering, it doesn't matter tremendously. It matters some, but the changes are primarily in the responsibilities of the A&S dean far more than they are in the responsibilities of the Engineering dean. First point.

Second point, it's hard for me to imagine that we will be deciding the dean based on that person's experience with Dowling, athletics, or with admissions. And so in the end, I don't think this is going to be that big a differentiator in who the dean is. And I don't expect that the deans are going to have tremendous differences in their experience with those issues. I mean, the primary things that the deans do now -- the deans and I talk about and that we'll do in the future -- is worried about the faculty, worried about the academic issues more than worried about these other issues.

So we're going to press on with the searches. If we can't come to some conclusion by then, then we will tell them that that's the context. And I talked to the search firm about this, but I'm not going to -- don't worry if that's a part of the concern that I'm going to tell them there's a certain outcome when we don't know. I told them the opposite, so don't --

PROFESSOR MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. Two questions, information. First of all, we have a resolution for committees, and we've gotten as far as the reports, but I would like to hear for sure that yes, the reports then get followed up by motions and a vote by the faculty. And whether that can happen before the end of November is perhaps more of a question.

But the other question is a more purely informational one, the question of the other schools. You have mentioned, and the new data has mentioned in the new proposal that the admissions dean, the dean of student services would have positions of university leadership.

My question is what is happening at the other schools? Do their student services also become detached from their deans? In that case, does that mean that our student services are competing not just between Arts and Sciences and Engineering, but among the seven schools for resources? I would like to have some idea of where this reorganization fits in to a university-wide one and where this conversation is at in the other schools.

PROVOST HARRIS: Roger?
PROFESSOR TOBIN: I'll say something about that. And thank you for asking that, although I was sort of hoping nobody would. So I think I have to give Christiane the credit for doing what none of us like to do, which was actually look at the bylaws, and that was some information that was circulated. So there is this sentence in the bylaws of this faculty that says that we shall determine matters of administrative -- I forget the exact phrasing -- administrative issues that are across the schools.

Now, the interpretation of that and its context and in the context of other bylaws that exist in the university is not something that we completely agree upon. I do think the Executive Committee's position is that at least it gives this faculty some significant status to have a board that's simply a (inaudible) voice in this matter.

My hope would be that we can resolve, come to conclusions that are mutually satisfactory enough that we don't wind up fighting over the parsing of the legalistic language of the bylaws, and that's the objective. But certainly, there is absolutely nothing that prevents this faculty from taking a vote. Exactly what the legal status of that vote is, we will either have to fight out, or I think preferably not. But at any rate, I think the Executive Committee's view is we're going to put that decision off for another day.

PROVOST HARRIS: Just a comment, that was actually what I was alluding to at the top of Page 2 of the memo under Point 1 -- I think that's what it still is. There's so many drafts. That was basically the point of saying we will work with the Executive Committee on the process to figure out, and then try and discuss this whole issue in a meeting of the whole, it makes sense to talk with the Executive Committee about what we think it means, what they think it means and why, and come to some understanding as a result of that.

But I completely agree, and I said it on the 19th, I've never tried to stop the faculty voting, and I can't imagine I ever would. So the big question is what are the implications of such a vote.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: It's the Executive Committee's intent to present the findings and recommendations to the faculty. That's what we're here for.

PROVOST HARRIS: Yes, I don't think there's any disagreement about that.

The second question was the university, what's going on. So AS&E are in a different place than other schools for at least two reasons. The first reason is that you're the only schools that are having dean searches. So there is a different time scale because of that.

The second is that when you look at other universities, you tend to find that these positions tend to report to the provost, and they tend to report primarily for undergraduates, and they have some role with respect to graduate students. And so we are continuing to work with the other schools. We
talked to all the other deans this morning about where we are on this. But there's no comparable faculty committees working in the other schools.

PROFESSOR MIRKIN: I want to reiterate again that we shall have a vote on this matter at the end of the day, and whether it is considered binding or not, I think we shall have it, because in some ways, if it's even (inaudible), it's binding in the sense that it cannot be undone. I think we absolutely should do it.

PROVOST HARRIS: Can I just comment on that? And the memo (inaudible). You folks can see, I'm trying to in a sensitive way get at what I think are some really important issues in this memo, and so let me just get it out. I can't imagine that I'd ignore it. I mean, the implication that somehow there'd be a vote and I'd say, “Okay, that's great, I'm moving on.” I just can't imagine doing that. I don't think I have done that thus far. I mean, maybe someone thinks differently, but I don't think so.

So I said I'm happy to have the vote. I'm actually less interested in the vote than I am in the conversation that's happening in the committees, because that's where you really find out what people are thinking and come to some understanding. At some level, the vote should really be a who cares at the end, because you should have figured out all these issues all along.

And I think Kevin has been involved in these more than I have, and David's sitting next to him. And it's a good sign that they're sitting next to each other, the Undergrad Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. So much for good signs. I think that positive things are happening there. We're talking for an understanding of what's happening. So that's what I want to keep doing.

PROFESSOR TALIAFERRO: Jeff Taliaferro, political science. Just a question. On Page 2 of the memo -- and thank you, David, for putting out this memo, and thank you, Christiane, for actually looking at the bylaws -- there's only one. David, on Page 2, it says that the argument doesn't apply to the academic programs in student services, such as advising; they should report their respective schools, i.e, the current model, for several engineering academic activities (inaudible) study abroad as appropriate.

It seems somewhat strange that we're going to have standing committees look at the other areas that are currently within the purview of Dowling Hall, but not also look at the things which used to be under what is called undergraduate education, even if there are other reports of schools, because any proposed change in a reporting relationship and budget relationship is going to have an implication for the academic side of Dowling Hall. And I was wondering if you could just briefly explain the rationale for that statement.

PROVOST HARRIS: So to clarify why aren't committees looking at some issues, or why --
PROFESSOR TALIAFERRO: I realize that this is in there because of faculty concerns, that the faculty would be excluded from core academic functions, which are currently within the purview of Dowling Hall. But since the reorganization proposal as revised on the 19th is going to have some implications for the relationships of people in the academic resources center, the alpha deans, student accessibility services, what's the rationale for not having EPC or Student Life or some other appropriate AS&E committee look at those areas as well?

PROFESSOR ROMERO: That's the intent, that they look at it.

PROFESSOR TALIAFERRO: Not the academic side.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Everything. Everything's that now, that's the intent. Everything's that now in Dowling, and since EPC and student life don't cover everything in their present charge, that's why we're suggesting creating an ad hoc committee that can combine and look at the whole structure of Dowling, the way it's now working or not working, academic, student life, both.

PROFESSOR TALIAFERRO: That clarifies it a bit. Thank you.

PROVOST HARRIS: I would just say, I'm not appointing the committee.

PROFESSOR SMITH: George Smith, Philosophy Department. First, on the question of election, I'm the person, of course, who put the word "preferably" into that sentence from the Philosophy Department, and I did so for several reasons. One is out of respect for the authority of the office of the provost and the president and their responsibilities to the trustees, I think they have to have some room for judgment on any election this faculty holds. If it's a 52-48 vote, 52%, 48%, I would think the question would go overwhelmingly to their office. If it's an 80 or 20 vote, I would be rather surprised if you just chose to override it.

So I put the word "preferably" in. It was the one thing that seemed to cause a lot of controversy, but I stand by it. I think it's the appropriate word out of respect for the administration, who don't report only to us. They report to trustees as well.

Now, having said that, the one thing you've said in these sessions that I want to raise an issue about is the appeal, I think it's three times, to other universities. I'm not sure that the structure of other universities is automatically that pertinent to Tufts. I've been here 37 years. I spent six years during this millennium on the MIT campus, and two years at Stanford, and my sense is Tufts has a very unique culture. The culture was once described by a former vice president here as a teddy bear feel of the place, which I've always quoted, because I think it's so appropriate.

But what I want to stress is we have succeeded over these 37 years in no small part because a huge number of faculty and staff have gone the extra mile, and they've done so out of a sense of the
community here. And so from the day you first raised the issue of the restructuring, what scared me most is we might lose the thing that’s carried us most forcefully these 37 years.

So I just raise the issue of maybe we should not wait what other schools do, but pay some attention to what we’ve done.

PROVOST HARRIS: So I agree with the teddy bear. I wish I had said that. By the way, I talked to him this morning on the phone, because he's running for selectman (inaudible).

So I guess I disagree strongly. I don't think we make the best decisions by looking back or just looking here. I think we make the best decisions -- and I said this, a version of it, and I don't want to steer from that -- at the (inaudible) diaspora last weekend. What I said was I think we understand what happened to Michael Brown, Ferguson by not just looking back at the African-American experience, but also looking to the side and the experience with Asian-Americans and Latinos and other populations, and I think the same is true here.

I think we understand best what's looking forward by looking back at what's happened at Tufts, but also looking to the side to say, “Hey, maybe there's something we can learn from this other university that makes us think differently.” It doesn't in any way mean -- and I hope folks never get the sense that I think that we should just pick another university and do exactly what it's done. In fact, I couldn't disagree more strongly with that perspective.

But I disagree just as strongly with the perspective that we should just think about Tufts. Now, I say that in part because I've been at other places, and the jokes are in my head, and I usually don't tell folks, is I've been in meetings in my two-plus years here that I've already been in before. There were just different people sitting around the table. They were the exact same issues. There are people taking very similar positions.

It doesn't mean that ultimately I think that I know it all. It just means that I just think we can learn something from a comparative perspective, that's all. But I certainly think -- and George, I think will be in agreement, is that the culture here is something we don't want to lose. And what I've described it as -- we're talking about the students, but I think it's not just the students, but I see it as a place where people don't say that your success is my failure. I see this as a place, unlike many places -- maybe I'll be quoted 30 years from now, but I see it as a place instead where people say, “We're trying to do something together and figure out how to collectively be stronger than our pieces.” So I agree with you on that piece, but I think we have to look at other schools for some guidance.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: I think we have now the layout for the revised plan that you have put forward. I'm just wondering, there's one I think concern that was raised, and maybe it was Roger
at the last meeting, was what are the true and long-term financial implications of this and the financial autonomy of arts and sciences?

As you know, historically, arts and sciences and engineering have been the cash cows historically, or our perception of it of the university. And I remember many years ago, when we were not happy to find out that we're subsidizing both the veterinary school and the medical school, and subsidizing goes on, where a standard percentage goes to the central administration and the rest goes to us. By moving these -- by centralizing these positions, we can't help -- and these positions have budgets, etcetera. I would like to suggest that maybe you want to flesh that out a little bit and present it back to the faculty as to what the true implications financially are. Because otherwise, we're going to see this as a financial takeover.

PROVOST HARRIS: So I would say that one of the things Tony's done, and I think had been done before -- Linda would be the one who could tell us -- is to be more open with the deans about the budgets of the other deans. Because I was down in Boston at a town hall meeting, and what I was hearing from the med school was banging on the table, “We're the cash cow that's subsidizing the rest of this university.” They weren't right, by the way. And A&S is less right, far less right in that, that you should be the case. In fact, we're seeing all of our margins decline across the university. That's part of the challenges we're having.

So Tony's been sharing that with the deans. That's why I was glad to hear Roger say the Budget and Priorities Committee will be a piece of this. It's an important issue. And Jim and I have talked about it, and Linda and I have certainly talked about it a great deal. So it's an important piece of this. But I think it's better to have that conversation in detail with Budget and Priorities than to try to have a minute before I get to bang the gavel for once.

PROFESSOR ROMERO: Thank you. And again, we're really counting on Budget and Priorities and the other committees to do their share and really help us all go forward. Thank you all.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Announcements

Election Results for T&P Committee Election

Ioannis Evrigenis, Chair of Committee on Committees, will announce the results of the ad hoc T&P Committee Election process. Nominees and their information can be found here: http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/committees/elections/index.htm.

Nominations for the 2015 Wendell Phillips Award

The Committee on Student Life is now accepting nominations for the 2015 Wendell Phillips Award (flyer attached). The nomination deadline is October 27. This prestigious award is given annually to the junior or senior who has best demonstrated both marked ability as a speaker and a high sense of public responsibility. The recipient of the award receives a cash prize and traditionally is selected as the only student speaker at the Baccalaureate Ceremony in May. To nominate a student go to http://ocl.tufts.edu/wendellphillips/ and complete the on-line nomination form. If you have any questions please let Helen Marrow, the convener of the Committee on Student Life, or Joseph Golia, the Director Office for Campus Life, know.

Old Business

Vote on EPC Proposal on Online Course Evaluations

Speaker: Montserrat Teixidor, Educational Policy Committee

Summary: EPC proposes to make average numerical values from course evaluations available in Trunk to all faculty members, to new students, and to continuing students who filled out their teaching evaluations in the prior semester. We also propose to slightly extend the period during which evaluations can be submitted and to allow students to revise their submissions during that period.

Key Issues: Participation in on-line course evaluations is likely to decrease without some incentive to do so. At the same time, students obtain their information from websites like "Rate my Professor" that contain limited numbers of responses. The proposed solution appeals to students’ sense of civic duty to others, as their contributions should not only be useful to faculty members but also to their peers considering taking a class in the future.

Action required: Vote on the proposal. The current policy is that numerical values from course evaluations should be available to students. This policy has not been enforced recently but corresponds to the latest resolution voted by faculty.

Further Information: See attachment. If approved, Parts 1 and 2 of the attachment could be implemented for fall course evaluations. If approved, Parts 3 and 4 would be implemented in a future semester.

Next Steps: If approved, work towards implementation.
Progress Report from the Committee on Faculty Work/Life

*Speakers:* Elizabeth Remick and John McDonald, Co-chairs of the Committee on Faculty Work/Life

*Summary:* Progress report on developments since the September 17 discussion of the open letter to the administration on the day care center.

*Key issues:* Brief update on September 24 meeting with Provost Harris, and acknowledgement of the administration’s letter in response to the open letter. Questions from the faculty about these matters.

*Action required:* None; for the information of the faculty, and discussion.

*Further information:* None

**New Business**

T&P Proposal Regarding Recusals

*Speakers:* Vida Johnson, chair, T&P Committee

*Summary:* Proposal from the T&P Committee for dealing with recusals when a member of T&P has a case from his/her department

*Key issue and rationale for proposal:* The goal of this proposal is to ensure compliance with AS&E Faculty Bylaws in T&P Committee representation from the School of Engineering and the three bylaw-designated areas of Arts and Sciences: Humanities and Arts; Social Sciences; Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

*Action required:* Vote of the faculty on the following additional language (in bold) to Statement 11:

Proposal 1:
For regular promotion and tenure/promotion cases, on p. 11, #16:

16. T&P discusses the case, and its members vote on a recommendation for or against tenure and promotion. In cases where a T&P member is from the same department as a candidate, the member **recuses him/herself** and does not participate in the tenure and promotion proceedings in any way other than as a member of the department.

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

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

Next Steps: The vote takes effect immediately, so that current cases will all have a full 6-person committee with appropriate school and area representation.

Discussion of and Update on Revised AS&E Reorganization Proposal

Speakers: Roger Tobin and members of the Executive Committee.

Summary: Status report on Executive Committee's actions to implement the AS&E Faculty Position Statement from the September 12 Faculty Forum.

Key issues: Following the overwhelming support for the Position Statement coming out of the Faculty Forum on September 12, the Executive Committee met with the Chairs of the relevant faculty committees. They asked that the provost put in writing both the problems he perceives and the plans/ideas he is currently proposing to address them, so that they can begin deliberations. We concurred and relayed this request to the Provost who promised to respond.

Our understanding from the Provost's meeting on September 19 and subsequent discussions is that Provost Harris has modified his September 2 AS&E reorganization plan and that Tenure and Promotion is now off the table. He is also willing to work with faculty and faculty committees on each of the other four areas of concern (admissions, athletics, graduate studies, and student life/academic affairs.

Our position is that according to University bylaws these are indeed areas that fall under the responsibility of the schools of AS&E and their faculties (See attached).

Action required: Faculty discussion.

Further information: Excerpts from the Tufts University Bylaws and AS&E Faculty Handbook:

The faculty of each school has its own bylaws, except that the College of Liberal Arts and Jackson College constitute a single faculty with a single set of bylaws. Membership criteria and responsibilities of the several Arts and Sciences and Engineering (A&S&E) faculties are specified in the bylaws of each of the faculties.
The Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering (AS&E) is composed of the Faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences (A&S) and the Faculty of the School of Engineering (SoE).

Bylaws of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering

Article I
There shall be a Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, comprising the Faculties of the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering, known as the associated schools. The Faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences shall consist of the Faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and Jackson College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering shall determine all questions of administration affecting more than one of the associated schools, including approval of the academic calendar; act upon all questions referred to it by the several faculties or the president; and receive and act upon all reports of its committees. It shall also nominate to the trustees candidates from the associated schools for all degrees, except honorary degrees, nomination being made only upon recommendation of the several faculties.

Article II
Section 1. All members of the Faculties of the Colleges and Schools comprising this faculty, as defined in Article I of these bylaws and in the bylaws of said colleges and schools, shall be voting members of this faculty.
Section 2. The Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering may authorize appointment of students to serve on committees of this faculty, or, on recommendation of a constituent faculty, on committees of that faculty, provided that the faculty always constitutes a majority of any such committee.

Article III
The officers of this faculty shall be the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the School of Engineering, appointed by the trustees, and a secretary annually elected by the faculty at the last regular meeting of the academic year, and who, by virtue of election by this faculty, shall serve as Secretary of the Faculty of each of the associated schools.

AS&E Faculty Handbook
Chapter 1
Organization and Governance

Faculty Governance in Arts and Sciences and Engineering

Faculty participation in university governance is essential to the success of any university. Tufts University recognizes that the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas of university life as the Arts and Sciences and Engineering curricula; subject matters of instruction; research projects; establishing criteria for faculty promotion and tenure; and those aspects of student life that relate to the education of students on campus. The faculty is not only a self-governing body, but also the body principally charged with day-to-day responsibility for carrying out the educational program of the associated schools. An overview of faculty governance is provided elsewhere in the Handbook.
The Committee on Student Life (CSL) is pleased to announce it is now accepting nominations for the

2015 WENDELL PHILLIPS AWARD

The Wendell Phillips Memorial Scholarship is one of two prize scholarships (the other being assigned to Harvard University), which were established in 1896 by the Wendell Phillips Memorial Fund Association in honor of Boston’s great preacher and orator. The award is given annually to the junior or senior who has best demonstrated both marked ability as a speaker and a high sense of public responsibility. The recipient of the award receives a cash prize and traditionally is selected as the only student speaker at the Baccalaureate Ceremony in May. Nominees will be invited to apply and following a review of finalists, the Committee on Student Life will select this year’s recipient in March 2015.

To nominate a student go to http://ocl.tufts.edu/wendellphillips/
and complete the on-line nomination form

Nomination Deadline: October 27, 2014, 5:00 pm

Nominated students must be a current Senior or Junior. Students may nominate themselves or other students.

For further information contact Joseph Golia, Director Office for Campus Life at joseph.golia@tufts.edu or x73212
1 On-line teaching evaluations

1. **Timing of the course evaluations.** Currently, students are able to fill course evaluations on-line starting one week before the end of classes till the end of the reading period. This dates avoid the final exam period when students might be inclined to give much greater weight to the final test than to the course itself. In addition, it tries to walk a fine line between allowing students adequate time to complete the evaluations and making sure that most of the course has been covered by the time the evaluation takes place. We would like to extend this timing to include one more weekend. Given that most semesters classes end on Mondays, this would mean that a few students might be completing the evaluation having seen one fewer class than with the current policy. Hence, we propose:

   *Evaluations will be available by the end of the day on the Friday before the last full week of classes and through reading period.*

2. **Possibility of students revising their responses after submission.** Currently students are not allowed to revise their evaluations after they press the submit button. We propose that students be allowed to revise their evaluations after submission, during the evaluation period only. This would allow students to answer specific questions asked by faculty on the last few classes, add further thoughts or complete evaluations that were cut short due to time pressure. It would also allow to correct a few rare instances that have occurred in the past of students submitting evaluations for the wrong course. Hence, we propose:

   *During the evaluation period, students will be allowed to revise their evaluations after submission.*

3. **Should evaluations be made available to students.** The faculty voted in 2005 that evaluations be made available to students, unless departments opted out. Evaluations were made available only one year, although the faculty did not subsequently vote to do otherwise.

   We propose that all average numerical values from the evaluations be made available in trunk to all faculty and to those students that satisfy the conditions in 4) below. Note that courses with small number of students and independent studies/thesis work do not have teaching evaluations.

   *All available numerical values of the course evaluations will be made available on trunk to all faculty, to first semester students and to those continuing students who filled all*
of their course evaluations in the last semester of the regular academic year (Fall or Spring) in which they were in residence at Tufts.

The EPC wants to consider the possibility of making some comments publicly available as well. It is exploring the possible addition of one question to the evaluation soliciting comments that the respondent thinks will be useful to a prospective student. Before these comments are made available to the Tufts community, they would be screened and any information that may violate privacy laws or be contrary to the laws that frame freedom of expression at Tufts would be removed.