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ANNOUNCEMENTS

SUMMER SCHOLARS
DEAN LOWE: Hi, I'm Carmen Lowe, Dean of Academic Advising and Undergraduate Studies. I have two announcements. The first is that we are now accepting Summer Scholars applications. This is for undergraduate research opportunities with a faculty mentor this summer. The applications are due at the very beginning of March. We're letting you know now so that you can reach out to students who might be interested, and we especially encourage applications from across the disciplines, including the arts, humanities, foreign languages, social studies, engineering, and STEM fields.

UPDATE FROM THE ACADEMIC CREDIT COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE
My second announcement is an update from the Academic Credit Compliance Committee. This is a subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee, and we've been meeting for the past year to address our accreditors' concerns about our unit of credit, how we assign credit to our courses, and the number of credits we require for graduation.

So I don't have time at this meeting to go into great detail or answer questions, but I'm just giving you a heads up for a sneak preview that we will be having a lot of discussions with the faculty in arts and sciences and engineering over the coming weeks and into the spring semester.

So a bit of background. There is a handout that you can pick up at the back of the room, and it's also available on our TRUNK site for you to have some more background information about why we're looking at our credit unit and what some of the initial proposals are from the committee. The TRUNK site has a lot more information, too.

So I'm just letting you know today that the committee has investigated the issue about our unit of credit and our credit hour. We've investigated how other colleges have addressed the same issue. We've looked into our options, and we're now developing recommendations for the faculty. So we're reaching out right now to various faculty committees, and we'll be reaching out to chairs, program directors, more departments and more faculty committees to discuss the credit issue and our recommendations in greater detail.

And we welcome feedback from the faculty as we prepare to bring this to a vote early in the spring semester. So in the spring, we will ask the faculty to make an important decision about how we assign credit to courses and how many credits we require for our degrees at the graduate and undergraduate level. We'd like the faculty to think first about changing our overall unit of credit and then about how we will insure that the ripple effect of that change does not negatively impact
our retention at graduation rate.

The Academic Credit Compliance Committee has been looking into that concern very carefully, and we have some specific recommendations to maintain Tufts' four-year graduation rate for our undergraduates. We hope to discuss our proposal in greater detail over the coming weeks. So meanwhile, please take a look at the materials we've provided to the faculty at the back of the room and our TRUNK site.

So I'd like to just introduce the committee members so you know who we are. There is Sam Thomas, associate professor of Chemistry -- I don't know if Sam is here -- Heather Nathans, chair of drama and dance; Kiyomi Kagawa from the Japanese program; George Norman from Economics; David Proctor, history -- he is representing the Curricula Committee -- JoAnn Jack, the registrar; Dawn Terkla, associate provost; Jim Glaser, representing political science and arts and sciences; and me.

So if you have any questions meanwhile, please don't hesitate to reach out to the committee. Also pulled into the committee as we've gone ahead is Chris Swan from engineering and Bob Cook, representing the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Thank you.

UPDATE FROM THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WORK/LIFE
PROFESSOR GONZALEZ: The next announcement is from Elizabeth Remick, the chair of Faculty Work/Life.

PROFESSOR REMICK: I'm happy to be here to give you a little bit of an update on how we're doing with the provost's sort of sponsored task force on work/life, which has come out of the open letter that the Work/Life Committee wrote following the transition from TEDCC to Bright Horizons.

I'm reporting on two meetings that we had the week of November 17, one with some members of my committee and representatives of every school at Tufts to talk about work/life issues and where we might want to go as a body moving forward, and also then at the end of the week, all of the members of the AS&E Work/Life Committee. So a big thank you.

Taken altogether, I think that these were really useful meetings, and they gave us a lot of information about what we need to do going forward, and also some positive feedback on how far we've already come.

One of the things that we found out at that meeting was, first of all, that we circulated this sort of one-page information sheet about AS&E work/life resources for faculty, and I hope most of you have seen before, because your work/life liaison may have passed it out. I have other copies if you don't have it.
So it talks about non-academic leaves and parental leaves and family illness and medical leaves and so forth. And when the people from the other schools looked at that, they said, “Wow, we didn't know that we had all that stuff,” and we said, “Well, actually, we don't.” But we do, because we've been working on this five years, and they were like, “Wow, we want that stuff, too.”

So that is sort of one of the prongs that is going to be in our approach that we're going to have going forward, which is thinking about how we can get all the schools at Tufts to where we are now after five years of pretty hard work and collaboration between faculty and administration.

So in fact, what the provost is going to be asking work/life to do is to have every single school produce a sheet like this that says what they've got now, and then we'll think about how to make that better over the coming years.

At the same time, the initial impetus for all of this was about childcare, and the AS&E committee is in the preparatory phase right now -- well, we're finishing our survey instrument for a dependent care needs assessment survey, and we're going to go ahead and administer that early next semester. And when they are ready, I think that it would be safe to say the other campuses will do that as well. But we're going to lead the way, because we're ready, and they may need some different questions, because how they do work is different on those campuses compared to how we do work.

So anyway, what's going to be happening in the next weeks and months is that the provost and his staff are going to be sitting down and talking about guidelines for how this task force, which will be ongoing, rather than a one-year and done kind of thing, is going to move forward what the scope is going to be, how it's going to fit together with our committee, and what its charge is going to be.

And that will all be forthcoming, and I think I speak for everyone on the committee when I say that we're really quite satisfied with the progress that we've made so far, and we're looking forward to continue to work with you on this. So thanks a lot.

NEW BUSINESS

TUFTS SUPPORT SERVICES (TSS) UPDATE

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ: So we now have Vice President Patricia Campbell and Dick Doolin, Senior Director of TSS, to talk about Tufts Support Services. So TSS is going to affect the way all of us work, and it's going to launch this month.

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: Thank you. I thought before I spoke a little bit about our TSS new team that I would update you on the health insurance enrollment. Some of you remember I was here at last month's meeting to speak about that, and as of this morning, out of the thousands of people who would enroll in healthcare, we have -- let's see if I get this number right -- 48 still
unaccounted for, people who had insurance in the current year and have not enrolled for next year. We're continuing to make phone calls. We emailed everyone.

We started about a week and a half ago with 98 people who hadn't signed up. So I just wanted to assure you that we are doing all kinds of diligent tracking to make sure that nobody is left out. So thank you for your cooperation with that and for everyone making their choice and signing up for health insurance.

So TEAM, let's talk a little bit about that. Yes, exactly, the most exciting thing next to happen is that on December 15, we will open Tufts Support Services, and that organization is going to be led by Dick Doolin. Dick, you want to maybe even stand up. Dick is a 32-year-long employee of Tufts, so he knows our university very well. Most administrative and finance staff across the university have had an opportunity at one time or another to work with him, so I think this is a really good thing, that Dick has been able to take on this lead role, and cares very much that this organization be about service, it be about support, and it be about keeping the personal way that we often do work at Tufts. And I've seen the training and orientation that we're doing for staff, and it very much emphasizes that kind of approach to the work that gets done.

I did ask Jillian if she would give me some heads-up about things that might be on people's minds, and so she gave me notes from the Executive Committee meeting where it was discussed, and so I have some idea of what may be on your minds. So let me talk about those things, and then turn it over to questions for as much time as we have for the meeting. Dick, maybe you want to say a word or two after I do that about Tufts Support Services.

In fact, there are sessions on all of the campuses over the next week that will be orientation for people that have to use Tufts Support Services. There have been things posted on the website for TEAM about how to use Tufts Support Services. There will be videos that will be used in the training that can be accessed online by anyone who wants to know about how to use Tufts Support Services.

And the bottom line is if you don't know how to use it, you can make a phone call, you can send an email, you can walk in, you can send a letter, you can contact that organization multiple ways and just say, “Can you help me with this?” and they will try to help you. So if you don't know, that's okay. You can just ask, and our staff is really like -- they're moving in today, and very excited about the idea that they can be the go-to place for many of our financial and human resource transactions.

So the things that you're worried about, however, include that, but also a question about what's going to be happening to our department administrative staff -- where's Jim? Because to a large extent, I don't know the answer to that question. What TEAM is doing and TSS is doing is taking certain transactions that are repetitive, arcane sometimes because they don't happen often, and
making sure that that work can be done by an organization that knows how to do it, that is service oriented, and can remove that work from the people who are your assistants in a variety of different ways across the university, not just in arts, sciences, and engineering, and not just in the schools, but also in the central positions.

And that frees up opportunity to either have people do more of what they've been doing, but haven't had enough time to do, to do something slightly different, or ultimately to use that position in a different way. I will not make that decision. I can help you, and Human Resources, as it is gearing up to be able to be helpful can help you, but those really are decisions made with your involvement and the leadership of the school's involvement.

And I do know that arts, sciences and engineering these days is concerned about its budget. When I see what your margin was at the end of last year, there's no way you couldn't be worried about your budget. You had a very, very modest surplus, and much lower than it's been in previous years. And so if there are opportunities to use resources better, to help fund the things that are most important, which is supporting students and faculty, I know that's what leadership wants to do. But no decisions have been made to eliminate your staff.

What decisions have been made is to take away work that's repetitive, transactional, and they can be held to do that work in a more efficient way. So I hope that's reassuring to you. It doesn't mean there won't be change. And there's particularly change happening in our central divisions. We've had a handful of layoffs in finance and in human resources as we're making these changes. There have been a handful of layoffs in IT as we've been making the consolidation changes there.

But they've been modest. They've been handled well, I believe. And we're not making decisions in the schools. Those are things that we'll help the leadership make, but you'll be involved in them. So that seemed to be the issue that was raised at the Executive Committee meeting that people were probably most concerned about.

There was also a comment about use of consultants, and I can't agree more, frankly. I don't want to spend any more money on consultants than we need to. On the other hand, there are times when consultants have expertise we don't have, and there are times when it doesn't make sense to add any expertise by hiring full-time staff, because we're not going to need it forever. So we have used consultants, and in those kinds of situations, we will use them recently to help support some high level executive type searches, because the capacity to really source and find the right candidates resides with those consultants and not with people that we have on staff.

So we'll use them when we should, and we will certainly try to not use them any more than we need to, because they aren't Tufts, and they don't know us as well as we do, and they can be expensive. So I agree. I don't disagree with you. So we won't place a moratorium on using consultants, because I think that would hamstring us in a way we don't want to be limited, but we'll be very,
very careful about using our funds on consultants.

Is there anything that stood out in your conversation that I should also talk about? Okay, then why don't I give Dick a minute or two to talk a little bit about the opening of TSS and maybe about the sessions next week?

MR. DOOLIN: Thanks, Patricia. Thank you very much for letting me speak for a minute. I'm really honored to do this. As Patricia mentioned, I've been working at Tufts for over 32 years. I'm in my 33rd year, and I've had a number of experiences with faculty and administration, and I have to say some have been very rewarding, and some have been very enlightening, too, to say the least.

I do think that with all due respect to all of you, I feel like what we're trying to provide for you is an opportunity to provide great service, great support, and do it the Tufts way. I think it's very important. It's something that we have impressed upon everybody we interviewed for any of the positions that we've filled in the Tufts Support Services, and it's going to be a cornerstone for the work that we do. We don't want to lose that high touch in the experience that you all have had in working with administration.

Having said that, we're opening our doors on December 15. We're at 62R Talbot. The space has been renovated to support a very modern open environment for us to work as a team as we provide service and support to all of you. In addition to that, we hired 35 or 40 positions in a little over two and a half months. So it's been a very fast track in terms of hiring the staff.

We have a great mix of internal hires to support services, as well as a good group of external people that provide all kinds of professional experience that we think is going to be very valuable in support services. And I'm very honored to be part of this new endeavor. Having worked here at Tufts for so many years, Tufts has grown tremendously in all ways, academically and research and even financial. I've worked with finance for many, many years. And to be part of an organization that's going to transform some of the support in the administration of the university is very exciting to me. So thank you very much.

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: We're both happy to take questions.

PROFESSOR AMMONS: I have two questions. I'm Liz Ammons in the English department. One question is what are these people going to do? Can you add some specifics? You say all these new people, and it's going to be centralized. If you could give some specifics.

The other question is you have referred to the fact that leadership will be making decisions about what happens in departments in terms of staff. Who's the leadership? I think it's very important for us as faculty to know who that is and to have department chairs and people in the departments
intimately involved in any decisions about changes of staff in departments.

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: I want Jim to answer that, because we're talking to the Arts and Sciences and Engineering faculty, but each of our schools is organized slightly differently, so it's a different answer, depending on where the question's asked, and I think about all of the schools when I hear a question like that. So I'm going to let Jim answer that.

DEAN GLASER: So the leadership is the department leadership and the school's leadership. I will talk about this with the chairs and the program directors as well, but Scott and myself, Bárbara and Nancy, we right now are involved in the management of the departments, and we will continue to be involved in that management. And as chairs have different ideas -- and I don't think it will be a one size fits all solution in every department and program. But as those ideas evolve in the different spaces on campus, we will be very happy to work with the chairs and the program directors to do things that make sense.

MR. DOOLIN: I'll answer the first question. So as Patricia mentioned, the types of activity that we're going to support are human resources and finance transactional type activity. These are common repetitive type transactions that you all provide through your departments and through central administration, travel, procurement, to speak on the finance side. We have a staff of travel professionals that can help you with booking travel. We're working very closely with travel collaborative to do that. In addition, travel reports and expense reports that need to get processed, we will be the experts that will help you compile all your expenses and process those reports and that activity.

Procurement, we're going to focus on the low dollar, high volume common types of purchases that you all make and leave the sourcing and the high dollar items to the purchasing staff for more particular types of purchases that are going to take place. But we'll help you not only transact those purchases, but we'll also help compile the needed documentation and information necessary to make the purchases.

On the HR side, there's a volume of requests that come in through HR. I think they surveyed it, and in one month, they had over --

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: Four thousand requests came in to HR in a month's period of time.

MR. DOOLIN: Right, and those can be as simple as a quick question or a particular personal matter that needs to be dealt with for your benefits or payroll. And we'll handle that right up through working with the central HR office as well.

DEAN GLASER: I just want to go back to the first question, and I realize I gave a very A&S
centric answer, and of course the issues that arise in the engineering departments would be worked out in consultation with Linda and the staff in the dean's office in the engineering school.

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: I just want to add one more thing. One of the tools that Tufts Support Services is going to use in doing its work is a system that will for every request create a case, if you will. And so the management leadership in Tufts Support Services with its staff will be able to keep track of every request to make sure it gets answered and resolved. And I've said this before, but I think it's true there probably isn't anybody here who's been at Tufts for a while who hasn't had the experience of I don't know where to go, I'll call the person I know, they don't know the answer, but they referred, but we never hear back, or we need something in a timely way, and it doesn't happen.

And we really want to change that so that you, as the requestor, or anyone as the requestor for a transaction or information, will be able to see the status of that. You'll actually be able to see, if you choose, by going online and looking and knowing who's working on it, how long it's been there, when you can expect to have an answer. And we're setting up service expectations. So for a simple request, you should be able to expect that you get an answer within X period of time.

For a different kind of transaction, you should expect that you can get resolution in X period of time so that we won't have the frustration and the wasted effort that goes on when people have to start the back and forth tracking for things or calling the next place because that wasn't the right place or calling somebody, all of that. I can't do it for the job as somebody might at describing that frustration, but I am sure most of you have experienced it at some time.

So I believe there will be a way for you to know the status of what you need as well as to eliminate some of the frustration that we've had in the past with those kinds of things, and your staff's frustration. Did you want to something?

DEAN ABRIOLA: I just wanted to take this opportunity to say within engineering, we have identified some areas that will probably be moving over to Tufts Support Services, and as we see things settle out, there are pieces of individuals who are actively involved in these transactional things. But as those in the School of Engineering know, we're very leanly staffed.

So presumably what will happen is some of the time that these individuals are spending won't be needed in those activities, so we'll be able to deploy their time in other ways, and we're going to be looking across the school for opportunities to take advantage of this freed up time. And of course, all the decisions will be made, as Jim said, between the dean's office and the departments who are involved, and nothing will be done unilaterally.

PROFESSOR GOLDSTEIN: Just a follow-up on this restructuring of services. I assume cost is always an important consideration and what you've described, certainly people have been
frustrated with this or that aspect of HR or finance before, but there was a staff doing all of that. What became of them, and how many people have replaced them?

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: Well, some of them are working in the new Tufts Support Services. As I mentioned earlier, there have been a handful of reductions, because with the consolidation, we didn't need necessarily the same people or the same numbers of people.

The way we structured this is the benefits that the schools across Tufts will accrue, because they no longer need to do this work, is the opportunity for that school. And they can determine, with guidance maybe from the provost's office or whatever, how they want to use that saved time that saved work effort. In central, our central divisions aren't going to have quite the same freedom. We're using the savings that we get in our central divisions in human resources and finance and IT and advancement, in the provost's office, even, to help fund the cost of doing these new things, both the Tufts Support Services, a new budget system that is coming later next year. A variety of things that we'll be doing to improve support is being funded by the savings that are accruing to the various Tufts central university divisions. Does that help?

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ: One more question.

PROFESSOR INOUYE: So does this mean that approvals for expenditures happen in your office from here on out?

MR. DOOLIN: The approvals will rest where they are today. We'll process the transactions for you. I think that's a question that will be further defined as the schools work through the staffing. I think the approval process will probably be refined at that point, but for right now, it's as it is.

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: We actually think, or I certainly think that there are the changes and the transactions that will move to Tufts Support Services in December, but there are opportunities over time to add additional things, and hoping to get more towards sort of a one stop place for people when they need administrative support. So there will be additional things that could be added in the future.

There also are I think work process still that needs revision, that there are too many stops along the way between it being initiated and it being executed. We have to be careful to do that well so that if there is a control in there that somebody really does need, it's not removed. But the personnel action forms are sort of a prime example of that. And while a lot of that doesn't change on December 15, we have an effort to look at that and try to streamline that and really re-conceptualize the way those things are done.

There are multiple confusing items that you have to know in order to accurately fill out a PAF, and if it doesn't get accurately filled out, it gets held up, has to go back. It's one of the more frustrating
things that universally everyone has had to deal with. So we're looking at that not just the form or not just where it gets done, but the entire process of how could we make that simpler for people, and that will be a subsequent improvement that we would like to make and have Tufts Support Services help with that. So we're not done. This isn't the end. There's more to come.

MR. DOOLIN: If I could, I was at the School of Engineering, and one of the faculty asked how will I process my transaction of a grant, what is my funding source? It still will continue to go to that person who does the budgeting and funding and tracks the funding for your research, and you'll still work with that individual. We'll be the people in this processing for you.

EXECUTIVE VP CAMPBELL: Thank you. Wish us really good luck. December 15, first day open. Come visit.

INTERIM REPORTS FROM FACULTY COMMITTEES RE: THE AS&E REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL
PROFESSOR GONZALEZ: Thank you, Patricia. So the next item is the committee report on the AS&E reorganization proposal, and Roger Tobin is going to give a short introduction.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: I'll be very brief. We've talked about this repeatedly, so as you know, various faculty committees have been looking at the various aspects of the proposals for the reorganization that the provost paraphrased earlier this fall, and we promised that we would get back to you with some preliminary information.

So we're going to have now, as you already have a packet of some written information. We're going to ask the chairs or representatives of each of the responsible committees to speak very briefly, I would ask probably like three minutes so that we have time for a few questions. There are five different committees. We want some time for people who have questions and get to the response.

This is not the end of the discussion, and these are not the final reports. This is just the preliminary update, and different committees are at various stages with these things. So there will be additional opportunities. We're not going to do any voting today. There are no proposals before you from these committees at this moment. That will all come in the spring. So this is just an informational update about where things stand.

So I think we might as well just go in the order they're listed here, except I think it would perhaps make most sense for Budget and Priorities to come last, because in a sense, the issues they're dealing with are sort of issues that overarch everything.

So let me just say we thank and I believe all of you should thank profusely the chairs and all the members of these committees who have had to work very hard. And thank you all for stepping up
to what I know was not anticipated and a quite difficult and time-consuming task.

KRZYSZTOF SLIWA, CHAIR OF THE GSAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR TOBIN: So let's start. Krzysztof, could you say something briefly. Now, this I should say is a little different from the others in that really this is a proposal from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences regarding issues within the GSAS, so it may have implications for engineering, but it is really an arts and sciences proposal, as it stands.

PROFESSOR SLIWA: As you know, on September 2, we had a presentation of reorganization, and our committee met quite quickly and actually before I have too many other committees -- six times altogether. And on September 19, we kind of met to decide what to do, and it turned out we had six meetings. On the 24th, we met for the first time with past deans of arts and sciences and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, trying to find out what their experiences were.

And then we decided to meet with representatives jointly of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering, because many aspects are common. So we had a very nice meeting with (inaudible) and it was obvious that we have to have a long meeting with the current deans. So we had a very nice and extremely (inaudible) meeting with current deans, Linda Abriola and Jim Glaser.

And then we considered five options, keeping the existing structure as it is; creating a position of independent dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences alone, reporting to the provost directly; creating a position of independent job dean of graduate studies for both arts and sciences and engineering; adopting the provost's proposal -- to remind you, the proposal is to create an associate or vice provost for Graduate Studies who reports directly to the provost. And the last option was to keep the elements of the existing structure, and we made some modifications, according to what we felt was the most important.

And we had another meeting of our own, and actually we reached a consensus, and we've prepared this statement, which actually we feel that is ready for the faculty. You have it attached. I will just read the recommendation. The recommendation says,

"The Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences recommends keeping the current financial structure of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences within the School of Arts and Sciences intact. At the same time, we request that the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, together with other deans, be present at any and all meetings at which financial issues and matters of policy priorities are discussed and decided. We believe that this seat at the table will ensure that graduate programs are well-represented and the graduate and undergraduate programs will continue to be mutually supportive and integral to the overall goals of our university."

At the same time, we felt that actually since we were in agreement -- we reached agreement with
the provost and vice provost, so we met with David Harris and Kevin Dunn, they kindly agreed to meet, and we had a very nice meeting where we discussed our recommendation and the entire issue on November 5, almost a month ago, and I think everybody agrees that it was a good meeting.

And the provost did agree that the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences should attend many more of the important meetings. Among those which were mentioned at the meeting was meetings between provost and dean of arts and sciences, which happen more or less once a month, and other meetings concerning advancement, development, and capital campaign.

It was agreed that there would be a meeting to iron out the final details about which other meetings. And this meeting is supposed to take place -- I'm not sure if it has taken place -- between the provost, vice provost, Dowling, and dean of arts and sciences and dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

We also had a very frank discussion about the provost's proposal, and I have to say we just said what we think. We think that our recommendation will serve the graduate school better, rather than the provost's proposal. We think that a new proposed administrator/vice provost/associate provost, would be unlikely to match the experience of the current existing dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences now or in the future. And we also think that creating in our mind a de facto intermediary between the faculty and the administration would necessarily diminish the role of the dean of arts and sciences and engineering that he or she has. And we think this should be avoided.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Thank you. Are there questions or comments?

PROFESSOR SWAN: Chris Swan, civil and environmental engineering. I'm curious, you talked about AS, but I didn't hear too much on E.

PROFESSOR SLIWA: Basically, we did agree completely that we will support a very similar structure should the Graduate School of Engineering want to have the same thing. So we will be in full support of the same representation at the table. So another seat at the table for the School of Engineering, absolutely. It's here in writing. We did discuss it, and we decided to keep our conclusions constrained only to arts and sciences. This was the result of some discussions, but we are in full support of giving the same representation to the School of Engineering.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: So I think we'll move on, and I've been advised that we'd like to save the questions until all the reports have been given, and then we can discuss them all collectively. So David Garman representing Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid.
DAVID GARMAN, CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR GARMAN: Thank you. Time is short, so I'll be quick. In one way, I think our committee had an either pass, because undergraduate admissions is not as complicated an organization as some of the others that have been under discussion, so it was our lucky break in serving on this committee.

There are three things that we learned, or in some cases knew already and reiterated, and then three things that we talked about. Let me just mention them quickly. The first thing that we relearned and was confirmed very strongly is everybody thinks undergraduate admissions works incredibly well. Everybody has praise for the organization. And this is talking to school deans, school administrators, talking to vice provost Kevin Dunn, talking to past chairs of this committee. So everybody thinks it's working well.

Two other things that I think we learned or relearned is the way the dean of admissions in the role of management works in AS&E is to be very involved in undergraduate admissions. By that, I mean he participates in meetings. He reads application folders. He should have a good sense of the guts of what's going on. And I think that's part of what enables him to make such nuanced decisions about admissions. And I think we can attribute part of our success in admissions to the involvement of the dean at that level of admissions, and this is something that Dean Coffin enjoys doing and wants to continue doing.

Another thing that we learned is that regardless of the official reporting structure, Dean Coffin acts as if he has solid line reports to both of the school deans, and he consults very closely. They're happy with the way he has worked with them. They would like that to continue. And again, I think his willingness to consult with basically anybody who has an interest in admissions is part of what makes it successful. So he's willing to consult with the committee, willing to consult with department chairs, willing to consult with central administration. He's always available. So those are things that we learned.

In terms of particular questions, in the end, our discussion got around to three very specific questions. One was should the AS&E dean of admissions start having some role for coordinating or improving admission practices in schools other than AS&E, and we honestly thought that this was a bad idea and an overreach.

Part of it is just practical, that it's not going to be feasible without just cutting out some of the things that he's doing right now. He's not working half time, folks. He is a very busy guy. And we don't want to take the risk of disrupting what we're already doing really well.

A second question was something that will be touched on by Budget and Priorities, and that is should budgets for admissions and financial aid be set and controlled by the provost's office or by
the deans of AS&E? Right now, this is done by the school deans, and we think it's important to keep that in the hands of the school deans. Anytime you look at the budgetary issues, where money is available to be spent, where the big decisions are, it always comes down to salaries and financial aid. And we really think those decisions need to be made close to where things are happening, so at the school level as opposed to central.

And then the last thing that we looked at was the idea of reporting relationships, and our conclusion was less institutionalized was working well. So we're proposing that admissions has solid line reports to both of the school deans, because that's the way it's behaving and it's working really well. And if a dotted line relationship to the provost's office would help with communications or help with coordination, then that makes sense. We'd be happy to see that happening. So that's it. Thank you.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Thank you, David. So as you know, the trick is the committee assignment was to know what to do about the Dowling reorganization, and the advisory board was good enough to take on that task, even though it's perhaps a little bit outside their charge. So Joe Auner is going to report on that.

JOSEPH AUNER, CHAIR OF THE FACULTY ADVISORY BOARD
PROFESSOR AUNER: Thanks. The first thing, I do want to thank my colleagues on the committee: Juliet Fuhrman, Al Robbat, Maggie McMillan, and Kyongbum Lee, and they might join in later with some comments, and also everybody who met with the committee. Everybody met with us on a very short time line, and it was very open.

So these are provisional findings, and partly because we're still working as a committee, we don't really have specific recommendations for you today, although we plan to develop those sooner. But it's also provisional in that a lot of the things that we're looking at with this proposed reorganization haven't been fully fleshed out in a way that we can properly analyze them in terms of like the ultimate justifications for doing it, in particular what parts of Dowling would move. It seems there's a clear sense that not everything would move, but there are different ideas about what parts would move.

In particular, also what the actual reporting structures would be. Right now, if you look at the proposed reorganization chart, it goes to the provost, but obviously the associate provost will have a big role, and we would like to understand better what those would be, since that's very crucial to questions of academic oversight.

Also, the budgetary impact of these changes is unclear to us at this point. And I know the Budget and Priorities people will talk about that later. But the things that are very clear to us -- and I think everybody on the committee was really impressed by the complexity of the Dowling operation, of the dedication of the people there, and just so you all know, it includes student affairs, student
services, student life, academic advising, orientation and transitions, study abroad, health and wellness. So a number of very different structures.

But the thing we learned very clearly is that the whole idea of them being together is that they work together in various ways, and every one of those offices interacts with every other office in complicated ways all the time. And the whole vision of the creation of Dowling in its current structure was a one-stop shopping for students where they could solve problems right away in one building and that people could meet with each other very quickly.

The biggest problem that everybody did identify is the feeling that student services, student affairs don't have a real seat at the table and a voice in upper levels of administration where decisions are made, decisions like dealing with problems that arise concerning students, but also budget planning, decisions related to facilities, construction, enrollment, all these things that impact student life, and that obviously relate to the core of business of Tufts, which is educating our students in this campus-based residential experience.

So everybody sees that as a problem, but based on the interviews we did, it's less clear that there's a consensus that the proposed reorganization would address those problems, or the best way to get Dowling to have a seat at the table. And the concerns were that breaking apart Dowling would decrease the communication and efficiencies of the operation as it currently happens.

A major concern was that it would decrease academic oversight and academic involvement in those parts that moved into central administration. Also the feeling among many people we spoke to that it's very, very hard to differentiate academic and non-academic parts of the operation.

Another point that was raised is that for parts that would move to central administration that there would be less accountability on their budgets. So currently, those budgets of the various parts are moderated by the deans in consultation with the upper administration. If the deans were pulled out of that, there's a sense that you don't know how those budgets could grow.

This is not a recommendation yet, but it does seem like one finding we have, it seems less that there's a problem in the structure with the various dotted lines and different ways of reporting and more communication -- problem with communication and oversight, but with Dowling and the relationship to the deans and to the upper administration.

And it seems like in the past, when the deans have cooperated that the problems of split reporting lines has really not been such a problem. There have been some tensions where the School of Engineering has not felt adequately served, and they've created some of their own parallel structures. So it seems less a problem of structure and more a problem with communication.

And then as we've already heard in the previous report, it does seem like the thing that needs to
happen no matter what is improved structures for communication, where people involved in developing and delivering all the student affairs and student services in Dowling have actually a seat at the table with the upper administration, ways to communicate through the deans and to the president and the provost. And then more mechanisms to get more people at the table when decisions are made, and literally getting them a seat at the table more regularly, including everybody we spoke to.

One little -- I don't know if this is a little thing, but this is a slight side effect that everybody we spoke to talked about their frustrations with the budget process and their operation. No matter what stage in the operation they were, a feeling that they didn't have complete or sufficient control over their own budgets. So I think I'll end there.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: So the next of the specific committees is the Athletic Committee, so Steve Hirsch will report to us.

STEVEN HIRSCH, CHAIR OF THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE
PROFESSOR HIRSCH: A lot of what I have to say is going to echo what's been said by the people who have gone before. The report that we've given you is very much a provisional, preliminary progress report, because as you can tell from the post that we have at the end, we haven't reached a consensus. Different members of the committee are leaning different ways given where we are at this point, and there are a number of reasons for that.

Some of it has to do with lack of information about particularly how decisions are made about resource allocation as regard to athletics. Administrators all somewhat reluctantly fail to talk about this. We did ask about it, but did not get a clear enough sense, and it makes it hard to think about how the different models would actually work if we don't know exactly sort of at what level and how these decisions are made.

And as I also said in the report, it was something of a moving target in that we had three iterations of plans. And while we felt that our main responsibility was to respond to the provost's final proposal, which is have the athletic director report directly to the provost, we also looked at some of the other models, which in some cases are things that have already been tried, and in some cases, things that were sort of put out earlier on as possibilities. And, of course, we felt that each model has its strengths and its weaknesses, and it's hard in the end to sort of do the math and figure out what's going to bring the most benefit.

The two models that made the most sense ultimately were the provost, our having the athletic director report to the provost, and variations on what is more or less the current situation in which the athletic director reports to the deans of arts and sciences and engineering. At the moment, the report is just to Arts and Sciences, and we feel that that's not appropriate, but there were sort of two flavors that we could see for the future. One would be solid lines to both, and the other would be
the solid line to arts and sciences and a dotted line to engineering.

And in the end, the advantages that we can see to report to the provost have to do with greater visibility across the university, potentially the athletic director and program having a seat at the table where decisions are made about resource allocations or about policy, and maybe some enhanced opportunities in terms of fundraising. The advantages of having continued report to the deans of AS&E are that an awful lot of what the athletic director does involves dealing with the academic deans, dealing with student services, dealing with the sort of day-to-day issues that come up, and in the current form, the communication, the collaboration is good.

So in the end, the strengths of reporting to the provost are the weaknesses of reporting to the academic deans and vice-versa. And in the end, where is the greatest benefit. So we are not at a point where we're able to give you a single, clear recommendation.

A couple of things would probably help us to do this, and we're actually looking to the provost to hopefully provide some information about really two areas of concern. One of them would be helpful to have more information about how decisions for resource allocation are made, and some reassurances that if the athletic director is reporting to the provost directly that he or she have a seat at the table and be part of those discussions.

And the second area is that we're very concerned that the communication, cooperation, collaboration that currently goes on between athletics and the deans and student services continues. So we would like to know what mechanisms would insure that that would continue. If the report is above that level to the provost, we would like assurances that this would continue and would like to understand what the motives would be at that point for people who are no longer receiving reports from athletics.

So getting some information and reassurance in those two might allow us to see our way clear to the provost's proposal. Failing that, both of the advantages of that scheme go away, and we're more inclined to lean towards some variation of the current system.

I'd like to just add two final broader concerns that I think apply to all of the different committees that are reporting here, and one of those is the way in which all of this is interconnected, they should have more and more reports going to the provost. Does he have, therefore, the time to devote to any of the sort of individual pieces of it. I guess that's what we're all wondering. So if we get more information, more answers to these questions, I think we'll feel somewhat more comfortable reaching a consensus decision, and if we want this to happen this semester, we would obviously need this sometime in the next few weeks. I do see a few of my committee colleagues here. If any of them want to add anything to what I've said, I invite you to do so. Thank you.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Thank you, Steve. And then the last of our reports is from Budget and
Priorities.

GEORGE McNINCH, MEMBER OF BUDGET & PRIORITIES COMMITTEE
PROFESSOR McNINCH: So I'm not actually the chair of this committee. Fio emailed me yesterday and said he was traveling and wasn't able to arrive soon enough. So despite all the forward references to the Budget and Priorities Committee's report, it's probably going to be a little terse.

So we met four times. We met with key members of the administration, Scott Sahagian and Kevin Dunn and Jonathan Dudley, and had good conversations. We asked a lot of technical questions. We learned a lot historically. I'm not sure exactly how to describe it, but we learned a lot, but we don't have a lot of answers, so the form of our report really is basically articulating a number of questions about the budget, and I'll focus on the main ones.

So we articulated some questions, and some of the members of our committee made a nice couple of flowcharts, which you can refer to. There are duplicates. The second one is the same as the first, but labeled with the questions. But the main questions, I think, are really just what's going to happen, what might happen under the reorganization, and we don't have precise answers to those budgetary questions.

And I guess the main ones are how will the cost change and the management change for the institutional support, which comes currently out of the shared AS&E budget; the same question, how will the cost change and how will the management change for academic support and student services and stuff that was reported on by previous dean of Dowling, the library, the athletics, the admissions, the registrar, and so on, how will that change structurally, and finally, the question of what will be the impact on the split, on the shared surplus.

So those questions articulated and a longer page full of them that I'll try to summarize, but you have access to, and I guess the conclusion is really just this sentence. "It is the opinion of this committee that the administration is working earnestly to define a budgetary plan for the reorganization, and that to date, such a plan has not been precisely defined."

So that's our conclusion. Like I said, it's a little terse, but that's where we stand. I guess I can add that the rest of the comments were that the administration feels, I guess communicated to us that it feels that it doesn't want to rush, and it wants to carefully provide the answers to these questions. Thanks.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Thank you to all the chairs for your clarity and brevity. So that leaves us some time for questions to any of the chairs or to the provost or comments, whatever you'd like to talk about.
PROFESSOR ROBINSON: I have a question about methodology. So the first report on admissions, and you used the phrase everybody agrees that this works really well. So I was wondering how you determined that, and I'll just sort of add that people -- some people with whom I talk, faculty members, have noted that in terms of the admissions, who goes to Tufts -- I've been here a long time, and when I first started teaching, there were a fair number of black students from inner-city schools, public schools. I rarely see any of those. So there has been a change in practices at a time when we're increasing our attempts to raise financial aid to bring more need-based students to campus. So I would just like to know what your methodology is, because it may not be really representative, truly.

PROFESSOR GARMAN: We obviously didn't do a poll, so this is from attending focus groups in the summer, talking to past chairs of the committee, committee members talking to other people, absolutely not systematic. So what I would say about the specific question that you're raising is I'm not sure the approach to admissions has changed. The results have changed. And I think part of the reason the results have changed is it's a different admissions and financial aid environment that we're competing in. So, for example, when Harvard became much more generous in giving financial aid, then that pulled students away from us who we would really like to attract, and we're still working on trying to make up that difference.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, German, Russian, Asian. Just to take off from what Pearl said, we definitely want faculty to be very involved, continue to be involved in the admissions process through our committees and through our deans, but it sort of argues that the reporting structure remain within our schools. But I wanted to actually ask the provost what his take was, since he consulted on all of this, and where he's standing now on all of these issues.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thank you, Vida. So we only have a few minutes --

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: You get the same three minutes.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thank you, Vida. So let me join Roger in thanking the committees in doing this work. The memo that I sent out on October 4, so excited about working with the faculty committees. I'm really excited about the work that's been done and the work that's going to continue to be done by the committees.

I also wanted to let you know some other activity that's happened over that period. So as I said in the note, we're going to try and figure out sort of what's going on, try and understand in different ways what the faculty are thinking about these issues and other issues. And so this semester, Kevin and I have met with 20 departments across arts, sciences, and engineering. Tony's met with another -- there's some overlap -- Tony's met with eight departments. So it's been a great opportunity, in addition to these meetings of the faculty, to actually meet with departments.
And you get different folks. There's overlap, but there are some people you always get at the department meetings, and so it's been very useful to get both of those. We do that before we sort of went -- ramp them up. Never intended to have a full plan. So I want to remind folks that these questions are good questions, and they're the kind of questions, as George said, I think that we're looking to pursue, moving forward.

The idea was almost like a pre-proposal, like a direction of travel. The sense is that to really answer these things fully, sort of getting in very deep with individuals, with faculty, with staff, with administrators, and we would certainly -- I'd love to have if folks are interested as when we get to a later phase on some of these, if and when we get to a later phase on some of these, I'd love to have the chairs -- so Joe for example, if we end up sort of doing some things in the Dowling space, or others of you as well -- to be partners in this implementation plan to figure out how we actually do this and answer the questions.

I want to clarify, Krzysztof, I don't think there's any disagreement between us, and I'm happy about that. That's why I walked out of the meeting. The original proposal was not that someone in my office replace the dean of GSAS. It actually was effectively what you've heard here, that the dean of GSAS continues to support the dean of arts and sciences. But there's somebody in my office that more formally has responsibility for thinking about graduate students and working on graduate student issues across the university.

That's a responsibility that my office already has. It's just not as formalized. So I'm saying give somebody that more formal responsibility. So that's really what we're suggesting. And as far as insulating me from the dean of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the reality, of course, is that things that report to my office don't necessarily report to me. Most of them have someone who's dealing with them day to day, because it's just not possible for me to deal with all of the day to day, just as it's not possible for Jim or Linda to deal with everything that reports to their office day to day. So the same things would happen here.

Last couple of things. Budget is obviously a significant issue, as I talk about it at all the meetings with folks. I want to say something about the role of the provost. Again, my sense, my belief is that the role of the provost's office is to be responsible for academic issues across schools. And for me, that's academic issues across any of the schools, not just academic issues that are AS&E with some other school.

It doesn't mean the provost's office is on its own dealing with these things, but it does mean to me that it ought to be critically involved in leading. And I think a great example is not central administration generally. I hope that people will have in their minds the office of the vice provost for research, because I think that's actually a good example of what we're talking about. It's a responsibility that crosses the schools. It's something that reports to me. It's led by Diane Souvaine, an academic who came from the faculty. But Diane is in regular communication with
the deans. There's no way she could be doing her job completely on her own. And that's really the model we're talking about in these cases.

There's lots of things, but I will stop in the interest of time. One other thing to say, Tony fortunately for him, perhaps, he's in probably sunny Cape Town today on Tufts business. So he unfortunately can't be with us. But we've already talked a little bit about the written reports, and we have plans to meet. We're meeting next Monday, and we'll talk about the discussion that happened here today. Thanks.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Other questions?

PROFESSOR MESSNER: Hi, Bill Messner, chair of mechanical engineering. Thank you, everybody, for these reports. I had two questions. One was to the people who looked at admissions and said that everything was great. Actually, I think things are pretty good. But did you talk to Lee? I don't know how you make two solid lines, right? It's great when the deans agree, but if they don't?

And that actually leads to the second question, which was somebody said, “Oh, it's just a matter of more communication.” All the communication in the world doesn't work when you've got two people with just different perspectives and some decision needs to be made. Right now, I think from the perspective of somebody in engineering, it's an 80/20 split. We really feel kind of -- we're the small gorilla in the room with a big gorilla. So those are my questions.

PROFESSOR GARMAN: Lee is a member of the Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid Committee, so he was very active in all of the discussions. My statement that he operates as if he has direct reports to those deans is directly from him. That's not my observation. That's his reporting to us. And then that's also the reporting of the dean of engineering who we consulted with and the dean of A&S.

So the principals here, the two deans and the dean of admissions and the director of financial aid, also an ex officio member of the committee, seem pretty happy with the way things have been working, and we're not pressing for any change in what we heard. Also, in terms of the split, on this committee this year, there are three members of engineering, three members from A&S. So no 80/20 on this committee.

PROFESSOR MESSNER: I wasn't referring to that committee. I was referring to the Budget --

PROFESSOR GARMAN: In terms of our deliberations, we had ample input from the engineers, and I feel like if there were issues directly related to admissions that we would have heard more about them.
PROFESSOR MESSNER: Thank you very much. That's very reassuring.

PROFESSOR HIRSCH: One more concern that applies beyond just the Athletic Committee, but I think to all of the components we're talking about today is the question of if the reporting goes to the provost, what are the implications for the faculty committees governance? Does that pull things further away, and does the committee have a lesser role? So that would also be helpful to have that concern addressed.

PROVOST HARRIS: So on that, there's two things I forgot. One, we care very deeply about shared governance, and that's actually why we've been working on a proposal, on working on a discussion memo which we've sent to a group of faculty representatives from across the university to talk about creating a faculty senate or some other university-wide faculty body. As I said, many times, we think it's a huge gap here at Tufts, and it makes it very difficult to do a lot of the things that we need to do as a university.

Again, that's not something we will impose on anybody. It's something that when Kevin's done work with me is to simply say all right, what are the different models for university-wide faculty governance, and then let's share that with a group of faculty reps people elected on the Executive Committee and so forth to say let's have a conversation as faculty. Is this something that makes sense to you? Is this something you think you ought to be pursuing?

This is an idea that I've heard from the group here on multiple occasions. And so we're simply moving forward and helping to convene that conversation with faculty across -- and the faculty committees, we're committed to making sure that any of these units that are reporting to the provost's office have very real deep faculty involvement.

So for example, as you said, Joe is pressed into service, because there isn't a Dowling committee currently. So I actually think we could provide at least as much, maybe in some cases more faculty involvement than you see now.

Last and quickly was athletics. The question I just heard from Steve today, and get back to you quickly on those things, this is the one we truly have time pressure, because we're doing a search for an athletics director, and I can't even tell the person who he or she is going to report to, or who they're likely to report to. That's the one.

The others, as I said, we're doing the dean of A&S, the dean of E. We can take our time and so forth. On this one, I think it's more critical than it is on some of the others. And so I'll get back to Steve as quickly as we can. We hope there's a way we can move forward more quickly on an outcome for that one, because I just have to tell the person who they're likely to report to, or I don't know how we can possibly hire an AD if they don't know.
PROFESSOR GONZALEZ: Thank you to everybody. I think we have to end this now, but there will be lots more discussion about that.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Announcements

Summer Scholars
The application for this year’s Summer Scholars program is open, and the link to the application can be found at http://uss.tufts.edu/undergradEducation/research/summer_scholars/.

The Summer Scholars program funds rising juniors and seniors to pursue ten-week independent research projects working closely with a faculty mentor. Please consider reaching out directly to students who show great potential, especially students from under-represented groups in your discipline.

Update from the Academic Credit Compliance Committee
The Academic Credit Compliance Committee, an ad hoc faculty sub-committee of the Educational Policy Committee, has been investigating the unit of academic credit for courses in the Schools of Arts & Sciences and Engineering for the past calendar year and would like to inform the faculty of the committee’s progress, recommendations, and next steps. Early in Spring 2015, the committee will propose a system in which the Schools of Arts & Sciences and Engineering will demonstrate compliance with the federal definition of the credit hour by assigning course credit in a way that better reflects the amount of time students are expected to be in class and the amount of work they are expected to do outside of class. Before submitting its final recommendations to the EPC, the committee would like to have conversations with a wider range of faculty and department chairs and program directors to inform them about the proposed changes and to solicit their feedback. These conversations will happen in mid-December and early in the spring semester. Meanwhile, more information about the committee, its charge, its research, and its initial proposal can be found at Trunk: Search Public Courses, selecting the Project Site labeled Academic Credit Committee.

Update from the Committee on Faculty Work/Life
Elizabeth Remick will report on the 11/17 meeting with Provost Harris and representatives from each of Tufts’ schools about forming a university-wide task force on work/life. The task force’s composition and charge will be determined by early in the spring 2015 semester and continue indefinitely as the various schools begin addressing work/life issues. The AS&E Committee on Faculty Work/Life will carry out its dependent care needs assessment survey as planned with the goal of expanding the survey to the other campuses as the task force’s work progresses.

New Business

Tufts Support Services (TSS) Update
 Speakers: Patricia Campbell, Executive Vice President
           Dick Doolin, Senior Director of Tufts Support Services

Summary: Opportunity for questions and answers relating to Tufts Support Services (TSS)

Action required: Faculty members will listen to a brief presentation, and then have an opportunity to ask questions.

Further information: In preparation for its launch next month, Tufts Support Services (TSS) will be offering education sessions in early December for all faculty and staff on all three campuses. Anyone who wants to learn more about what is changing and how to work with TSS to accomplish routine human resources and finance tasks is welcome to attend.

December 3, 2014
TSS leaders will give an overview of the new organization, the services it will offer, a brief tour of the TSS web portal and where to go for more information. Attendees will have the opportunity to ask questions at the end of each session.

**Grafton Campus:** Tuesday, December 9th, 9-10:30 a.m., Agnes Varis Auditorium

**Medford Campus:** Thursday, December 11th, 9-10:30 a.m., ASEAN Auditorium, Cabot Intercultural Center

**Boston Campus:** Friday, December 12th, 2-3:30 p.m., Posner Auditorium, Administrative Building, 200 Harrison Avenue, Boston

For information regarding TEAM please visit [http://team.tufts.edu](http://team.tufts.edu).

**Interim Reports from Faculty Committees Re: the AS&E Reorganization Proposal**

*Speakers:* Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair of the GSAS Executive Committee; David Garman, Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid Committee; Joseph Auner, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Board; Fiorenzo Omenetto, Chair of Budget and Priorities Committee; and Steven Hirsch, Chair of the Athletics Committee

*Summary:* In accordance with the Position Statement voted by the AS&E faculty on September 12, the Executive Committee charged the above faculty committees to review the structural changes to AS&E proposed by the Provost. They are providing reports on their findings so far. These reports are attached and committee chairs or committee members will present short summaries.

*Key Issues:* The five key areas being reviewed are student services, athletics, admissions and financial aid, graduate studies, and the budgetary implications of the Provost's proposals.

*Action required:* Discussion
Update from the Academic Credit Compliance Committee

The Academic Credit Compliance Committee, a faculty sub-committee of the Educational Policy Committee, has been investigating the unit of academic credit for courses in the Schools of Arts & Sciences and Engineering for the past calendar year and would like to inform the faculty of the committee’s progress, recommendations, and next steps. Early in Spring 2015, the committee will propose a system in which the Schools of Arts & Sciences and Engineering will assign course credit in a way that better reflects the amount of time students are expected to be in class and the amount of work they are expected to do outside of class. Before submitting its final recommendations to the EPC, the committee would like to have conversations with a wider range of faculty to inform them about the proposed changes and to solicit their feedback. These conversations will happen in mid-December and early in the spring semester. Meanwhile, more information about the committee, its charge, its research, and its initial proposal can be found at Trunk: Search Public Courses, selecting the Project Site labelled Academic Credit Committee.

More Information:

Why are we talking about changing the way we assign credit to courses?
Tufts’ accreditor, NEASC, informed the University that our credit unit (in which 1 Tufts credit is equivalent to 4.0 credit hours) does not appear to conform to the federal standard used to calculate academic credit hours, and some of our degree programs do not appear to reach the required minimum of 120 credit hours for the baccalaureate degree and 30 credit hours for the master’s degree. NEASC has asked Tufts to submit a formal report in Fall 2015 to clarify how we will bring our unit of credit into compliance with the policies established by NEASC, which conform to the federal “credit hour.”

What is the “credit hour”? 
The credit hour is a formula that equates a certain amount of in-class learning and out-of-class learning with an expected learning outcome. The federal credit hour assumes that over a semester of roughly 14 to 15 weeks, for each hour spent in class, students will spend a minimum of two hours out of class studying. Thus, a 3-credit course will require approximately 3 fifty-minute hours per week in class with approximately 6 hours of homework or out-of-class study each week. A minimum of 120 credit hours is required for the baccalaureate degree and a minimum of 30 credit hours is required for the master’s degree. There is some flexibility to account for different course structures (such as online courses, hybrid courses, and flipped classrooms) and for internships, independent studies, and practica, as long as the university has a consistent process for awarding credit, in line with commonly accepted practices.

Why is this important?
Alignment with the federal definition of the credit hour is important for setting minimal standards for graduation and for establishing each student’s full-time status or part-time status in order to be eligible for federal financial aid. Overall, Tufts’ accreditation and eligibility for federal financial aid are at stake.

When will Tufts change its credit system?
We hope to have a new system in place for Fall 2016. This will require a new course credit assignment policy and process to be in place by January 2016 so the Registrar can prepare SIS for registration in March 2016.
What is being proposed?
The Academic Credit Compliance Committee (AC3) is proposing a system in which 1 Tufts course will continue to be assigned 1.0 credit, but the value of the credit will change (from 4 credit hours to 3 credit hours). This will allow us to assign additional credit to courses that require more work in class or out of class, so that many courses will be worth 1.5 Tufts credits (equivalent to 4.5 credit hours). Undergraduates will need 40 Tufts credits to graduate.

How will this affect future undergraduate students?
A system in which credit is assigned to each course based on the amount of work required for that course will allow students to more easily balance their course-loads each semester. The new system should not significantly change the typical student course load each semester nor change any major requirements. Undergraduate students will be expected to take four or five courses (equivalent to 5 credit hours) each semester to graduate with the equivalent of 120 credit hours within 8 full-time semesters.

How will this affect future graduate students?
A few of Tufts master’s degree programs will shift to a model that requires a minimum of 30 credit hours (generally 10 courses or some combination of coursework and thesis, practica, or qualifying examination adding up to the equivalent of 10 courses). There will be no change to doctoral programs or the way credit is determined for full-time continuation or part-time continuation for doctoral students.

How will this affect current students?
Students will graduate under the degree requirements in place when they matriculated.

How will this impact faculty?
Faculty may be asked to add a statement to the syllabus indicating the amount of time students are expected to study for the course, in proportion to the credit-value of the course.

Who will determine how to award credit to each course?
The Educational Policy Committee will draft a detailed set of guidelines for determining the credit value of a course and various course components such as labs and recitations. The Curricula Committee will then create a process for reviewing courses that may merit more credit than is apparent from the scheduled amount of time spent in class each week. Credit will be assigned to each course (not to individual classes or sections, which may be taught differently by each instructor).

Why is this such a big deal?
Any change to our unit of credit will require changes to SIS and the transcript, so these changes will need to be made with great care. Careful consideration also needs to be given to the academic records and degree progress of students already enrolled when the transition occurs. Changing the credit value of our courses will require us to change the wording of numerous academic policies (including those about distribution requirements, pre-matriculation requirements, dean’s list, academic probation, course-load limits, full-time study, and the like). Changes to the credit system will also require Tufts to adjust the way it bills per credit (so as not to over-charge students) and may change the way Tufts determines full-time and part-time status for purposes of financial aid. Changing the way we “count” credits will be confusing for students, their parents, and their advisors. Academic departments and programs will need to review requirements for their majors and minors to clarify whether a certain number of courses are required or a certain number of credits are required for the major or minor. These changes will be discussed with faculty in greater detail in Spring 2015 and then determined by the appropriate faculty committees.
Committee Reports on AS&E Reorganization Proposal
On September 2nd, 2014, the Provost presented to the Tufts Faculty his proposals for a reorganization of the current structure of A&S and Engineering. Realizing that the proposed modifications may have significant consequences for the students and faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, the Executive Committee of GSAS held a series of special meetings to discuss the existing structure of GSAS and possible ways to improve it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Only three members of the committee responded to this question. Two members asked that future proposals from the Provost’s Office be vetted by the relevant school administrators and the Executive Committee in advance of being sprung on the AS&E faculty-at-large. This would allow concerns to be raised and proposals to be modified in a way that might avoid the rush and frenzy of this semester. One member admonished the committee to see through strategic considerations and to focus on the best interests of the university.
To: Executive Committee
From: FAB
Re: Progress Report on the Proposed Reorganization of Dowling
Date: Nov 25, 2014

The following draft report reflects our initial fact-finding interviews and some provisional discussions. The committee still has an important interview coming up this week with Dean Glaser; we will meet on Dec. 4 to draft a more developed report. The provisional nature of our report also reflects the fact that proposed organization chart has been in flux during this process while crucial aspects—such as precisely what parts of the Dowling operation will move and what the actual reporting structures will be in regard to the Associate Provosts—have also not been spelled out.

This draft report reflects a series of meetings with senior administrators and many of the key players in the proposed reorganization; the list of interviews is included below. These interviews made clear that what is referred to as “Dowling” represents a large and complex operation, including seven branches (Student Affairs, Student Services, Student Life, Academic Advising, Orientation and Transitions, Study Abroad, Health and Wellness). Each of these branches operate with various degrees of autonomy and face different challenges, but they all also interact in complex and productive ways with each other, the schools, central administration, and the broader university. In what follows the word “Dowling” should be understood as referring to this overall complex operation currently reporting to the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Students.

I. Challenges with the Current Organization

1. Student Life, Student Affairs, and Student Services do not have high enough visibility or “a seat at the table” at either Provostial and Presidential levels in terms of communication of important everyday issues and problems as well as short and long range budget planning and decisions related to facilities, construction, enrollment etc. that major impacts on student life. There is a shared concern that this lack of adequate attention to the student experience can have a detrimental impact on the “core business” of the school in delivering the highest quality campus-based residential experience. The provost also argued that pulling parts of Dowling out from under the deans’ budgets would make it easier to determine what the appropriate budget for Student Affairs, and Student Services should be.

2. There seems to be an endemic challenge to cooperation between the deans of A&S and SOE due to current budgetary models and the relation with the provost. While in some case the “dotted lines” reporting structure works well for SOE, in other cases the school does not feel adequately served by Dowling. This has necessitated the development of parallel structures such as advising and career services in SOE.

3. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the budgetary processes at every level. People spoke of the lack of flexibility with their own budgets and the lack of any regular budget process that would allow mid- and long-range planning, and a lack of transparency about budgets with central administration.

II. Concerns with the Proposed Reorganization

1. ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRATION
There are substantial concerns about preserving academic oversight and integration with the academic mission for the Dowling operation if parts are moved to central administration. This reflects a strong consensus that it is problematic to draw clear distinctions between “academic”/“non-academic,” “grad”/“undergrad,” and “A&S and SOE” in connection with any of the seven branches. A major strength of the operation is how it can engage faculty as part of integrated model of academic, co-curricular, and residential student life supported by student services and student affairs.

2. GETTING A SEAT AT THE TABLE FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS/SERVICES
The challenges of giving a stronger voice in the central administration to those most directly involved in shaping student life and dealing with student affairs and services was recurring theme in our interviews. Yet we also heard that there were aspects of the current structure in which important issues could be readily addressed (such as OEO matters). Some also noted that it currently seems easier to heard at the presidential than at the provostial levels. Several suggested that there were other mechanisms besides the large schedule restructuring for achieving this goal, such as was suggested in the “Enhancement of Reporting Structure” developed by Dowling for regular meetings that would literally put more people around the table:

3. BUDGETARY CONCERNS
Everyone agrees that putting large parts of Dowling under the provost would impact the budgets and budget flexibility of the two deans, though the provost argued that they would lose both revenue and expense. This matter is the central concern of B+P committee as is the question of whether or not the new reporting structure would reduce these structural tensions between the deans since they would still be in competition for funds, albeit from a significantly smaller overall budget. We heard of significant concerns about checks and balances on the budgets for Dowling operations if they were removed from reporting structures responsible for the academic mission.

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

FAB Meetings
Dean Linda Abriola
John Barker, Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Students
Melanie Bowdler, Sr, Dir of Health and Wellness
Associate Provost Kevin Dunn
Dean James Glaser (meeting scheduled for 11/16/14)
Provost David Harris
Kim Knox, Dean of Students, SOE
Carmen Lowe, Dean of Academic Advising and Undergraduate Study
Mary Pat McMahon, Dean of Student Affairs
Bruce Reitman, Dean of Student Life and Leadership
Paul Stanton, Dean of Student Services
Prof. Vickie Sullivan, co-chair A&S Strategic Plan Committee
To: AS&E Executive Committee
From: Fiorenzo Omenetto – Chair, Budget and Priorities Committee
Re: B&P Review of Reorganization Proposals for AS&E Admissions from Provost

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the new structure:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

**Questions from the student representatives attending the BnP committee.**

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

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

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

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

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

Will there be any check on the power of the provost to allocate resources were he or she to hypothetically feel it necessary to prioritize the budget to another campus?
REPORT TO THE AS&E FACULTY BY THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE REGARDING THE PROVOST’S REORGANIZATION PLAN

The Athletics Committee met four times this semester. The first meeting was organizational and directed at the first iteration of the Provost's reorganization plan. The second meeting was concerned with the imminent search for a new Athletic Director. The third and fourth meetings were devoted to a review of the most recent version of the Provost’s reorganization plan.

The Athletics Committee’s review of the Provost’s reorganization plan as it involves Athletics, has been something of a moving target. The original September proposal was that the Athletic Director (AD) report to a new position of university-wide Vice-President of Student Services; the October 4th revised proposal stipulated that the AD report to the Dean of Undergraduate Education, Student Affairs, and Student Services in Dowling Hall. Provost David Harris and Vice Provost Kevin Dunn met with our committee Monday, November 12th, and made their case for the AD reporting directly to the Provost. This is the proposal now on the table. We then talked to Dean of Undergraduate Education, Student Affairs, and Student Services John Barker and Paul Stanton. Tuesday, November 25th we met with Dean of Arts and Sciences Jim Glaser and Dean of Engineering Linda Abriola, as well as the Athletic Director, Bill Gehling, then formulated several questions to which all committee members were invited to respond in writing.

What follows is a compilation of those responses. We did not try to reach a consensus recommendation, thinking it would be of greater utility to the faculty to lay out the pros and cons of the six different reporting models that have been discussed. If the faculty would like the committee to make a concrete recommendation, we will need more time to discuss these issues.

The six reporting models are as follows:

1) the AD reports to the Provost
2) the AD has a solid reporting line to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and a dotted line to the Dean of Engineering
3) the AD has a solid reporting line to both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Engineering
4) the AD reports to the Dean of Student Services
5) the AD reports to the Dean of Arts and Sciences (the current structure)
6) the AD reports to the (currently nonexistent) university-wide Vice President for Student Services
The last two models are, for all practical purposes, off the table. There was a consensus on the committee that the current structure, in which the AD reports solely to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, is unsatisfactory because it excludes the School of Engineering altogether, even though there are many engineer-athletes. A university-wide Vice President for Student Services is, presumably, not a viable option, given the strong initial faculty resistance to the creation of a new administrative position. However, several members of the committee saw various benefits to this approach. This is the structure at many peer schools, and it has the advantages of giving Athletics more visibility across the institution by reporting to a high-level administrator who, at the same time, is primarily concerned with student services and activities.

The questions posed to the committee members were:

1) What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the Provost's plan to have the Athletic Department report directly to the Provost's Office?

2) What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the several other possible reporting models: a) Athletics reporting with a solid line to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and a dotted line to the Dean of Engineering; b) Athletics reporting with a solid line to both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Engineering; c) Athletics reporting to the Dean of Student Services?

3) Which of these four models do you see as the best arrangement, and why?

Before laying out the aggregated responses of committee members, it should be said that we do not have a very clear sense of how the budget for Athletics is currently constructed, nor how this would work under any of the models under consideration, which necessarily impedes our ability to judge the efficacy of any given arrangement. It should also be said that we were made aware that the personalities and predilections of administrators often play an important role, and that the Athletic Department is best served when the administrator to whom they report has a good working relationship with the Athletic Director and a commitment to the value of athletics as part of the college experience. Given that the identity of the relevant administrators is bound to change over time, we confine ourselves to looking at structural aspects, but we want to stress the importance of good communication to the success and well-being of Athletics within the larger university structure.

If the AD reports to the Provost
STRENGTHS:

Tufts would have a reporting structure similar to other peer institutions. Tufts is more complex than our peers, and the Athletic Department should embrace both A&S and Engineering. Having the Athletic Department reporting directly to an entity above both schools guarantees even-handedness between the schools.

Reporting to the Provost may increase the visibility and importance of Athletics to the university as a whole, alums, and the outside world. This places the AD closer to the President, who has the ear of alumni and ultimate responsibility for athletics in the eyes of the NCAA. The higher-level report may also help with recruiting the AD now and in the future.

Athletics could benefit from this structure from a financial perspective. It’s likely to involve the AD more directly in budget and development discussions. It may provide a more appropriate structure for fundraising activities. According to the job description, the new AD will be involved more with the Development office, and outgoing AD Gehling will be working on this inside Development.

WEAKNESSES:

Given that the Athletic Department has relatively little to do with the other schools and primarily serves the two undergraduate schools, A&S and E, the interaction of athletics with academic and other aspects of student life might be weaker due to the higher-up reporting structure. The Provost would be less likely to help with smaller issues that the Athletic Department currently turns to the Deans to mediate, such as student-athletes caught between academic and athletic obligations. This option might weaken the existing strong working relationship between the AD and the academic deans. Those who deal with Athletics on a routine basis have universally noted the importance of regular school-level interactions and communications between the AD, the Deans, Student Affairs, etc. What structures would be put in place to institutionalize and regularize these interactions should the reporting line go directly to the Provost?

Concerns about whether the Provost’s Office should be setting the priorities for spending at the school level, when the schools have to pay for these decisions. There is a lack of clarity about how the budget will be created and what that means to the schools. What level of budgetary control, if any, would remain with the Deans of A&S and E?
Concern that the higher the position the AD reports to, the less freedom the AD might have in making decisions, and the more susceptible the Athletic Department might be to pressure, coming from trustees, alums, etc., in the making of certain decisions, like hiring or changing coaches.

If the AD has a solid reporting line to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and a dotted line to the Dean of Engineering

STRENGTHS:
As compared to the current system, this would give Engineering a voice. Regular meetings and consultations between both Deans, the AD and Student Affairs would be necessary and appropriate.

WEAKNESSES:
There should be equal balance between the Schools of A&S and Engineering. It is not clear how the Dean of Engineering could enforce policy or be represented at the decision-making level.

If the AD has a solid reporting line to both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Engineering

STRENGTHS
The deans can share authority and prioritize activities; both A&S and Engineering have equal representation. The current deans of A&S and E feel that they can work well together. If there were disagreements, they could be mediated by the Provost.

WEAKNESSES
Two solid line reports to people of equal rank is a difficult reporting structure, creating the possibility of conflict. It would be time-consuming for the AD. It might also look unattractive to a candidate applying for the AD position.
If the AD reports to the Dean of Student Services

STRENGTHS:

The Dean of Student Services is closer to student and academic life than the Provost. It’s important for Athletics to have good lines of communication with Dowling.

WEAKNESSES:

Concern that this position is too low in the organizational structure. It is not clear to the committee how the Dean of Student Services reports to the academic deans or provost, and therefore what his/her role would be in decisions about budgetary allocations and policy decisions.

Academic oversight on the AD should be a requirement, because of the importance of coordinating the relationship of athletics to academics, yet in the current configuration of Dowling the Dean is not an academic.

Best Model

Members of the committee were split in their preferences. Some representative quotes:

“I think reporting directly to the provost or reporting to both deans with solid lines are the best (and equally good) arrangements. In each of these two models strengths outweigh weaknesses.”

“Best arrangement in my opinion: report to the Provost if they truly have time with dotted line to Deans of A&S and Engineering.”
“I weakly prefer the Provost's plan, primarily because it aligns Tufts with our peers. I think academic considerations may get more weight if 2(a) is chosen, but I also think that Athletics is more likely to be short-changed on budget under that arrangement.”

“My preference would probably be for Athletics reporting with a solid line to both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Engineering.”

“Athletics reporting with a solid line to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and a dotted line to the Dean of Engineering.”

“I think the best is for there to be a new position in the Provost's Office or elsewhere if more appropriate of something like "Vice President for Student Development" to which Athletics (and the other components in the Provost's proposal) would report.”

In sum, because each model has both strengths and weaknesses, it’s hard to calculate which approach will bring the greatest benefits. Simply put, having the AD report to the Provost brings greater visibility to Athletics and, perhaps, a bit more leverage in discussions of resource allocation. Having the AD report to the Deans of A&S and E, in either of the two configurations, probably ensures better day-to-day communication and collaboration.

Submitted on behalf of the Athletics Committee,

Steven Hirsch, Chair