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DEAN GLASER: Welcome to the last pre-spring break faculty meeting. I hope everybody has excellent plans. I know that I do. I'm planning to go to Hong Kong on Friday to visit my son for a week. So I hope everybody else has excellent plans and that we can reduce our email traffic by 75 percent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

DEAN'S ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS PARTY
DEAN GLASER: We have a few announcements to start. Let me first announce the Dean's Annual Publications Party will be held on April 27 from 3:00 to 4:30 here in the Coolidge Room. I remind you that if you had something that you are proud of -- it's the Publications Party. It's no longer the “Book Party” -- please make sure to send a copy of your book or a copy of your CD or a copy of your article to Erica and Laura in the dean's office, and they will put them together for that wonderful celebration.

PARTICIPATING IN THE COACHE SURVEY OF FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION
You received something from central administration on what is known as the COACHE Survey on Faculty Job Satisfaction. That probably happened about two weeks ago. It is actually very valuable to the university to have data on how people feel about the university, the school, their department and their relationships.

And I myself have taken the survey. I gave myself excellent marks. So at least there's one person I know who did. But it is not a huge time sink. It takes about 30 minutes, maybe 40 minutes to fill out the survey, and you don't have to fill it out all in one moment. If you walk away from your computer, which has happened to me a couple of times, it holds your place and sends you another email, and you can go right back to where you were in the survey. So I highly recommend that you do it. It does provide important data for us.

PROF ROSENBERG: I tried to take the survey and was told I was ineligible, and I have no idea why that was.

DEAN GLASER: I have no idea, because you're a tenure stream faculty member in the School of Arts and Sciences, and you should not have had a problem.

PROF ROSENBERG: I'll try again.

DEAN GLASER: Try again, and if you have a problem, Joel, then contact somebody in the provost's office, I think. Is that right, or contact Jillian. Contact Jillian. She's the all-purpose fixer of all problems, and she will communicate with the right person to make sure that you and others who might encounter that problem have it fixed.

Joe Auner has something very exciting to announce.
UTOPIAN LISTENING CONFERENCE

DEAN AUNER: Hi. When you came in, you would have seen these little cards. And what this is, is the Department of Music is hosting this really big four-day festival over spring break from Wednesday through Saturday focusing on the music of Luigi Nono, who's this Italian composer, really interesting composer. He's incredibly politically engaged and connected to all the leading intellectuals of the day.

And so we're bringing in an amazing group of scholars and performers to engage with these pieces. And the pieces we're focusing on all involve live electronics. So if you come into Distler Hall, there are going to be these multi-sounder systems that send the sound hurtling around in various ways and being processed. And it's also dealing with issues of historical change in digital technology.

Everything is free. So if you're interested, you can go to the webpage and find out when these concerts are. To me, the best concert is going to be Saturday morning at 10:00 a.m. on the 26th in Distler. And there's a North American premiere of this amazing piece. I had help from many people here in translating the text, which is going to be Greek, German, and Italian. And it's going to be a fun thing.

And the other reason I wanted to say this is as part of the Dean's Publication Party, we're also asking people to submit -- let's say you directed a play or put together a conference. There will be ways to represent that kind of work as well at the Publications Party. So thanks.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Joe.

INTRODUCTION OF CHINESE DIRECTOR OF CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

DEAN GLASER: Now I'd like to invite our colleague, Mingquan Wang. He's going to introduce Dr. Jianbin Yao, who is visiting here.

PROF. WANG: Thank you, Jim, for this wonderful opportunity to talk about our CI, and also our Chinese director, Professor Jianbin Yao. As many of you know, the Confucius Institute at Tufts was inaugurated last June. The purpose of the CI is to provide support and service in the Chinese language understanding and the understanding of the Chinese culture.

Currently, there are 100 CIs in the United States. While all CIs share the same goal, to enhance the understanding of the Chinese language and culture, each CI is unique. It has the flexibility to create its own programs to meet the needs of the host institute and the needs of its local communities.

At Tufts, in addition to providing service and support in Chinese language and culture, our CI plays an active role in facilitating academic exchange between Tufts and our partner university in China: Beijing Normal University. We're grateful for the strong support and leadership we have received from both Tufts and BNU. We're equally
grateful for the support we have received from both our faculty and students.

As our partner university in the CI collaboration, BNU has provided strong support in the establishment and operation of a CI. By August this year, BNU will send three people here to Tufts to help us with our CI programs. Earlier this month, the School of Chinese Language and Literature at BNU sent us one of their most talented members, who will serve as the Chinese director of our CI. That's Professor Jianbin Yao.

Professor Yao is a well-known and highly regarded member at BNU, both academically and administratively. He is a professor of comparative literature and world literature. He is also the vice dean for National Exchange and Cooperation at a school of Chinese language and literature for the last six years.

Professor Yao has been here for only two weeks, and he has already made significant contributions to our programs. For the last two months we have been asking Jianbin to send us the fund, and the funds arrived only a few days after Professor Yao's arrival. So we look forward to working with Professor Yao, and we think it's a very good team. And Professor Yao, as in Yao-ming -- Yao and ming. So that's a very good combination. So welcome to Tufts, Professor Yao.

PROF YAO: Thank you so much for the hospitality and friendliness. It's great to be here. I look forward to working with you.

DEAN GLASER: I'm told that Professor Yao is an excellent cook, and so we look forward to many fine meals at the Confucius Institute.

If anybody has an announcement that we have not put on the agenda, but would like to take this opportunity to communicate, please let me know.

**LA&J CURRICULA COMMITTEE PROPOSALS**

DEAN GLASER: With that, we will turn to David Proctor, chair of the curriculum committee.

PROF PROCTOR: So we've got several items to get through today. I do want to just start off by apologizing for what seems like the umpteenth millionth time for the technology issues that we are continuing to have with our online submission system. We're going to work over the summer to try to smooth some of those out so that some of the issues that many of you have been dealing with will hopefully be resolved by at least the start of the fall semester, if not a little bit before.

All right, so on the agenda, to start with, we have American studies, a new course in American studies, “American Studies 100: American Studies Theories and Methods.” Are there any questions, concerns, or comments on that course?

Moving along to Item 2, “American Studies 173: Struggle for Justice in the 1960s
American Counterculture.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item Number 3, “American Studies 172: American Highways, Routes and Roots.” Questions or concerns on that course?

We'll just keep plugging along. Item Number 4, a new course in anthropology, “Anthropology 24: Anthropology of the Environment.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Number 5, in the anthropology department, “Anthropology 136: Cultures of Computing.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item Number 6 from the Department of Classics, “Classics 77: Sport and Entertainment in Greece and Rome.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item Number 7 from the classics department, “Classics 127: Philosophy in the Greek, Latin and Arabic-Islamic Traditions.” Questions or concerns in regard to that course?

Item Number 8 is simply the upper level version of Item Number 6, “Classics 177: Sport and Entertainment in Greece and Rome.” Questions or concerns?

Item Number 9 from the classics department, “Greek 131: Survey of Greek Literature.” Questions or concerns?

Item 10 from the classics department, “Latin 132: Survey of Latin Literature.” Questions or concerns?

Item 11 from the education department, “Radical Lesbian Thought: Education 169.” Questions or concerns on that course?

PROF DEBOLD: Joe Debold from psychology. This is not a direct question. It's just a point of information. And on all of these courses, where it says “Academic Review Board: review requested,” in some cases, we will contact the instructor for a syllabus if it's not really a straightforward request. That's separate from this process, but just warning instructors that sometimes they'll be asked for a syllabus as well as a course description.

PROF PROCTOR: Thank you very much for that. And this is a good point, also to point out that whatever a department has requested as far as, for example, distribution credit, it is not the purview of the curricula committee. It's the purview of Joe's committee. So that will be something that will be the ARB's responsibility to deal with. So all you see on here is what departments have requested that the curricula committee is forwarding on to ARB.

Any questions on Item 11, the education course?
Item 12, new course in the education department, “ED 170: Critical Educational Policy Studies.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item 13, “ED 176: Internship.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item 14, new course from the environmental studies program, “ENVS 9 Food Systems: From Farm to Table.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item Number 15, environmental studies program, “ENVS 135 Environmental Policy: Linking US and Global Politics.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item 16, new course in environmental studies, “ENVS 190, Practicing in Food Systems.” Questions or concerns on that course?

All right, I would like at this point to -- I would be willing to entertain a motion to approve Items 1 through 16. Is there such a motion? All in favor? All opposed? Any abstentions? Great.

Item 16A, a new minor in environmental studies, “Food Systems and Nutrition.” Are there questions or concerns about this new minor proposal?

Moving on, Item 17, new course in the Department of History, “Colonialism in Global Perspective.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item 18 from the philosophy department, “Philosophy 25: Food Ethics.” Questions or concerns on that course?

Item 19, from the philosophy department, “Philosophy 129: Meta-ethics.” Questions or concerns on that course?

And lastly, Item 20, a new course from sociology, “Sociology 100: Research Design and Interpretation.” Questions or concerns?

PROF SHEVEL: Oxana Shevel, political science. I also submitted a course through the website back in February, and it's not listed on this. So I'm not sure if it means it wasn't received or --

PROF PROCTOR: It depends if you submitted it before the February deadline, then it could be that it was either not received by us, that the approval was not submitted by the chair, or if it was received after the February cutoff date, then it will be considered in the March/April cycle. So I will get back to you.

PROF SHEVEL: Okay, thank you.
PROF PROCTOR: Any other questions, or any questions on any of the remaining courses? Is there a motion to approve Items 16A through Item 20? Second? All in favor? Opposed? Abstaining?

And just a quick kind of preview of wonderful things to come. As we begin to move forward with the transition of credit, you're going to be hearing, and your chairs will be hearing, and you'll be hearing from your respective curricula committees about how that process is going to move forward. Our hope is to begin the process, at least some of the initial stages of it, as early as this semester. So we'll keep you posted on that.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, David. And I, for one, am very excited about the food systems minor, and I want to just pay a tribute to Colin Orians and his colleagues. I'm sure you noted that there were a few new food-related courses that are now in the curriculum, and Colin exercised great leadership to get this organized, and I think we're going to see a lot of interest in our students for this. So thank you, Colin.

STATE OF THE COMMUNITY
DEAN GLASER: I'd like to ask Mary Pat McMahon to join us up here. Mary Pat was reporting some things that were quite concerning to us at our steering committee meeting last week, I believe before, and it seemed to me that this -- the kinds of things that she was talking about were things that we want to make sure that the faculty understood more broadly. So I invited her here, and she's going to lead a conversation. Thank you.

DEAN McMAHON: So hello. Thank you for giving me and my colleagues -- my colleagues, Chris Rossi, Marisel Perez -- Marisel is here, and I think may have had to leave -- yes, in the back -- Michelle Bowdler, director of health and wellness, and Julie Ross. Julie, are you here? Director of our counseling service. Thanks.

We wanted to bring to the A&S faculty's attention some information and trends related to student health and well-being this particular academic year, particularly the fact that the depth and complexity of some of our student challenges right now is notable.

I was talking a little bit with Jillian back and forth, because I know that eventually this conversation goes into the record of the faculty minutes, and I want to share some data, although I'm hoping that that doesn't go into the record, because I don't want to cause undue alarm, but I want to make people aware.

The dean of student affairs office works with students at intersections where they are hospitalized for one reason or another. We have lots of different students on campus seeking support with counseling, working on substance or addiction issues that don't work in their odds, because they're managing that in a way that is contained within their own experience. Our office works with students when their studies are interrupted. They're short-term or longer term for hospitalization of some kind.
Chris and Marisel work with students on the medical side. Micky Toogood and Chris work with the students on conduct related things, and that includes transport to the hospital when students are drinking too much.

The good news for this year is that alcohol transports are down about 15 percent from last year, and at least a four-year low, I think, our records going back. And that's just based on the raw number of transports, and I think we have some pretty large classes. I think they're notably down that way as well. So we have fewer students reaching a place where they have to go to the hospital to get monitored because they're in such a state.

I'm delighted about that. I can't celebrate too much, because it could change any minute. But the severity -- anecdotally, the severity of what we're seeing around the substance abuse side, sort of the conduct related requiring immediate emergency intervention side that is also on a lower level right now. So we really are appreciative of the different efforts that have gone into that.

Tufts has had a positive student culture where people call and seek help for themselves, and they call and seek help for their friends, or the RA's do that. So there's a good culture of you can get checked out right now. You shouldn't be so concerned about the consequences of repercussions back on campus. You should be really concerned about getting help right now. And we've done well on that for a while, and we continue to do well that way.

We work closely in our office with students who are dealing with both acute substance concerns, those transports, but also long-term substance concerns. That includes newer synthetic drugs. I had a conversation with a friend who works at the Pine Street Inn, and I was talking about some synthetic drug use that I've seen this year, and that person -- I said “Are you seeing this down in your work?”

He said, “Mary Pat, you are in a position where you could come teach us about this,” the kind of synthetic, sort of innovative, quote, unquote, access to different synthetic drugs used by our students. It's not a very large population, but it's not nothing. He said “You could come and teach us about how that works,” because our kind of population has the resources and the where with all to do that, putting it on the radar screen.

We certainly have students who are abusing prescription medications, using either their own inappropriately, or using someone else's prescription medication. We also have alcohol and other sort of hard drugs on campus.

We work with students to help them take time off to get significant help. Some of them are doing that while they're here, and others see disciplinary consequences as a function of their actions as well, you know, really high or really in an altered state. Not everybody has to leave when those things --

One of the reasons I wanted to get a chance to talk to everybody today, there's a lot of
sort of conversation in social media. There are articles about many of our peer schools, about the idea of forcing people out when they have a problem.

Our approach is to do what we can in partnership with many people on campus, certainly including the faculty, to where possible support students who can seek help and be a part-time student or a near full-time student, and that sometimes is a process that unfolds over a period of weeks or a semester, and then we can work with people about taking time away.

We are improving our alcohol and substance awareness for our student leaders. We have some exciting things happening in the fall that gives more of our student leaders and freshmen good information about normative behavior and college substance use, and hoping students get some good information from us and not just from the interwebs.

But we also are working this week, actually tomorrow, to get more staff to have some good information around the opioid crisis in Massachusetts. I am concerned about the prevalence and low cost and availability of potent strains of heroin and other opioids. So Michelle and Ian Wong have brought a former state commissioner –

MS. BOWDLER: Joanne Peterson from Learn to Cope.

DEAN McMAHON: -- Joanne Peterson from Learn to Cope. She's coming tomorrow, and a large number of us are doing training to sort of understand what a student with an opioid overdose, but also what an opioid addiction looks like, and that makes us better partners to you if you have concerns.

The major thing that I mentioned at the steering committee meeting is the cluster of recent involuntary mental health hospitalizations within AS&E. We have exceeded -- the last two years, we ultimately had 20 students each year involuntarily hospitalized. As of today, we have 23 students, and we have almost two months left in the semester to go. So that's a marked change. Julie, go ahead.

DR. ROSS: They're not all involuntary.

DEAN McMAHON: Thank you very much.

DR. ROSS: They're not all involuntary. They're all emergency hospitalizations. An important distinction, thanks.

DEAN McMAHON: Hugely important distinction. And then the metric that we sort of gauge this off of is our on-call emergency. So we have a counselor on call available 24/7, over breaks, anytime that we're in session. And at this time last year, we had a very high number of 125, and as of June 30, we've already had 130-something calls this year. So we are seeing -- sometimes it helps me to see the numbers, because it feels like it's really kind of escalating in a way that we want to be paying attention. And, in fact, our
numbers reflect that.

I want to add another data point, and then sort of have a chance to have a conversation about this. I don't know what it means, but we're also not alone. Julie surveyed peer schools in the Boston area and peer schools in the northeast and found that more than half of the school counseling services that she's talked to also reported a really sharp increase in hospitalizations this academic year.

And when we're talking about hospitalizations -- and I said not involuntarily, necessarily, but it's the situation where a student is in a place where they're not safe or they're too psychotic to be managing whatever's going on outside of a facility. So that's the scope of what we're talking about. And other schools have commented that they, too, have already reached, with three months to go, their number from last year or exceeded their number of situations like this, so based on their student populations.

The hospital community in the Boston area is actually pretty challenged, based on this, and sort of working on the discharge, helping students figure out a plan to return, to go home. If home's not a good option, what does that mean. We're trying to coordinate as best we can with them.

I've been talking with other schools’ dean of student affairs' offices, trying to work with clinicians at hospitals to help them understand the distinction between going home to a sort of family environment and coming back to a residence hall. Obviously, they're different things, but not everybody in the discharge community understands the kind of services -- while we are a supportive community, we are not able to do that level of support for people. So it's definitely a challenge. The other major thing I wanted to sort of mention again is that we don't require students who are hospitalized to go away. Similar to the alcohol, you get in trouble for an alcohol or substance abuse issue, the school makes you leave, quote, unquote. There's a real concern about that. There's a lot of articles in student papers at other universities and colleges around that. We don't automatically reflexively make anyone leave based on requiring emergency hospitalization.

As you all know from your own experiences supporting students, there are times when it's not realistic. When somebody wants to come back and be engaged in classes, but the degree to which they need to be getting more significant inpatient or full-time care just doesn't make that possible, we work as best we can with the student and with their families in those situations. We certainly work with advisors and with faculty.

Some of our messages, from the advising deans -- and Carmen's here as well, and she can speak to this -- when we say somebody's out for a while, they'll be back, and then all of a sudden, that changes. I’ll tell you right now that some of the context of that is the person wants to come back. We want to see if it's possible. And for each individual student and their family, there's a bit of a process that plays out in how their initial stabilization goes.
So there's all kinds of things I could say related to that, but I'm looking at Julie and Michelle and Chris. Is there anything else that I'm missing around that sort of frame?

MS. BOWDLER: I don't think Mary Pat missed anything. I just wanted to add that it really is a collaborative effort, and I really appreciate you inviting Mary Pat and the rest of us to be a part of the faculty meeting, because we know that you often have a relationship with students where you are somebody they trust, or you notice that something has changed in your class.

And we have provided some materials in the back, which many of you have heard about when you were new faculty or if you've trained other faculty, and it's a handbook called "How to Help Students in Distress." And we're going to make sure it gets back up online. It used to be online, but with all the changes in the web, we can't find it online now.

So we're going to make sure it gets back up online, but we also have copies for you, really not to give you a primer on how to be defacto therapist, but in fact how to ask questions when you might be concerned and the availability for any of us -- the dean's office, the counseling center -- to be available to you if you just have a question or a concern.

DEAN McMAHON: Marisel, you had a comment, too.

ASSOCIATE DEAN PEREZ: You covered everything.

PROF ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology. You're bringing it to the faculty, so I'm wondering what role we can play? Is there any relationship between students who take six classes or trying to push the envelope to end up in this condition, in which case as a faculty, we could vote to sort of reduce the number of classes students can take simultaneously.

So I'm really interested in maybe personal reasons, home front stuff, in which case we don't have any role to play in that directly, anyway. But if there's something that we can do as a faculty, I'd like to hear if there's any relationships between class load and this.

DEAN McMAHON: I love that you're asking the question, and I'm so grateful for your sensitivity to that. I think there is a sort of broad generalization, and I don't think there's anyone in this room who doesn't already know this, but the broad generalization is that many of our current students are trying to pack it in. Whatever it is, they're trying to sort of maximize, whatever term you want to use. But they can really sort of load up in a way that doesn't allow for depth of critical inquiry. It doesn't allow for a lot of different things.

In general, I support for all of our students more depth of critical inquiry and sort of
focus. I know we have some students who are incredible high flyers and can be doing graduate level work. We just did the awards meeting the other day -- it blew me away -- and simultaneously concerned about every single person in that pool.

So I know we have a lot of talented students, but I do think attending to the question of sort of where is your balance in the advising conversation with students, where is the relief from some of what you're doing, how are you engaging in other ways and taking care of yourself. But then I would love to encourage your question to be part of the conversation around sort of where students have any limitations.

I would like to work with students back from time away to help them in particular, not try to catch up. Sorry about all the air quoting. But for students who think, “Okay, now I'm back, and I had my inpatient treatment program, and I've had a few months of outpatient, and I'm feeling okay. I want to get caught up.” You know, my line, which I've now used at four different schools, is “Tufts is going to be here, right?” So Tufts will be here. You can continue and sort of pursue your work.

The student perception of we're all getting to a particular mark after four years. Tufts is unique in that that is more common than not, right? A lot of universities have people that take time away for all kinds of reasons. So to the extent that you can help us normalize that. But the particular credit question, I would love to add more conversation around.

PROF ORIANS: It would be nice if the Committee of Student Life discussed this issue and brought it to us as a faculty and the different options.

DEAN McMAHON: Yes, and I've been talking with Judith and Roger about sort of the committee question, because this is one of those things. The CSL has so much to react to, and so many of us have so much to react to. You know, where's the right place to bring some of these different longer term questions up?

Dr. ROSS: Just a quick add. I just wanted to say that we do have many students who can manage, as you're saying, Mary Pat. But also to add that just because a student can do it doesn't necessarily mean that it's good for them. So some of our most high achieving and best known students may also be struggling invisibly with eating disorders and suicidal ideation and drug abuse. And just because they're so smart that they're able to do all that, all that academic work, doesn't mean they're not also suffering from the stress that it causes them.

PROF SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. So when you said that it's not just Tufts, it makes me also think if there are other things happening in the world that are relating to this. So I wonder if there are particular demographic groups on campus that seem to be particularly affected that might make sense, in light of domestic and international events?

DEAN McMAHON: This has come up a lot, this question of whether or not the election
politics that are unsettling people or other things that are in the water. My guess right now -- and it is a guess, and probably not -- it's only a guess -- is that it may have more to do with sort of the drug market and marijuana and edibles. But I really don't know. Julie, do you have an answer to that?

DR. ROSS: I can't really speak to the national data, but I will say that in the research that we do here at Tufts -- I mean, these are issues that affect everyone across all demographics. But that said, there are certain subgroups that report higher levels of distress and tend to seek help more often, and they're fairly expectable if you think about racism and bias in our culture. But that said, there are not huge differences, but they do exist.

DEAN McMAHON: I'll mention that we recently hired an additional staff person who has experience working specifically with African-American students and sort of cultural adjustment related to African-American students' experiences in places like Tufts, and I think that's already been tremendously helpful. It's just a specific thing we've done recently.

PROF ART: David Art, political science. I care deeply about this issue, and have for a long time. Do you have a sense -- you were somewhat vague when you were describing the drugs. You mentioned synthetic drugs. That could be anything from synthetic marijuana to everything else. My concern is the opiate epidemic. And I wonder, and I've been fearing for a while, if we are now going to see that at Tufts, at other places. We've been immune to it for a long time.

But that is the concern for me. Not all drugs. And this way of drawing things, I think has been very -- has been regressive. I'm concerned about opiate, prescription drugs, and the mix with alcohol. Is that what's changing?

DEAN McMAHON: I agree with you. I have that plus other concerns. So I agree 100 percent with what you're saying, and then I'm also concerned about --

PROF ART: Just a question. Is there evidence that that's happening?

DEAN McMAHON: Yes. And we have students in heroin recovery. We have students who are injecting things that are not yet illegal because they're research drugs. And then we have students who are sort of fueling sort of a lot of marijuana, and then gateway into other stuff.

PROF ART: Putting aside the question about the gateway issue, it seems to me that this requires a very quick response on the part of Tufts, because opiates -- we just had a speaker, Leonard Campanello, which political science and community health brought in to talk about the response to the opiate epidemic. And the lesson there is that it's an incredibly hard problem to manage, but it's also an epidemic. And there's a silence to it, and we don't see it.
And I think the point that even among our smartest students can hide this. But we know it's deadly. And I don't want there to be -- I don't want Tufts to become like that. But I see that as a possibility, and I'm really quite scared about that particular issue, death through opiate. Not marijuana, okay? And the drinking issue is something we have to talk about in connection with the opiates. So I would hope that we could have an adult conversation about drugs and focus on what really is the public health emergency here.

MS. BOWDLER: So I want to respond to that just briefly. I think that the fact that we're talking about it and that there are two speakers in a week addressing it I think speaks to the fact that Tufts isn't afraid to actually say that this is a real issue. Mary Pat and I are working on really developing way more resources for students who want to identify as being in recovery and allowing students who can come back to campus who may have really struggled with significant drug addiction to feel like they can succeed here and not that they're hiding from the social life that they believe might previously for them have been around drugs and alcohol.

So I did want to say that. The other thing is that the thing about marijuana is not so much necessarily synthetics, but the fact that it is available in different forms now so significantly that people don't -- you know, when you're smoking marijuana, it's very different than if you ingest it, and you think you're not having an effect, and so then you have five more brownies. People can become psychotic.

So we are really paying attention to that. And it rings true what we -- Mary Pat brought it up, because the speaker had talked to her about it. It I think addressed some things that she's been thinking about. And I talked to some clinicians, and they were like that makes a lot of sense to us with what we're seeing. So we hope to continue the conversation.

The other thing I want you to know is that the Tufts emergency medical service has Narcan. It is life-saving. And if you don't need it, and it's used, nothing happens. But if you need it, and you use it, it saves people's lives. And so we have taken that step.

DR. ROSS: I just was going to add -- and this is completely apolitical -- but one of the things that we have seen nationally over the last ten years with the changes, as Michelle was saying in forms of marijuana and strengths is that we have seen a surprising increase in the number of young people -- I work with students, so I don't know about whether it's actually true other places -- but young people are having first psychotic breaks smoking weed, and where the psychosis actually does not go away when they're no longer high.

And we don't know whether it is something about their particular brain, like maybe they were headed for a psychosis at some point in their life, and this brought it forward in time, or what the underlying physiology is, but we've seen it with weed, which certainly surprised all of us in my generation who grew up in the '60s and '70s. And also with acid and other hallucinogenics.
PROF DEVOTO: I have an entirely different question. So let me know when we're off this.

PROF JOHNSON: I had a question, which is I assume that engineering students have some of the same issues, and I'm wondering why we're -- this a very important discussion, but why we're having it here and not in an AS&E meeting?

DEAN McMAHON: I would be happy to go to engineering or do it again. So thanks for asking.

DEAN GLASER: Well, I invited them here, because I have responsibility for this agenda, and this seemed critical, and we were talking about it in the arts and sciences steering committee. So that doesn't preclude us from talking about it in an AS&E meeting. And by the way, I do believe this is an issue that also affects graduate students and presumably students at the other Tufts schools. Mark, last question.

PROF DEVOTO: My entirely different question. Mumps.

DEAN McMAHON: Yes, I knew somebody was going to ask about mumps.

MS. BOWDLER: So just so you know, all of our students have been immunized against mumps. That's part of the entrance into a university. It is not fully effective in all cases. So students are getting mumps, and they're getting much more mild illnesses than they were 50 years ago. We currently have two confirmed cases and a few more suspected. Our waiting room was absolutely packed yesterday. We are following it carefully and communicating with student affairs leadership and faculty to let them know what's going on, and I'm glad it's spring break next week.

PROF DEVOTO: They have 13 cases at Harvard. And I want to make sure that faculty are aware there is a risk to adults who haven't had it, as I know perfectly well from age 30, and it was highly unpleasant.

MS. BOWDLER: If you have any concerns, Marathon Health is happy to talk to you, and speak to your physicians. They can do a titer, or they can just reimmunize you. Most of you have probably been immunized in graduate school, but it may not be so. And so you might want to check.

I'll say one other thing, which is that one of our goals is students, they can present pretty mildly and not be that disruptive to them. We're really trying to raise awareness with student leaders to then relay to other students who won't ever open a really boring email from me to make them aware that it's about other people's health and well-being. You know, compromised, pregnant people, other people in the community as much as it is about, “I know you don't feel that bad, and you could go work out, but please don't.” So in any way that you can help us spread that message to think about the greater risks of
others, that would be great.

DEAN McMAHON: I want to use this opportunity to say thank you to Michelle's team, to Julie Ross, and to Chris and Marisel and to the alpha deans, and the students themselves, because this has been quite a thing. And I know that you share my appreciation for the ways that this can be a lot of sort of supportive work, and I'm just so grateful we have a good team working on it. So thank you.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Mary Pat. It is very impressive where you started with the alcohol transports going down. That doesn't happen by accident. It happens because of proactive thinking, studying the problem, and coming up with solutions. And I hope that continues. But it is good news in a series of less good things, bad things.

Bárbara.

UPDATE FROM FACULTY WORKLOAD COMMITTEE
DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you. So I hope that we'll only take about 20 minutes, so we'll try for the presentation part of this to be brief to allow questions so that Vida and Lynne can get the last five, ten minutes.

I think most of you know that we have been working on workload issues for now over a year. Drusilla and Pearl and David, do you want to come up now? This is going to be a group presentation for everyone.

I want to first introduce you to the committee members. Not all of them are here. Nancy Bauer was on the committee until the SMFA stole her away, myself and Drusilla Brown from economics and also representing IR, and Anne Gardulski was also a member of the committee when schedules allowed. Michelle Gaudette, a full-time lecturer in biology; Sergiy Kryatov, full-time lecturer in chemistry; Penn Loh, full-time lecturer in UEP; George McNinch, professor of mathematics; and Amy Millay, full-time lecturer in romance languages; Sergei Mirkin, professor of biology; Martha Pott, senior lecturer in child study and human development; and David Proctor, full-time lecturer in history; Hugh Roberts, professor of history; Pearl Robinson, associate professor of political science; Ted Simpson, full-time lecturer in drama and dance; Cristiane Soares, full-time lecturer in romance languages; and Rosemary Taylor, associate professor of sociology.

So there are 17 committee members, eight full-time lecturers, nine tenured faculty members, 15 departments represented. So it's quite broad. And I want to thank all of them. We've been meeting every week, an hour and a half every week. We started meeting last spring. It's a running joke that we're dealing with workload. And that's just the meeting time. On top of that, we have a lot of work between meetings.

I personally have learned so much from all of them. It is a group effort, and it reflects -- what we'll share today reflects everyone's ideas on where we are today. It's a very collaborative group. And you may have seen that in the survey, if you filled that out, the
workload survey. It's a survey created by a committee. There are problems when you create things by committee, but that's also part of the joy of doing things altogether. If you have not filled out the survey, I encourage you to do that.

This all started when I first joined the dean's office. It was one of the first things Jim threw at me. He said I want you to work on this. And I want to thank Hugh Roberts for being very eloquent last week and clarifying for me what it is that we are trying to do with basically both workload that we all do that we feel is over and beyond what we can handle -- I'm sure you've all been there at some point in time -- and at the same time, imbalances in our workload; doing too much of one thing and feeling like other areas of our work are not receiving enough attention.

What we end up producing, we want it to be helpful for everyone. We're hoping that this process will end with something to share with all of you in May. If we need to take longer because through feedback, it sounds like we're not there yet, we will take longer. As you can imagine, it's a very complicated process to satisfy over 400 faculty members in 25 departments and a dozen interdisciplinary programs. It's no small feat to design something that will work for everyone. It's a work in progress. We're likely to propose something, and then that will need to be revised as we put it into practice.

At the very least, I can say that the members of the committee understand the issues that are going on across the school in a much deeper way. And I'm going to hand it over to Pearl, who's going to give a short intro.

PROF ROBINSON: I'm going to summarize what our chair has just said. The faculty workload committee of the 2015-2016 academic year has been charged with the task of reviewing the many responsibilities of faculty across the School of Arts and Sciences. Our goal has been to make it possible for chairs and deans to recognize the workload of individual faculty members and to notice faculty work that might have been invisible or undervalued.

We've been mindful of the contributions of the work-life committee and recognize the need to create more balance between work and home life. The committee's work has been led by Dean Bárbara Brizuela, who was asked to lead this endeavor by Jim Glaser, dean of arts and sciences. The committee has met weekly with subcommittee and individual work between meetings.

PROF PROCTOR: So my job is to just briefly outline the overall process, to give you a sense that this has been a process that has been coming along since last semester, or since last spring. It has really been continuing to build and continuing to expand outreach.

So it began in January and February 2015, with department chairs and program directors and lunch meetings held with those people. These meetings were organized by discipline. Other department representatives were invited as well. The goal of the
meetings was to discuss with chairs and directors our purpose of exploring general faculty workload and more specifically the possibility of some kind of a system to acknowledge that workload.

We asked chairs and directors to discuss these issues with their units and to solicit volunteers for a committee. A committee was formed with all faculty volunteers, as you've heard. At all times, the committee made clear that the faculty were welcome at any time to attend and join the meetings to actively participate. We had two meetings in April of 2015 where the goals for the committee were effectively laid out. The committee reconvened in September of 2015, meeting for, as you already know, one and a half hours every week during the academic year.

The committee provided updates to chairs and directors at the October chairs meeting, and we invited departments and program directors to continue to encourage faculty participation. The survey was submitted to department chairs and program directors in November of 2015. We had 100 percent participation from department chairs and program directors in that survey.

The purpose of the survey was to gather data on a full array of work that faculty do for their departments, programs, and the university, and the goal was to better understand the current status in terms of faculty effort in order to identify what aspects of faculty effort have gone unnoticed and unacknowledged. And as you also all know, a survey was submitted to all full-time lecturers and tenure-stream faculty members in February of 2016.

Today, we've had a 50 percent participation rate of the survey. If you've not had a chance to participate in the survey, we strongly encourage you to do so. The survey stops on Sunday, March 20. The more faculty input we have, the more useful the results of that survey are going to be. So we strongly encourage you if you have not already participated in the survey, please do so before March 20.

We plan to hold an open forum on Monday, April 26 or Wednesday, April 27 at noon. Our goal there will be to discuss our preliminary findings and recommendations and to solicit more faculty feedback.

PROF BROWN: So we are not going to propose a single way of managing workload accounting. What we've found is that as we worked over the past year that there are several different ways of thinking of workload accounting. And at the moment, we're working with three models, which I think kind of cover the spectrum of how it is one might do this.

We started out -- which is a standard approach used in many schools -- with the point system, and it was also experimented with a year or so ago. Basically, the idea of a point system is pretty straightforward. You identify a target number of points that you have to accrue in a year. There is a price list that basically attaches points to individual
activities. And then for people who exceed the points required in a year by some amount get some kind of accommodation in their workload, to be defined.

The good thing about the point system is that it's very clear, and it also gives us the ability to reward exceptional performance. So if we have somebody who is earning a very large number of points every year, we could make some accommodation for that person.

I actually in the process of doing this test set up a little toolkit, a toolbox, where what you could do is you could put your workload in for a set of points that was established in a template, only to discover that the vast majority of us are probably exceeding the targeted number of points by about 50 percent.

So I think we're finding that a lot of people are working very hard in the institution. And this is a benefit of the point system, is that it reduces a variation of characterization of workload across departments.

The cons -- and these are huge cons -- is that they fundamentally undermine the intrinsic motivation to work, which is extremely important, in our opinion, in a university. It only rewards observable behavior, and it has difficulty rewarding unobservable behavior. And one of the huge problems with points of this sort is that once you establish the point system, a set of values associated with particular work activities, it becomes politically very difficult to change those ways.

And then also in the cons is it reduces variation in the characterization of workload across disciplines. So essentially, in the process of doing this activity, we discovered two things. One is that there's quite a lot of variation across disciplines in terms of what is considered to be even the definition of a course. So we've got some significant inequities that we need to think about.

We also discovered that one of the underlying principles of our undertaking was to do no harm. So we have, on the one hand, this do no harm principle up against this eliminating inequities principle, and it's difficult to do, to meet both of those objectives, particularly -- the point system highlights both aspects of that challenge.

The second model we've been working with is called the norm model. Essentially, I think all of you know that 50 years ago, Tufts was a commuter school with a certain set of expectations of what it meant to be a teacher at Tufts. We have now worked into an entirely different institution, where everyone is expected to do many kinds of activities.

And essentially, what the norm model does is simply attempt to characterize in fairly lofty language our current expectations and aspirations as teachers and scholars. And essentially, the underlying idea here is that over time, what we're trying to accomplish has changed. And, in fact, we're trying to accomplish way more today than we were trying to accomplish even 20 or 30 years ago.
And one of our theories about what's going on here is that since our aspirations for what we're doing here have changed, but we haven't sort of eliminated any of the tasks that we're doing. But this is where the pressure to do more and more without limit has emerged.

So the idea of the norm model is, in fact, to basically say, “All right, let's step back, let's think about what we really are trying to accomplish here, and make some adjustments in the way we're structuring our workload to reflect our new expectations and aspirations.”

Now, the pro here is that essentially, what we're using here is establishing a norms behavior, which is wonderful when you're trying to use intrinsic motivation to get people to accomplish a particular objective. So we -- me, in particular, but I think generally on the committee feel that this is the model that's most likely to nourish an intellectual vibrancy in the faculty.

And what it does is it allows faculty to identify themselves, self-identification strategy of saying, “I'm in this new model, and I want a workload that comes along with this new model of a faculty member at Tufts.” But the challenge is, or the con, the biggest one, is that it potentially creates two tiers of faculty; that is, there are going to be faculty who are meeting all the new norms, and therefore, get the new workload design, and those who don't meet the new norm and are stuck with the original design. And so there may be some inequities that arise there.

And then the second is that there is no definition of exceptional performance in this model. Basically, if you're doing exceptional performance, it's not because you're doing anything exceptional. It's because you're doing the new norm for the university. And because of that, there's no need to reward people for exceptional performance.

The third model is what we call the baseline model. And essentially, what this model does is it acknowledges in a very important way that the way the different departments define workload or the standard workload varies. And so what we allow individual departments to do is use both their disciplinary norms and the market conditions in which they're functioning to identify what the baseline work effort is in their department.

And then from there, there would be identification either by the chair or by a committee within the department, identifying the individuals who are exceeding that baseline. And then there would be some adjustment to the workload for those individuals.

Now, the real strength of this approach is it allows us to vary what the baseline is across disciplines, acknowledging that disciplines are different. It also provides faculty with a little bit more control on how it is that they're balancing the different aspects of their workload.
The challenge, of course, is that whenever you have these -- if you're very formal about how you account for work above the baseline, you get into the same kind of trouble that we have with the point system. If you're informal about it -- that is, you let the chair or a committee make a lot of decisions about how's exceeding baseline performance and what kind of compensation they should have -- you run into problems with accountability and equity.

I will say just two last things before I turn the mike back to Bárbara, is that when we were doing the chair survey, one of the fundamental objectives of that survey was to identify what the baseline looks like in each department and what aspects of work are not currently being accounted for.

The faculty survey was designed very specifically to identify the -- to make the metric against which we're comparing these different workloads the underlying well-being of the individual.

So when you saw questions about work-life balance or job satisfaction or general well-being, that's our strategy of basically saying the underlying metric here has to be the individual sense of well-being. That's where we're going with -- when we're identifying points or we're thinking about trade-offs, those trade-offs are done in the context of what those different activities mean in terms of your faculty well-being, with lots of different indicators of well-being.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you. I don't know if any other committee member, Martha or Hugh, if you want to say something? So we can entertain questions, feedback. Again, there will be an opportunity in the last week in April, either Monday or Wednesday, the 25th or 27th, we'll have an open forum. Chairs always get feedback. We're also going to be encouraging committee members to share preliminary recommendations with departments so that we're getting, again, ongoing feedback. But if there are any questions right now, it would be great for suggestions. Roger.

PROF TOBIN: Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. I just want to point out that I feel there's a little bit of a hidden thing going on here. There's a lot of talk about recognizing things that have not previously been recognized and rewarding exceptional performance. But the fact is the pool of rewards is finite. There's a raised pool every year. There are a certain number of courses that have to be taught and committees that have to be served on.

So if you're going to reward some people more, you're going to reward other people less. And that may also be important, because I think in addition to recognizing exceptional performance, we also need ways to recognize and deal with inadequate performance, which is rare, but not non-existent.

So I just think we should be honest that as we acknowledge some things, and we give them more weight in our reward system, that inevitably means we're going to give other
things less weight. And if we're giving more rewards to some people, inevitably that means there will be less rewards for others. I don't mean that as a criticism. That's just the way it is. But I just think when we talk about it, we should be honest about it.

DEAN BRIZUELA: I totally agree with that. I will say that in the process of listening to faculty and other departments, we’ve learned of practices which we think might be helpful for other departments in terms of how to account for workload. And I know as an academic dean, we get emails all the time about low enrollment courses. So maybe there are courses that don't need to be taught every year, that can be taught every other year, and then workload can be accounted in some other way during those years when those lower enrollment courses aren't topped.

PROF HOFKOSH: Sonia Hofkosh, English. First of all, thank you so much. It sounds like your committee has been incredibly hard-working and very thoughtful. So thank you for all that effort.

I'd like to connect our previous conversation with this conversation and point to one sort of maybe large category of invisible effort, which is if we have students who are suffering, we have a lot of extra work that goes into dealing with these students. We send messages. We consult with them. We consult with the academic deans. There's a lot of invisible extra work that I'm not sure is something that usually gets considered as work. And even small things, like taking out our own trash and having to spend the time. I mean, it's not really a joke. It actually adds to the fracturing of where our brains are and how much that limits other things that we can be doing for our own research or even developing new curriculum.

So I guess it feels to me like there's a big category even -- so I started the survey, and then I didn't finish it because I felt -- I started to feel like the questions weren't actually getting at what the issues were for me so much. I'll go back, and I will finish it.

DEAN BRIZUELA: You should finish it, because there is space for open responses, and we will be looking qualitatively at the open responses.

PROF HOFKOSH: One question I did have is could we extend the time to work on it into break, because I haven't had time to go back in. So if it could get extended into break --

DEAN BRIZUELA: I'll talk to the group.

PROF HOFKOSH: -- and we had time over break to get it, it might actually help. But I guess it feels to me that there's a whole category of -- our jobs have changed, as Drusilla was suggesting, and the quality of ours have changed, not just the quantity. And I guess I want to just be able to think about that some more with people.

DEAN GLASER: I'm so sorry to cut the conversation off. We have one more topic to
cover today. And we do have a couple of open sessions that are scheduled. So I promise that we'll get to them, and indeed, we can carry this conversation into the next A&S faculty meeting. So I apologize.

Lynne and Vida.

**FEEDBACK ON PROPOSAL FROM FACULTY WORKING GROUP ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE**

PROF JOHNSON: There is no conspiracy that we left this for the end of the agenda so that we could railroad you into something or ram through a proposal.

I just want to catch you up, and I hope that you've had a chance. If you haven't, please do read it, the newer version of the interim report that the task force, the university-wide task force on the formation of a faculty senate has produced.

I want to thank Roger Tobin for giving us a push and a shove to make this the only topic of the forum, the AS&E forum that was held last week, where we had about 45 or 50 -- oh, and Judith Haber. Well, Roger, you were the one who was exchanging all those emails with me. And Judith Haber and the whole executive committee that they encouraged us to make sure that we have a full vetting, and there was an hour and a half devoted to this discussion.

So I want to sort of summarize the points that were brought up and concerns that were brought up. And they seem to have been the same concerns brought up across various schools so far. We happened to have after the forum, the next morning, or whenever we met with the university-wide group and sort of reported back from the preliminary discussions, the overall response from all the schools seems to have been positive. I think most of the faculties are convinced that there is a need for university-wide faculty body that could discuss and weigh in on issues of concerns across the schools.

That said, there was also a common sense that, well, the devil's sort of in the details. We haven't gotten all the details yet, but there was concern that this document or that the senate, that the document would have enough teeth, or more specificity, that it would not be that this body when constituted would not be a rubber stamp with the administration. So that was a concern across that we took seriously and went back and just tightened up a few of the -- used some of the suggestions from A&S and from the discussion across the schools the following day to produce an interim report, which Jes Salacuse produced the day after with additional sort of specificity. There is more work to be done. So these issues are being considered and addressed.

Another issue that was raised in our AS&E discussion that this body would not meddle in AS&E business, even though -- we're talking about issues that are cross-school issues, but for the purpose of this, and we will find the right language -- that this is not an end-run to the current governance structure in AS&E. It is not meant to be. And we do have a special relationship, which is one of the reasons I asked. I was thinking, “Well,
this may be a matter that should be discussed by the senate about student use, graduate student as well as undergraduate use of what were the medical issues surrounding use of opioids or use of pot, the much maligned pot.”

So these are things that we've taken seriously. So please, AS&E, don't worry that this would actually create a problem for the current structure. It may create some thoughts to reconsider some things. We acknowledge that. For example, specific suggestions that we took into account that we be more precise about saying how we participate in various searches and reviews at the upper levels and in choosing the president, in choosing the provost and the deans of the various schools.

And it came as a surprise to some that generally, when deans of schools are chosen, a member of the faculty from another school serves on the deans' committee. So we already have a cross-school collaboration. And it just happens to be that when those faculty are chosen we don't know in what way, and we're saying that the senate would be the body that would help choose or appoint a member of the senate to serve on this. So this was taken into account and added as a more specific suggestion.

Another specific -- there was a whole question about the budget and how we can at the university level participate in at least the selection of budgetary priorities, establishment of new schools, for example; where is faculty input into that. And there was a sense that this would be precisely one of the issues that we would work on. And so that also is part of our, we would think of the mandate of the senate.

There were also suggestions that we add more specifically the various conditions of employment, such as benefits, health plans, retirement, work-life issues, also be sort of front and center as part of the charge of the senate. We haven't had the chance to add something like that, but I think that was something that was of concern to everyone.

For example, the question was raised why did faculty really not have any significant input in rolling out those new health plans, for example. Or why is it that the work-life committee is so active in AS&E, but people of medical or other schools didn't even know about it. So there would be issues that are of concern not only to the academic aspect of the teaching, but to faculty interests in our cross-university.

Generally, there was suspicion, as one might always expect from the faculty, about the corporatization, the business model that we see being employed here at this university, and so how would this body be able to push back on that, or not. We realize that we need buy-in if the schools decide -- and I think this should come up for a vote hopefully before the end of the semester.

But also we want to make sure that we hear from everyone, and if we don't have a chance to hear from you today, Lynne and I said that please email us if you have any questions if you weren't at the big forum. I think we had a really good representation of faculty there, and a lot of issues that you might be thinking about were already raised.
So we would need to have buy-in from the trustees, buy-in from the individual faculties, where all the individual faculties would vote, all of the schools. So buy-ins from the schools, and also of course buy-in from the leadership, from the president and the provost, who commissioned this task force and asked the task force to consider. With representatives of all the schools -- there were 16 of us -- to consider creating some kind of university-wide body which we ended up calling the senate, but it would be a senate and house model. I don't know if we want to name anything after our government at this point.

But anyway, it would be a body that would combine the senate model of equal representation, sort of a base representation, and then additional representation, depending on the size of the schools. So we in arts and sciences would need to provide seven warm bodies as proposed in this 29-person senate committee. But I certainly assure the faculty -- I'm an optimist at heart -- that any kind of body like this is not going to function if we're not taken seriously and if those who are on it are not taking the business of the university seriously.

So I wouldn't pre-judge us and say, oh, it's just going to be a rubber stamp. It is what we make of it.

PROF PEPALL: That was a lot of information after a point system, but we think this is worth a lot of points, and it's a good norm, and it will be a new baseline for the university. And in that, I think we've scored. I know this is the end of the meeting, and we are in our feedback gathering mode, so if you have feedback on the model that you have in the draft, please send your feedback to us, and we'll try and bring it to the task force and get a document that we can actually vote on before we break for the end of the year, and then it will go to the trustees in the summer. So that's the game plan, and I think we're probably out of time.

DEAN GLASER: You did it right to the minute. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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