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ANNOUNCEMENTS

CELEBRATION OF LEE COFFIN, DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
DEAN GLASER: Welcome to the last A&S meeting of the year. Getting my Jillian instructions out. I want to remind you first of all as I make some announcements that there will be a celebration of Dean Coffin tomorrow from three to five in Alumnae Lounge. I promise it will be a very emotional and bittersweet event and an opportunity for us to thank him for his many years of service here and all that he's done for us. So it will be much appreciated if we could get a lot of people there.

I'd like to call on Nancy Bauer to talk about another event.

RECEPTION TO WELCOME SMFA FACULTY TO TUFTS
DEAN BAUER: Just a reminder that after the Lee Coffin fête and you're emotionally worn out, you can come from six to eight tomorrow very close by in the Remis Sculpture Court to a party to welcome the SMFA faculty. I know there's a lot going on. Everybody still has many people and piles of grading out. If you can make it there that would be a wonderful thing. It's really fun to talk to the faculty, and they would love to see you. You don't have to be there the whole time, obviously. There will be food and drinks there and also the art gallery will be open.

2016 FRONTIERS OF DEMOCRACY CONFERENCE
DEAN GLASER: On June 23rd to June 25th the Tisch College of Civic Life is sponsoring a conference on Frontiers of Democracy. It's organized by the Tisch College. It will be held at the Boston campus, Tufts Boston campus. It is the main international interdisciplinary conference devoted to civic life. It will be limited to 120 people, and I do believe that they have almost met that number, but there are still a couple of spots left if you would like to participate in this very exciting conference. There are flyers available at the front door and you can pick up information about it on your way out.

UPDATE ON RESCHEDULING EXAMS
DEAN GLASER: Finally, I'd like to call on Carmen. I have to say that they picked Monday, which is a most unusual day. In my experience in the Dean's office there has been a day or two like it, but not many, thankfully. While people were asked not to come in to work and while we postponed exams for three of the exam blocks there was a lot of work that was done by the administration to figure out what to do, how to communicate what we were doing, and what was going to come next. So I'm going to ask Carmen to talk about that.

DEAN LOWE: Well, first off I just want to find out how many people had a planned scheduled exam canceled on Monday. How many people in this room? Thank you.
Thank you very much for your flexibility. It was a very confusing situation for all of us in Dowling Hall. The deans received, I don't know how many, emails from students. Initially, they were very worried about, “When is my exam? When is the makeup? I have a flight to catch.” And within hours students got back to us to say, “Oh, I’ve heard from my professor, problem solved.” I really want to thank you for your flexibility, for your creativity, and trying to reschedule exams, come up with alternate arrangements for students who had some conflict. I know that the exam schedule plan is not perfect. It moves exams to Thursday and Friday and a lot of students, especially freshman, sophomores, and juniors have plans to leave campus before that time. Seniors who are graduating in a couple of weeks should be here, so we also have to be cognizant of the needs of seniors to finish their course work so they can graduate. If you have any ongoing concerns about your final exam and are not sure how to balance the needs of the majority in your class with one or two students, you can certainly reach out to me or the associate deans of undergraduate education for some advice. TRUNK can support online exams for online submission exams. I know a lot of people have opted for take-home exams. Is anyone going to actually hold an in-class exam on the time slots for Thursday and Friday? Let me see hands. Okay, so a couple of people. Thank you very much. That's really all I have to say about that, just to thank the faculty. And be in touch with your students. That's the main thing. I think almost everybody has been in touch with the students and the students have been in touch with you. Be in touch with your students about the location of the exam scheduled for Thursday or Friday, about alternatives. And thanks for being so kind and flexible and understanding for the students who had travel plans that they could not afford to change at such late notice.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Carmen, and thanks to all in helping us deal with this difficult situation. I'm looking at Laura Wood, Tisch Library, who opened up shortly after noon on Monday so students would have a place to go. The dining hall has been very flexible. It was a very kind of crazy day and a lot to adjust to, and your flexibility as well as the staff at the library was so appreciated. Thank you.

DEGREES

LIBERAL ARTS AND JACKSON COLLEGE
DEAN GLASER: I'd like to now open a meeting of the faculty of Arts and Sciences to proceed with voting degrees in Liberal Arts and Jackson College.

Members of the faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from Liberal Arts and Jackson College. It is the function of this faculty to recommend to the Board of Trustees all candidates for degrees in Liberal Arts and Jackson College as authorized by the trustees for the award of the degree in May 2016, subject to the usual conditions.

I am happy to certify that these candidates have met or will meet the degree
requirements, as set forth by this faculty, for the programs in which they have been enrolled.

The total number of bachelor degrees to be recommended is 1,024. Of those, in Liberal Arts there are 275 Bachelor of Arts candidates, 165 Bachelor of Science candidates. In Jackson College, there are 381 Bachelor of Arts candidates and 203 Bachelor of Science candidates.

Is there a motion to recommend?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So moved.

DEAN GLASER: Any discussion? All in favor?

ALL: Aye.


Now, I would like to close the School of Arts and Sciences meeting, and I would like to call on Dean Cook as we open the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences faculty meeting.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
DEAN COOK: At this time I'd like to open the meeting of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences to vote on degrees.

Members of the faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It is the function of this faculty to recommend to the Board of Trustees all candidates for degrees in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences as authorized by the trustees for the award of the degree in May 2016, subject to the usual conditions.

I am happy to certify that these candidates have met or will meet the degree requirements, as set forth by this faculty, for the programs in which they have been enrolled.

The total number of degrees to be recommended is 265. Of these, 237 are master's degrees and education specialists, and 28 are Ph.D. and OTD degrees. The number of graduate degrees are as follows: 89 Master of Arts, 18 Master of Arts in Teaching, 45 Master of Fine Arts, 66 Master of Science, 5 Master of Public Policy, 1 Doctors of Occupational Therapy, 27 Doctors of Philosophy, and 14 Education Specialists.
Is there a motion to recommend?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So moved.

DEAN COOK: Discussion? All in favor?

ALL: Aye.


At this time, I would like to close the meeting of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

COLLEGE OF SPECIAL STUDIES

DEAN GLASER: I would like to open a meeting of the College of Special Studies to vote degrees, and call upon interim dean of special studies, Nancy Bauer.

DEAN BAUER: I know everybody is crushed that this is the absolute last time we're going to do this. I'm first going to open the meeting of the College of Special Studies and explain to people who may not know that the College of Special Studies is an administrative vehicle that allows Tufts to award degrees to schools that are not part of the university proper. Of course, that will no longer be the case with the SMFA as of July 1. So this is the last time we'll do this. We'll only have to go to four meetings -- or three meetings, instead of four, on the last day of each term.

Members of the faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from the College of Special Studies for the degree of Bachelor of Fine Arts.

I am happy to certify that these candidates have met or will meet the degree requirements, as set forth by this faculty, for the programs in which they have been enrolled.

The chair of the department of Visual and Critical Studies of the Museum School, College of Special Studies, has approved this list of degree candidates.

I would therefore move that this faculty recommend that these candidates be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for award of the degrees in May 2016, subject to the usual conditions.

There are 52 Bachelor of Fine Arts candidates. Is there a motion to recommend?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So moved.
DEAN BAUER: Any discussion? All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

DEAN BAUER: All Opposed? All Abstentions? Thank you. The students will get their degrees.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Dean Bauer for your services as interim dean of Special Studies.

(Applause)

NEW BUSINESS

LA&J CURRICULA COMMITTEE PROPOSALS

DEAN GLASER: I now re-open the meeting of Arts and Sciences and call upon David Proctor, the chair of the LA&J Curricula Committee.

PROF PROCTOR: We have only one item to look at today, so everything in part two has been approved by the committee. There was nothing that required a vote. The only thing to vote about is part one, which is a new course, half credit course, in Science, Technology, & Society - STS 0010. Are there any questions, concerns about that? Is there a motion to approve?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So moved.

PROF PROCTOR: Second?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PROF PROCTOR: All opposed? Abstentions? Great. Just one minor mention, corrections to what was sent out by email. The program we have only allows people to choose to be a department chair rather than program director. A lot of our submissions this time around were program directors, so we have corrected that, and I will send it out to you today with the correction.

DEAN GLASER: The Curricula Committee, in my experience, had many ups and many downers. With David Proctor in the chair seat we have a very efficient and very excellent Curricula Committee, and I hope you'll join me in thanking David for it.

(Applause)
It gives me confidence knowing that the committee is in your able hands, and we've had a very good year with regard to this.

**DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON EPC RESOLUTION**

DEAN GLASER: Now, I call on the chair of the EPC, Anne Mahoney.

PROF MAHONEY: Thank you, Jim. I have three small announcements before getting to the proposal. First of all, I want to thank and congratulate the Office of the Registrar, for successfully implementing the early grade release reward for completed course evaluations for this very semester. There are students right now who cannot see the grades we already posted because they didn't do their evaluations. So thanks to all of you. I'm glad that this got done so quickly, and let's hope that it helped our response rate.

Second, EPC has been asked by the TCU Senate Committee on Education to review the curriculum and the requirements for undergraduates. And I'm pleased to announce that EPC and the Senate Education Committee will collaborate to do that over probably the next two years. We're working out the details, but we are going to be asking you to join in to participate, to comment. There will probably be a very small steering committee that will then recruit a larger working group task force on student and faculty volunteers that will then have open meetings, four-month discussions, teachings, everything for students or faculty or everyone. I think this is going to take at least two years. It's kind of a big deal, and we kind of want to get it right. We will be asking you to get involved. Please be receptive when we do that.

Finally, something we'll hear more about at the end of this meeting, the faculty Work/Life Committee has asked EPC to take a look at pre-major advising and EPC is happy to do that. I don't know what that means yet. We'll work it out next semester, but again, we will probably be asking for participation in that effort.

Now, the proposal that we bring before you today is about simplifying how we treat minors and closing a couple of weird loopholes. So we have proposed new language, which you see on the front of the handout, which is something like half the length of the existing language. The key points are we want to abolish the distinction between departmental and interdisciplinary minors. If you think about it, the asymmetry in that is part of the problem because one of the departments is a discipline. My friends in education proudly tell us that education is interdisciplinary. And I don't think discipline is a department. Think about the -- I hope it's still an ongoing minor in linguistics. Linguistics is a perfectly good discipline but not a department here. So we decided that this mechanism was obsolete. It was a little too cumbersome. So we proposed to simplify that. We also propose the current language of the Bulletin was that a student
may not have a major and a minor in the same discipline. Doesn't say anything about having two minors in the same discipline, if that's possible. It is in my department. Doesn't say anything about having two majors in the same discipline, if that's possible. It is in my department. Classics has a possible number of majors and minors and students double-up on them right now.

We are proposing, instead of trying to make a blanket policy, which kind of doesn't work, to put this in the hands of the departments and programs so that each department and program may say you are or are not allowed to have the following combination of our majors and minors. The impetus from this comes from environmental studies, which wants to make sure that students may, if they wish, major in environmental studies and minor in the new food and nutrition systems minor. EPC doesn't see any reason that environmental studies should be kept from making that decision for itself, and we decided stepping back and looking at it, that the whole thing should be put in the hands of the departments. Those two things constitute the proposal. Discussion on this?

PROF HIRATA: Hosea Hirata, German, Russian, Asian Languages and Literatures. Just one clarification: it says one course used in fulfillment of a minor or a credit. I always wondered what it means for transfer credits from non-Tufts abroad programs?

PROF MAHONEY: Can anybody answer that offhand?

PROF LOWE: I believe that's for a letter grade as opposed to taking a pass/fail. So if a course is transferred in from another institution, it cannot transfer unless the student has gotten a C or better from the other institution. So they have taken the course for a letter grade and not pass/fail.

PROF MAHONEY: Thank you, Carmen.

PROF GOLDBERG: I just had a question about what's going to happen to the capstone requirement for interdisciplinary language. It seems like from the course language that there's no capstone requirement. Would it be optional to keep them or would everybody be required to get rid of them?

PROF MAHONEY: No one is going to be required to get rid of everything. Programs that find it useful to have a capstone we encourage them to continue that. Programs that don't have capstones, in fact, EPC, some of us were thinking that capstones are generally a good thing. But we aren't going to force in particular the minor program to define a capstone if it doesn't want to. On the other hand, we encourage integrating the student's program and the capstones that are replaced are good and should stay.
PROF RIDGE: In the language of the proposal it says two course credits used toward the departmental minor may be used toward a foundation, distribution, or concentration requirement. Concentration requirement: does that mean majors or and minors?

PROF MAHONEY: It means majors and minors. We need at some point to clarify that language and, I don't know, define a major concentration and a minor concentration or something like that. But EPC was not up for that level of language lawyering right now.

We should proceed to a vote unless there's more discussion? All in favor?

ALL: Aye.


DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Anne, and thank you for your service with EPC. It's a very complicated committee, and we absolutely appreciate all that you do for us. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHANGES IN INDIRECT COST RECOVERY (ICR)
DEAN GLASER: Now I call on Bob Cook to talk about changes in indirect cost recovery.

DEAN COOK: So last year at this meeting I initiated a review of our indirect cost policies. There are a couple of different implications. One was how we distribute indirect cost returns, and the fact that we deviated from what engineering was doing. The other was that we also have a number of underperforming grants that didn't recover the full federally rated indirect cost that we could. I have at several times given a presentation about this, about what those costs are and how important they are for us to try and recover those.

So over the course of the last year a group of us have been discussing changes that we can make to these policies. We researched, I can't remember the full name of the committee, and came up with a number of recommendations that we would like to start implementing on July 1st. There are two kinds of costs. There's direct costs and institutional indirect costs. But here are the really important things that you'd like to know. There is no new distribution allocation, obviously. We thought there should be but nah.

All right. So it's proposed that what we're going to do is, in agreement with engineering's policy the indirect costs that you generated from your grants will be for the PI returned to your research account at the rate of five percent.
This will go to your research. Again, the PI's will take on the responsibility for distributing that money to their co-PI's. So you can allocate amongst yourselves how that should be distributed. So you want to make sure you have good discussions with your co-PIs before you submit the grant, but it will be up to the discretion of the PI to allocate that five percent among the co-PIs because co-PIs have a variety of different roles. Some work very hard and others are there for other reasons. So you guys should decide for yourselves.

The other change is that the School of Arts and Sciences will distribute five percent of that ICR back to the departments as part of your operating budget.

So there are two policies that you need to know. The first one is that this is retroactive to anybody with an NIH grant whose initials start RJC, all right. I thought he was exempt. The other one is there's the unwritten policy that because we're now distributing almost ten times the amount of money that we were previously giving back to the departments, from the order of, you know, $50,000 down to a half million dollars going back out to you guys to control, is that deans will probably ask you whether you have funds in your account to help cover the cost that you might traditionally have come to us to cover. So you might get some push-back if you have some minor in your ICR related funds that could help support the various ideas that you have. So there might be some push-back up here for us to do that.

DEAN SAHAGIAN: We know the answer to the question before we ask it.

DEAN COOK: So those are all good things. On the other side of things is that we've been under-recovering from various programs. So what we want to do is try to increase that as part of the effort to generally increase the revenue of the school.

So here are the following proposed changes on that: The first one is that for all grants that don't require the use of the modified tool direct cost, MTDC, which is everything that's the cost of the grant, minus major equipment, graduate student tuition, and those kinds of things. What we're going to do instead is use the total direct cost basis for those. So if you're not having a federally funded grant or something that's recovering the full fifty-six percent, we're going to use the total cost of the grant to compute the indirect cost rate rather than using the MTDC. That should generate about 100K extra a year.
Over the next two years we're going to increase graduate student tuition recovered from the grant, and fifteen percent, which is allocated now, to twenty-five percent. So next year we'll go to twenty, and the year after that to twenty-five. We may have some simplifying assumptions there too that will go along, but we're going to try and recover more federally funded grants at twenty-five percent.

In addition, we'll come up with different scenarios. If you look at different foundations everybody has a different set of rules for what can be counted as a direct cost, what can't be counted as a direct cost, or what the rate is that you can charge. So it isn't easy to have just one rule. So Jackie and her group are going to help us to develop a series of foundations and profiles where we can begin to try and recover some indirect costs. In particular, we're going to try and do graduate student tuition, data management costs, and open access support. Some foundations won't let you do some of these. They'll let you do others. But we're going to try and come up with a fairly standardized formula so you can have some idea of ways that we can recover some of the university's cost and previously parts of the budget, specifically to the PI. Rich Lerner, for example, has been helping us develop new models for him to be able to recover some of his graduate student costs from his bigger grants for example. So we'll be working on trying to do that and recovering costs there.

Then finally, we're going to make no attempt to try and increase any of these cost recoveries for small grants that are under 50K. Pretty much all of those have very little indirect costs or, you know, faculty fellowships or graduate student fellowships that basically have no indirect costs, so we're not going to try and worry about that.

So these are changes that hopefully will impact our budgeting. But Jackie and her group work hard to make sure everybody knows what the rules are. Hopefully, between those two things we can have a successful research program here. I'm happy to answer questions at this point.

PROF KILMER: Misha Kilmer, mathematics. So I'm just wondering if we're grandfathered in to this increase over two years, graduate student tuition, those of us who have existing grants?

DEAN COOK: We're going to have to -- yes, you're going to have to get grandfathered on that. There are also, just to anticipate down the line too, there have been recent changes to the federal government with regards to student health insurance policies and whether we're going to be able to cover them or charge some grants. We're going to have to work on that over the next year too. So there are changes there. And we understand some people already got their grants fixed, and we'll have to accommodate that.

PROF KUMAR: So two questions. One is that even with the new building coming up,
maybe this is a question for Scott. The agreement itself should actually provide a very big increase for the ICR number itself. The percentage that we are charging on this. So the new building actually increase ICR that it can recover. So the rate itself is negotiated.

DEAN SAHAGIAN: The rates have already been negotiated for the next two or three years. Tom McGurty's office has already put that in. From what I understand, we're fortunate to maintain the same rate we have. I would agree with you that the new facility would add to it, but I think we did okay to stay where we are.

PROF KUMAR: So the second question is about the 50K. Some of the foundations and even technology accounts basically say that it's up to the institution whether they want to add on ICR. But they say it's not recommended. But the office has always been insistent on recovering something from those grants and that seems to be a criticism sometimes when we apply.

DEAN COOK: Okay.

PROF TOBIN: Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. I have a comment and a question. The comment is, and I understand why you're doing this, just to point out that when you increase the effective tax in graduate students you will cause shifts to post-docs. This has already happened since we started adding in tuition and fees for graduate students to grants. I see an increasing number of faculty with grants choosing to hire post-docs rather than graduate students. I just want to point out that that will be an effect.

My question is going back to the rebates, which is wonderful, how do we get away with that given that these are strictly audited, and we have to justify our rates and indirect cost recovery on the basis of real expenditures? How does anyone get away with having these policies? I know we do but why does the government put up with that?

DEAN SAHAGIAN: We're actually reducing our operating revenue in the school by ten percent and redistributing that. So we're not taking it off your grants. The grants are coming in and then we get the ICR on the bottom line.

PROF TOBIN: Oh, I understand that. My question is why doesn't the government come and say, “Look, ten percent of the ICR --”

DEAN SAHAGIAN: Because it's in our operating --

PROF TOBIN: -- you're not justifying --

DEAN SAHAGIAN: We're not taking out of the ICR. Your ICR is whatever it is and
that still is recorded when an audit is done. We, on the other hand, are able to withdraw fifteen percent to go into the use fund, which is for renovations and so on and so forth, and the rest of it hits our bottom line. So we can point to some discretionary costs and money where we replenish funds from ICR, and we can also redistribute those and redeploy those in different ways to other activities on the campus. We are taking out of our operating revenue and redeploying it to the faculty, but we don't have to. Wait, I shouldn't have said that.

DEAN COOK: That's why it's called a discretionary allocation policy, not an ICR return policy.

PROF DEBOLD: Joe Debold, psychology. I just want to reinforce what Roger said and that is when we devise a budget, and we see the cost to us for a graduate student on our budget would be similar to a post-doc, and the post-doc is going to spend 100 percent of their time on research, and a graduate student fifty percent of the time, we're going to start looking for money in post-docs instead of graduate students.

DEAN COOK: Well, as dean of the graduate school, don't do that. But that's a good observation and something we should look for. We do not want to deter graduate students. We love having them here.

PROF SAJINA: Anna Sajina, astronomy. So I also was pretty surprised at the big shift between fifteen and twenty-five percent, and I was wondering how that compares with other institutions because when people review your grant they also review the budget. And they might say, “Why is your price so expensive?”

DEAN COOK: I believe it's comparable in many other places.

PROF SAJINA: So we were on the low end before and this jumping ten percent makes us more comparable, is that –

DEAN COOK: That's a good question. I don't know the answer, the distribution of those. We're not trying to hurt anybody. We want you to be competitive.

PROF URRY: Heather Urry, psychology. This is great, and I started clapping because I think it's great that we have a new allocation policy. One thing that comes up for me is as a scientific manager in a center that's housed in the engineering department, I'm wondering how do these discretionary allocation policies apply to grants that might go through a school other than A&S?

DEAN COOK: Well, there's no reason to go through another school other than A&S now. That will have to be worked out.
MR. DUDLEY: Just to follow-up on your question, Heather. For engineering at the moment you will get your five percent because it is their policy as well. But the department will not. So that is yet to be negotiated with the deans, I guess. From other schools outside of AS&E, that has to be something up front, whether we do that –

DEAN BRIZUELA: Bábara Brizuela, education. So what will be the approach for sub awards where the full ICR is being recovered?

DEAN COOK: Jackie, you want to handle that one?

MS. DEJEAN: So my understanding is that this would apply to all grants that A&S faculty already have. So it wouldn't matter if it was private or a sub award or federal, as long as it's recovering the full indirect.

DEAN BAUER: I speak for some humanists. Before I became dean I would have not understood almost everything that's up on this screen. You mentioned the thing about less than 50k recovering and you mentioned a kind of a fellowship award that might be given to somebody. But a lot of fellowships are more than 50K and they're, you know, something that faculty will sometimes confess and ask us to top up and so forth. Are those going to be subject to ICR? They're not now.

DEAN COOK: Well, that will depend on where they're getting it and how big it is and where, you know -- if there's no graduate school tuition involved in the grant or if data management cost or open access support then the answer would be no.

DEAN BAUER: Okay. I just wanted that to be clear. It's basically always going to be no. Thank you.

PROF ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology. I guess on line number two I'm trying to understand the implications of this given the comments, and I wonder if there's an opportunity for us to get a little bit more information before that rolls out. I know the grant that I have with the nutrition school they do a lot more around tuition recovery. But I don't really understand what this number means to my future grants and my competitiveness and whether I'm going to opt for post-docs or grad students, and I was wondering if we could have more discussion around that one?

DEAN COOK: Sure. One way to think about it, with the fifteen percent now you would be paying -- we'd be asking you to contribute $4,500 towards the tuition of a grad student in a grant on a per annual basis. This I think raises it to $7,500.

DEAN SAHAGIAN: And commonly that's what engineering is budgeting.
DEAN COOK: But if it turns out it hurts our graduate students not being able to apply or it seriously begins to hurt our competitiveness then we need to rethink. Thank you.

DEAN GLASER: So we started to notice that engineering was incentivizing grant activity in a way that arts & sciences was not, and the EAD in engineering had initiated these changes and so we stole the EAD from engineering.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES
DEAN GLASER: We're going to spend the rest of this meeting talking about workload. Bárbara Brizuela and a task force of working group of faculty has been toiling all year long to talk about this topic and they will be presenting and posing some questions to us about that new workload.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you, everyone. I see a lot of faces that were here, was it last week or the week before, for the open forum. So thanks for coming back. There's been a large group of people who have been working on this all year, basically since last January and February. I have two possible plans for today. My experience from the open forums was that some people came and had and not actually read the handouts. And I got some emails today and yesterday which indicated that still people had not read the handouts. So I'm prepared to give you an overview of what Jillian sent on Friday. I can also skip that altogether if everyone has read them. I just want us all to be on the same page when I'm talking. Okay, I will do an overview, and I'll speed it up.

So where we are right now there are draft recommendations. I emphasize draft. There was some misinformation after the open forums. I heard that some people thought that what was presented at the open forum was going to be implemented, even though that would be impossible because there were contradictions in the things that we were presenting. So I emphasize it's a draft. What you're seeing today and the handout that Jillian sent on Friday is very different from what you saw at the open forum. So we actually did listen. We did take in feedback, and we're prepared to do that again. We're going to say a few things for those of you who weren't here at the open forums. Emotions run high when we talk about workload. Let's focus on being constructive. As I said, these are drafts. It's a huge challenge to address the needs of 400 faculty across twenty-five different departments, interdisciplinary programs. Our goal is to help. So if what we propose in your minds is going to make things worse or keep things the way they are, I personally am not prepared to move forward with that. I'm here to listen as are the rest of our working group members. There are lots of them here. Listen about the process, listen about the content of what we are recommending as well.

I'm going to jump through the process thus far, but just so you see, it's very long, a lot of meetings, a lot of sharing starting in January of last year. Next steps, more sharing
today. Between this afternoon and tomorrow Jillian will be sending out a Qualtrics survey so that people who aren't here are able to log in provide their feedback. There will be an option where they're anonymous or not. We will be posting an interim report. What you see today does not provide the full gamma of the results that we shared in the open forums and the research that we've done from workload systems at other institutions. So that interim report will include that, and we'll be distributing that. Then we will reconvene in September, look at the feedback that everyone has posted, and then hopefully depending on the kind of feedback that we get, come back in September or October for a vote from the faculty on the recommendations that we end up making. My hope for next year would be to pilot the recommendations and then to reassess after a year. As far as we see it, this should be a cyclical process where we keep coming back and revising the recommendations. Please interrupt me if there are any questions.

So the goals in general for our process would be to allow more flexibility so that faculty can focus on their strengths. At one of the open forums someone mentioned well, “I love teaching, I don't want to do less teaching, I'd love to do less service.” So that's a possibility to enable faculty to have more manageable and desirable workloads. We learned from the faculty survey that a lot of faculty are finding themselves overwhelmed with workload. Also to ensure more equitable sharing of the work within departments and across departments, and to give faculty a voice in making decisions within their departments.

The general approach that we are recommending is a bottom-up approach. So, in fact, you will see that there are not a lot of details right now, and the reason is that we are providing just very general guidelines right now so that departments can implement these, and over time as departments provide us with more specific data about things that they're doing our guidelines can become more specific.

We're trying from our recommendations to be informed by current departmental practices and also what our faculty need or what the faculty has expressed as needing. In fact, what we are recommending is already happening in some departments. These are current practices in some departments that we're trying to build on because they seem to have worked.

Our recommendations establish workload on an individual basis, individual by individual, but looking at department-wide practices. I can say a little bit more about that.

The recommendations also establish a direct line to make sure that departments are communicating with deans so that even though it might be department specific practices, the deans will be able to provide feedback about whether or not the practices that are being implemented in a department make sense across departments, and also allows for
revisions over the years as we begin working in departments.

So I know that if you think of a point system on one end of the spectrum that this might seem a little fuzzy right now. Again, this was a deliberate decision not to make blanket decisions without knowing what makes sense within a department.

So the highlights of the recommendations. These are the different subsections in the handout that Jillian sent out Friday. The first one is about shifting workload. What we're thinking about has substitutions, economists were calling trade-offs, built on current departmental practices. We've also identified them through the faculty survey as a potential transition or efficiencies as the economists were calling them. We also talk about department workload committees. We propose a process for establishing workload, and we provided some guidelines, very basic for substitutions.

So just a very general overview of what's in that shifting workload section. Given what we're recommending, it should be possible for faculty to focus on the kinds of activities for which they have strengths and also to reallocate work. This is in response to some of the feedback that we got at the open forum saying that we're not emphasizing research. In fact, we are if you look at how we're thinking of research-related activities and how research-related activities can lead to shifts in your workload and these shifts can either be teaching or service or advising. One thing that came up in our working group that I mentioned in the open forums is that a number of faculty who are uncomfortable with constantly talking about teaching reductions because, you know, we're at a teaching institution. We're all supposed to love teaching. Some faculty would rather be off the hook from service, from advising, and not reduce their teaching load. So that should be possible within our recommendations.

In terms of the current departmental practices, if you read that section in the handout, our view is that we can build on the current departmental practices and that what we are recognizing can complement either current departmental approaches or new ones that might be implemented. I know that the economics department is working on a point system, and as far as I understand, what we're composing is entirely compatible with what the economics department is doing. I've spoken with Gary Bedell in occupational therapy and they have their own mechanism for accounting for workload. That would be entirely compatible. I think UEP has their own as well. Again, this would be compatible as well.

So we're not trying to throw away the current departmental practices, but allow for more communication so that practices that are being implemented in one department can also be implemented in others through communication with the deans' office.

I reported at the open forums on the -- yes, Colin.
PROF ORIANS: Since you invited us, I just wanted to ask one quick question. So when I got hired, I was looking back at my hire letter, it made no mention of my workload except that I was supposed to be an active member of the Tufts University. Recently, when we've made hires or offer letters it's been very much more specific on what's expected, especially around teaching. I guess my question is: are you backing -- I'm hoping that you're backing off so that we can, our department culture and decision is consistent with our peers so that we no longer -- that the letters look more like what I received rather than this you shall do this when you come to Tufts. So that we can really get the best and recruit and not have that be a barrier.

DEAN BRIZUELA: We have not as far as talking about what contract letters will say, but our recommendations are not stipulating what the teaching mode will be in each department. But we can get to the question of the contracts.

So it turns out the areas of potential reorganization I mentioned these at the open forums. Committee work, advising, low enrollment courses are areas where again, using an economics term, there could be efficiencies of what I've heard from other committees where some committee members never show up for the entire year. So that might be a committee that needs fewer members and can still operate efficiently. Advising, Anne Mahoney just shared that EPC is going to take on a revision of the review of pre-major advising. Again, to try to figure out if we can serve our students as well as we can while being more efficient about it. We've heard over the year a lot of complaints around pre-major advising, lack of clarity about what's the role of CTA, what's the role of the alpha deans, what's the role of the faculty members and whether or not there are ways to make sure that works better so that we're all not over worked. We also mentioned the low enrollment courses at the open forums. Faculty themselves report that not 100 percent of the courses taught this past year had ten students or fewer, again, a potential area to reorganize workload in more detail.

The recommendations also call for establishing some sort of committee. I italicize committee because there was some negative reaction to establishing another committee. Some departments have curricula committees. That committee may be a committee that takes on a review of what it means to advise senior honors thesis, and what it means to be supervising a lab with three post-docs and five graduate students and twenty undergrads. That's what these committees would be doing. I'm thinking in my own department this is something that perhaps the program directors could take on. Program directors meet every month anyway. What we are proposing is not on a very time-sensitive committee is that we meet once or twice a year, to establish basic guidelines within your department.

A proposed process we're thinking of as being cyclical so that you start at a department
level, the department establishes specific guidelines for their own unit. Those proposals are shared with the academic deans. The department chairs implement the committee recommendations. Then the cycle is repeated, revisions are included. Our own school-wide guidelines would become more robust over time as the deans learn of the specific trade-offs that different departments are implementing.

The final part of your handout has, again, very basic guidelines. We're happy to hear feedback about these or if we need to be more specific. The three at the top are things that are actually happening right now in departments. Different departments are already doing this, such as being a primary advisor for honors theses or Ph.D. dissertations. Substitutions exist. Substitutions again don't need to be for a course. They could be for advising. It could be for service. There are also departments that currently implement substituting and supervising of a collection of independent research studies for teaching. The last one would be running of labs, or supervising of research groups. There's a whole list, very long list, of other things that we heard from chairs where chairs think that these kinds of activities should be acknowledged but they are not currently. So it's a very brief overview and I'm happy to hear more questions.

DEAN GLASER: I just want to add one thing. Last year our budget was --

DEAN SAHAGIAN: About (inaudible).

DEAN GLASER: -- roughly 300 million and we spent $299,983. I mean, we came within a whisker of what our budget was.

DEAN SAHAGIAN: A $73,000 surplus.

DEAN GLASER: There's not much surplus. There's an itty-bitty surplus and not enough to do very much with. So here's the point. The point is as we look at what the future size of our faculty is it's not going to grow. In 2005, the strategic plan said we would like to grow by an additional sixty full-time lines and there was no rhyme or reason to that number. But the fact of the matter is we have grown by about fifty-three, fifty-two, over the past ten years. We keep growing anymore, and we don't have a place to put people and we don't have the ability to pay for a significantly larger number of faculty. So the size of the faculty is going to remain the same. It doesn't mean, in upcoming years, it doesn't mean that some departments may not grow and other departments may not constrict a little bit as a result of changes in student interest or the vibrancy of the research area. But the fact of the matter is that it is a fixed pie and whatever changes happen with workload will take place within that context.

PROF RICHARDS: Dan Richards, economics. I just have three comments. One is that we've gone through this process in our own department. I know that it's a tremendous
amount of work to do. So I really wanted to thank the committee because I know this must've been an incredible amount of data collection and analysis. I think we all owe them a lot of thanks.

(Applause)

Two little points I had, at the bottom of page three, point five, where it talks about the committee, the school-wide committee to discuss the implementation across departments. It seems to me that rather than construct another committee that it would be an obvious agenda item to ask for an entire meeting of the chairs. That seems to be falling under their whole section there about the chairs on the committee, rather than have another committee. It just seems the better solution would be to devote a meeting of the chairs.

The other comment that I have is this seems, at least as I read it, that all the trade-offs here are within a point in time. I don't know if the committee or the deans are giving any thought to trade-offs where a person might teach an extra course this term or this year and then get a reduction in the future. I know in my own department we've talked about not borrowing, but being able to bank possible default problems with borrowing. I wonder if that has been given any consideration or will be given any consideration?

DEAN BRIZUELA: We can definitely consider that. It was in an earlier version of our internal documents so I don't think it's off the table. Thank you.

PROF SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. So you mentioned a lot that this is building on what departments already do and that several departments already have some pretty formal mechanisms for dealing with this. Representing a department that is starting from zero, I think it would be really helpful, you mentioned posting the interim report and more materials. Rather than talking rather broadly about the types of things departments do, it might be very helpful to see -- you know, here's our social sciences departments doing this and here's how it might look in the humanities, how this might look in social sciences. And choose actual practices from this is what classics does or something like that. Adding that to the materials available. Think about how to start from zero that would be great.

PROF MARRONE: Steve Marrone, history. One of the meetings that you had to discuss this plan, Roger Tobin suggested that it looked like a plan to redistribute the burdens rather than actually to change the total work or lower the total work. And I'm coming back to that because I can imagine that many departments are looking at the work done by members of the department will decide that a course doesn’t need to be taught and it's possible that the total effect on courses will be fewer courses rather than the same or possibly more. I wonder if the committee has thought about that and what its position on
it, that question of maintaining a certain level of course teaching.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Again, there are so many versions of the documents right now. In the documents that were shared at that open forum there was a statement there that we need to make sure that our curriculum is delivered within our resources as Jim said. So there are two perspectives on this, Steve. One is: yes, we're talking about workload reductions that are significant or that make sense. Another one is about shifting workload from one area to another. I don't think that those are incompatible and within our department I think that either approach could work depending on a situation. In terms of the reduction, possible reduction, of courses, this is where the low enrollment courses might come up. We're not indicating that low enrollment courses don't make sense. I think they make a lot of sense. I currently teach a class of ten, and I think it makes a lot of sense. But there might be cases, and we've heard from faculty themselves, that it does make sense sometimes to think about offering a course maybe every other year instead of every year and have a slightly larger class rather than a class of four, five, or six. So I don't know if that answers your question or not, Steve.

Other feedback or questions?

PROF EICHENBERG: I apologize, I keep hearing open forum, and I should know everything but I still have a question. It's not clear to me whether as individuals and within the department workload committee hours devoted to research or some measure of research productivity is part of the evaluation of workload or not. The only phrase I saw was research related teaching. What's the answer to that question?

DEAN BRIZUELA: So we purposely focused on service- and teaching-related activities, advising, as well as the purview of what we were looking at this past year. We're not looking at a number of publications, a number of grant dollars. But we are acknowledging these research-related teaching activities and in what way are you engaged in activities with your students where your research becomes relevant, such as supervising of independent projects and running labs or supervising research groups.

PROF MAHONEY: So this all sounds good and, of course, we all pull our weight and we all do our job, but what happens if we don't? What kinds of sanctions are there for someone who figures, “Oh, good, I'll just squeeze out of some of this stuff, I'll trade off real work for counting blades of grass in the quad,” and is there any sort of recognition, the phrase that was in the document from the workloads, was reward, for exemplary performance or extraordinary performance? Where has that gone?

DEAN BRIZUELA: We are not in the position as a working group of suggesting any kind of sanction on people who don't pull their weight. Honestly, I think there are very few and far between. The faculty I know either pull their own weight or pull way beyond
their weight. But I think that there are ways which we currently use on a case by case --
I honestly think these are on a case by case basis where chairs can try to figure things out as they have in the past, however ineffectively, but we'll keep trying.

PROF MARCHESINI: Danilo Marchesini, physics and astronomy. I guess I want to --
we are a research university and research has to be one of the components for which our workload is assessed, quantified. Not just if it's related to teaching. I mean, a lot of our faculty spend most of their time, fifty percent on research. So I just want to add that and I hope I can see some changes.

DEAN GLASER: We have expectations that everybody on the tenure track is engaged in
research. Certainly there are a lot of incentives, financial incentives, rank and salaries, where more research and more productivity is rewarded. Where we see the inequities is in service and teaching. So that's really what the charge was, was to try to make sense of that. So there are rewards for being an active scholar. Those rewards come about and you see, as I see, the entire distribution of compensation across the school there's a strong correlation and causal relationship between research activity and compensation. In our opinion, there's unevenness and inequities with regard to the other things that are parts of our portfolios, and that's really what we're trying to address here. We're not trying to discourage research. Everybody is supposed to do it and people do it to their own degree. There are rewards that are assessed, to go back to Anne's question. There are people that are less research active, and can elect to be less research active, but those profiles generally tend to see less impact in regards to compensation.

PROF MARCHESINI: I guess the way I see it is maybe thirty, forty years from now I will be less active in research, but at the same time I will want to be more active in teaching. I mean, research, and not just for a tenure track, also for tenured and full professors, as you said, it's part of our job. It's part of who we are and what we do. The same goes for teaching, advising, and service. It's not only with Tufts but also to our professional community. So I feel like those should be explicitly outlined in here, especially the research piece because it's not that much. Again, if at one point, you know, some of us will not want to be as active in research I think they -- it should be the case or the situation where they invest more in other fields, services, teaching, and what not.

PROF HAMMER: I'm interjecting. I heard a different -- I understood this to be about quantity of work. And the reward structure in research I think should be, if it isn't, more about quality of work. Quantity and quality are folded in together. But in thinking about, how does any of us spend our day? If there are hours spent on research, how should we think about that as balancing the teaching and service? I think the part that Danilo is making -- it seems like there's two different things. One of them is amount of time that you are spending in various ways. The other one is the quality of your contributions in
those various ways. I've taken this committee to be focusing on the former, not the latter, but the latter may also need attention.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So in response to Danilo, I think that where we want to end up is in recommendations where the kinds of shifts that you're describing are made possible so that, you know, you might be doing slightly less research, but maybe you're doing more service or more teaching. That should be entirely possible. In fact, faculty in our school do that currently.

PROF EVRIGENIS: Ioannis Evrigenis, political science, classics, and chair of the Committee on Committees. So the first comment is this is not the right group to speak about who's pulling their weight because people who pull their weight on one end are abundantly represented in this group. I don't think it's true that everybody pulls their weight. And I can think of many examples and I speak routinely to people who think of many examples of people who do not pull their weight. The second thing, the notion that there are rewards for people who pull more than their weight, I beg to differ with. The third thing is at least in the beginning, part of the intent of the committee was to figure out a way to create more space for research because thinking of research as a portion of a fixed body of one issue. But of course we all know that we're competing with a university (inaudible) to people who apply for jobs. So in that case we're handicapped every time we make an offer and there's a competing offer from another university that provides this kind of incentive.

The other thing I wanted to say is that if the issue of research is left out, it seems to me it does not conform very well to the idea that there is no thinking in this committee about ways of sanctioning those who do not pull their weight. Either it's about the positives alone. If it's about the negatives, I can't think of a way of assessing the negatives without a way to punish people who do not pull their weight. In some ways, this goes back to David's point about quality and quantity. So someone who's on a committee and sits there doodling and does nothing or someone who doesn't show up and is not on a committee, that's an issue not just with quantity but also with quality.

The last thing I want to say is we have had a hell of a time finding people to staff committees and to run for elections. It's not because there aren't enough faculty members. It's not because there aren't faculty members who do not have assignments at present, it's because the same fifty or seventy-five people across the faculty of arts & sciences do all of the committee work or the vast majority of the committee work. And there's a whole bunch of people who figure out ways to not.

(Applause)

PROF ALLEN: It's a little hard to follow that. So I just want to reiterate this concern
which I raised at the very beginning of the formation of this committee. I would like to suggest that something that would happen in parallel to this process, that we address the research process because people who are pulling in grants that have to put their salary on the grant have issues with conflict of commitment if we're required to do that on top of the load that we currently have. So I would hope that we're giving more thought to that and thinking about trying to keep people who are research intensive. It seems to me to be a very intentional process. Thanks.

PROF KELLY: Just a quick question. Erin Kelly, philosophy. Are you asking the chairs to come up with a proposal, a department-specific proposal, that we would then bring to the deans for approval, and if so, when is the timetable that you had in mind for that?

DEAN BRIZUELA: Well, it will definitely be after the faculty vote whether or not they want to do this. So it will be sometime in the late fall, maybe. We're not thinking of the chairs making these recommendations on their own. That's why we're talking about these department workload committees or groups of faculty who already exist within departments who can engage in this process.

So our time is up. Again, the Qualtrics survey will go out. If you haven't spoken, please post your feedback and encourage your colleagues to post their feedback as well. Thank you.

(Applause)

DEAN GLASER: Have a good remainder of the semester, and we'll see you at next week's AS&E meeting and at commencement.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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