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PROF. HABER: Welcome to the AS&E faculty meeting. I would like to remind people, please use the microphone. That was an interesting way of reminding people. Because even if you think your voice is loud, as obviously I do, the people need to get it for the minutes, so you have to use the microphone and wait for it.

So first, we have some announcements, announcements about AS&E faculty awards. Jillian Dubman.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
AS&E FACULTY AWARDS
MS. DUBMAN: Hi, everybody. Just a reminder. A couple of years ago, we went to one universal deadline for all of the faculty award nominations. Some are department specific; some are based on senior surveys and data like that.

But I just wanted to remind everybody that for the Leibner Award, the FRAC Distinguished Scholar Award, the ROUTE Award, which was renamed a couple of years ago, the Seymour Simches Award, the Lerman-Neubauer Prize, the Fischer Award, the GSAS Faculty Teaching and Mentoring Award, the EEOC Faculty/Staff Multicultural Service Award, and the Gerald R. Gill Distinguished Service Award, all of those awards are using the deadline of February 29.

The award nomination criteria and information is available on my website, or you can just email me for that specifically. So just so you know, I wanted you all to be aware, because I think some of the awards didn't get as many nominations last year, because people weren't as aware. So February 29. Thank you.

PROF. HABER: Thank you, Jillian. Now Student Accessibility Services, Laura Rogers.

STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES
DEAN LOWE: I am Carmen Lowe, Dean of Academic Advising and Undergraduate Studies, and I am very pleased to introduce you to the staff of Student Accessibility Services. Some of them have been serving in this role for one semester. And I'm going to turn it over to Laura Rogers.

PROF. ROGERS: Hi. I just thought it was important for us to become a little more visible to you. So first, very briefly, the staff at Student Accessibility's offices are going to introduce themselves, and I just have one or two things I want to say about the work we do and what we're looking for from faculty over the next few months.

MS. ROSEN: Hi. I'm Lizzie Rosen. I'm a learning specialist at SAS, and I work with students weekly on time management skills, different accommodations, and assistive technology.

MS. GIACOPPE: Hi. I'm Brianna Giacoppe. I'm the assistive technology specialist at the
SAS office. I work with students, much like Lizzie, in coordinating accommodations and with time management, as well as producing all sorts of formats, like Braille and tactile graphics for students, and coordinating interpreters and CART interpreting, that's captioning in the classroom, and working on caption videos for faculty and for our students.

MS. DOAN: Hi, I'm Kimberly Doan, and I'm the assistant director at the SAS office. I work one-on-one with students with disabilities, and also oversee general office management and insuring that accommodations are implemented in a timely manner.

We also have a couple of other staff members who aren't here today. Susan Irizzary is supporting us. Many of you probably spoke to her about exam accommodations. So she's with us this spring, as well as Katie Novak, our accommodations coordinator, and Liz Gasparini, who are both not with us this spring. They're on maternity leave, but they'll be joining us at the end of the semester.

PROF. ROGERS: So I really want you to see the faces of our staff, because they're the ones who are working day in and day out to help students who come to us with impairments and tackle the barriers that they experience. So let me just say very briefly, some of our students who we work with have what are referred to as low-incidence disabilities. They might have visual impairments, hearing impairments, motor impairments, and those are the rare students with severe, significant challenges in navigating their education, and we work with you to find ways to bring them in, integrate them into learning.

There are also students with high-incidence disabilities, what we call high-incidence disabilities, like ADHD, learning disabilities, and emotional disabilities. These high-incidence disabilities seem to becoming higher and higher incidence. And so often the students you spend the most time getting information about, even though to you, it may seem like the impairments they have are less severe, but they require more of our time.

And over the next few months, I'd like to think that how we as a faculty -- for example, it can't have passed you by that an increasing number of students are experiencing anxiety in lots of different ways, and it's filtering into the way they live their lives as students.

So we would say that a student who has a diagnosed disorder of anxiety has an impairment, but the disability arises when, because of that anxiety, they experience barriers to learning. Those barriers can be reduced in any number of ways. In the accommodations office, we think about ways to reduce them. But there are structural ways we could reduce the barriers that all students feel, or that arouse anxiety or trigger anxiety.

For example, many of the ways we as an institution deliver exams creates a culture and
climate of anxiety. And there are lots of ways that we could consider working together to reflect on our practices and think about, how could we reduce the barriers that students face? How could we reduce the ways that anxiety gets created in our school, given the way it intersects with the culture and with our students in order to promote better accessibility and performance, and so that we don't have hundreds and hundreds of students coming over to the SAS office to take their exams?

So that's just one question. I don't have any answers for how we're going to work together or how we're going to answer these questions, but I think it's time for us as a university to think about our practices from the perspective of reducing the barriers that students face to learning and demonstrating their learning.

So I look forward to working with you. I'm in this role part-time, two days a week, while I also do my full-time job as the co-director of the school psychology program and teach three courses. So I will always answer inquiries or emails, but not the minute I get them. Thank you.

DEAN LOWE: I just want to remind the faculty that we are searching for a full-time permanent replacement for this office.

RECOMMENDATION OF DEGREES

RECOMMENDATION FOR AS&E DEGREES FOR FEBRUARY 2016
PROF. HABER: Thank you. So now Provost Harris will give us the recommendation for February degrees for AS&E.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thank you. Just to follow up, thank you, Laura and all the staff for what you're doing. It's obviously an important area, and it's becoming even more of an important area and a bigger challenge, and I appreciate, Laura, the work you're doing on top of your existing commitment. We know that universities aren't really good with fractions, but I appreciate you doing the extra load that's been asked.

So my job here today is to get the degrees approved in advance of the trustee meeting on Saturday. So members of the faculty, I have the honor to present these candidates from Liberal Arts and Jackson College, the School of Engineering, and 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 Liberal Arts and Jackson College, engineering, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, as authorized by the trustees for the award of the degree in February 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 159. Of those, 56 are bachelor's degrees, 89 are master's degrees and education specialist, and 14 are Ph.D. degrees.

The number of undergraduate degrees are as follows: 24 in the College of Liberal Arts, 27 in Jackson College for Women, and 5 in the School of Engineering.

The number of graduate degrees are as follows: 27 Master of Arts, 2 Master of Arts in Teaching, 5 Master of Engineering, 2 Master of Fine Arts, 46 Master of Science, and 6 Master of Science in Engineering Management. In addition, 1 Master of Public Policy and 14 Doctors of Philosophy.


PROF. HABER: Thank you, Provost Harris. Now, on to new business. Mark Cronin-Golomb will give us a summary of changes in Statement 11 of the T&P Committee Version 19.

NEW BUSINESS

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO STATEMENT 11, VERSION 19 (2016-17)

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Thank you. Each year, T&P looks at how Statement 11 is functioning in the current climate, and most years, we come up with some changes. I won't go through all of the changes, which are in your handout, but I do want to highlight a few of the most important ones.

As you know, this next year is the first year that we're going to be having an eight-member T&P Committee, and one of the first maybe unintended consequences of that is how to deal with lateral hires, expedited lateral hires, which are processed quickly over the summer, these people who are generally recruited from other campuses for their wonderful fit and great research.

So for that reason and because of the historical difficulty in recruiting ad hoc committees to evaluate those cases over the summer -- I think Jillian will agree with me that it's extremely difficult to get six -- we've decided to take the ad hoc nature of these lateral hire committees to heart and keep the size of the ad hoc committees only to a membership of six.

Some of the other changes are simple procedural matters, but I think one change that many departments will really appreciate is that the dossier is now delivered to T&P only through the Secretary of the Faculty, who then distributes it electronically as required in its various forms. The preparation of hard copies in file boxes for the subcommittees is eliminated. The delivery requirement is now the dossier must be delivered to the Secretary of the Faculty in the following form:
1. The original paper version of the dossier, including all signed letters;
2. One electronic version of the entire dossier, including the electronic record of correspondence, as described in the above statement, and one full set of course evaluations.

The intention here was to reduce the burden on the departments and to minimize unnecessary printing. In this day and age, the materials are online, and it's been our practice in T&P to refer to the electronic materials. If there's a case that has expensive copying costs, then those would be submitted of course as part of the dossier.

The other main change is that fourth year reviews will no longer be included in the dossier. And that change was in response to a request by the deans to enable them more leeway in their communications and interactions with the candidates. We really don't want the fourth year reviews to be treated as a prescription for success when it comes to tenure time. So after considerable discussion, we decided to remove that from the dossier.

Those are the most important changes. Are there any questions or clarification?

PROVOST HARRIS: David Harris, Provost. We did talk about this, but the question just occurred to me as you're alluding to this again. I don't think it says here explicitly, but I assume that the six would have to include at least one member from the candidate's area?

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Yes.

PROVOST HARRIS: It doesn't say that.

MS. DUBMAN: So I construct the ad hoc committees based on what's in the bylaws, that each discipline needs to be represented, as it is for the regular committee. So that's also contributing to why I'm having such a difficult time, because if I only have a few people in one particular discipline, I have to have one of the available --

PROVOST HARRIS: I just want to make sure that when we drop from eight to six, that stays.

MS. DUBMAN: I still maintain that.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson; German, Russian, Asian, former chair. I do have a question about the fourth year report and review. It's a pity, because that provides a lot of -- by not making it available, it provides a lot of information about where the case was in the fourth year and what expectations there are for the sixth year. I think having those letters helped T&P sort of explain why let's say suddenly a case doesn't seem like it should go at all, and how did we get here in this form. So I'm just wondering what the
thinking -- I'm not saying it should be done. I'm just wondering what the thinking of T&P was of the pros and the cons of having the fourth year review.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Well, it's true that we have had a lot of information from those fourth year reviews, and we do meet with the administration in each case. So there's still an opportunity for that information to come out at that meeting. But when we considered the balance between positive and negative effects, the negative effects of tying the candidate's expectations in the fourth year review and having those available to T&P, we considered it in our committee to outweigh the benefits of having access to that information.

PROF. COUCH: Alva Couch, computer science. I think I understand what you mean, because I have been involved in cases before where the fourth year review described a specific solution to a problem, and the candidate did it in a very different way and was successful. And I believe that this is a good change to the policies for that reason, because the success is defined independently of what was actually said in the fourth year review, which might be quite different.

PROF. HABER: If there are no other questions, Mark will also lead a discussion on the new T&P procedures for faculty with a primary appointment in one department and responsibilities in another department or program.

**DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON NEW T&P PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY WITH PRIMARY APPOINTMENT IN ONE DEPARTMENT AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM**

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: So the lengthy nature of the title of the addition comes about because of the discussions we had when this topic came up last year that not all cluster hires are in interdisciplinary programs. So that's the reason for the change in the title.

So just a bit of background: The establishment of the cluster hires, we were asked to come up with tenure procedures for multidisciplinary faculty with responsibilities in departments or programs outside their primary departments. These responsibilities are generally specified in a memorandum of understanding, or MOU, which is drawn up through negotiations between a faculty member and the appropriate deans.

These are new procedures to an insertion in Statement 11. So I'm going to ask for a vote of approval of this section at the end of my explanation. The procedures were very much a part of discussions in T&P in an attempt to make sure that the additional departments or programs -- we call them secondary units -- have sufficient and appropriate say in the tenure process.

So the process that we have now and presenting to you involves the formation of a three-person subcommittee of tenured faculty in the secondary program or department. The responsibility of the subcommittee is to prepare a report which will be used by the
primary department when it is meeting and voting on the case. The secondary unit
does not vote. It provides a summary of the contributions that the candidate has made
to the secondary program.

There's also some discussion about what portions of the dossier a subcommittee should
have access to, and after some discussion, we decided that the answer to that question
should be determined by the contents of the memorandum of understanding. If the
memorandum of understanding includes a research component in the secondary unit,
then the subcommittee will have access to the external letters of evaluation.

We made this restriction in an attempt to maintain as far as possible the confidentiality
of the external letters of evaluation, and we want to be able to assure the letter writers
that their comments will indeed be held in the strictest of confidence. The letter sent to
the external evaluators soliciting their letters will state rather than that the candidate has
a multidisciplinary appointment, the candidate more accurately has an appointment in a
primary department and additional responsibilities in a secondary program or
department.

The subcommittee prepares the report, as I said. That report gets sent to the primary
department, and the process proceeds from there, as usual, with the chair or director of a
secondary program being kept informed at each step, as required in Statement 11. Is
there any discussion of this matter? If not, I would ask for a motion to vote. Second?
All in favor? Against? Abstentions? The motion passes. Thank you.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AS&E BYLAW CHANGES: B&P COMMITTEE,
IT COMMITTEE, AND REMOTE BALLOTING

PROF. TOBIN: So the next items on the agenda are actually a single item. There are
three bylaw changes that are being proposed today. Since these are bylaw changes, they
are discussed at this meeting and to be voted on at a subsequent meeting, and at that time
will require a two-thirds vote from the faculty.

There are three that are in sort of increasing level of complexity. The first one will not
be terribly controversial. This is a proposed change to the bylaw description of the
Committee on Budget and University Priorities. This is the only place, as far as we can
tell in the bylaws where when we designate the various areas of inquiry: humanities, the
sciences, and so on, we actually define that with an explicit list of the departments
included in each of the groupings.

And we added a new department recently. We added the Department of Community
Health, which is not listed in the bylaws. So it seems like they ought to be. So this is a
proposal to amend the bylaws to include community health under the social sciences
departments in that description of the representation on the Budget and Priorities
Committee. Are there any questions or discussion regarding this? And again, we're not
going to vote on it today, but it's a heavy matter that will require several weeks of
thinking about this.
PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: Sharon Schwartzberg, occupational therapy. I just have a question. I understand you want to have groupings, but occupational therapy is listed with other groupings, and they are defined as a Social Science. So I don't know how that got configured in this way, but -- let's see, biology, chemistry, earth sciences, blah, blah, blah, natural sciences, and the Departments of Physical Education and Occupational Therapy, and then you have the social sciences. So I just don't really understand the logic to how these are grouped.

PROF. TOBIN: I don't know the history of this. It's interesting the way they're phrased, because there's this parenthesis defining the natural sciences, and then after the close of that parenthesis, then under the same heading are included the Departments of Physical Education and Occupational Therapy, which seems to suggest that they are not being defined as part of the natural sciences in the disciplinary sense, but they are being included in this grouping for purposes of representation of the committee. As to exactly why that was the right way to do it, or was felt to be the right way to do it, I don't know. Is there anyone here who was involved in this or has insight into it?

PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: That was my observation.

PROF. TOBIN: Is that something that you would want to change?

PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: I'm fine with it, because it doesn't mean anything substantive, but I did make that observation, and I just wanted to point that out.

PROF. TOBIN: Okay, thank you. Okay, then I think we can move on to the next item, which is about the IT Committee, and Mitch is going to lead this one.

PROF. McVEY: I'm Mitch McVey, chair of the Information Technology Committee. And really, this proposed change to the bylaw is just to kind of formalize something that's already basically been going on in the IT Committee.

The proposed bylaw change is basically to state that instead of the committee ensuring that all computing and information technology services for research and instruction are delivered in a way that meets the needs of the faculty, staff, and students, it would be for research, instruction, and learning spaces.

And the reason why the committee was asked to take on this additional charge to the mission is because I think related to something we will talk about later on in this meeting, which is that there are many attempts to try to change some of the learning spaces, to improve those, and it was thought that bringing in the information from the Information Technology Committee and getting their opinions would be helpful in this process. This has been voted upon by the entire IT Committee. It was unanimously approved, and now we bring it to you. So happy to discuss this.
PROF. DeBOLD: Joe DeBold from psychology. How are you defining learning spaces? The reason I'm asking is that some of us teach in our laboratories, and I wanted to know if that would be considered a learning space.

PROF. McVEY: Yes, absolutely. So learning spaces in this case are being broadly defined, not only as classroom spaces, but also laboratory spaces. So we are interested in technologies that are used in the laboratories, both teaching laboratories and also individual faculty's research laboratories in which these are maintained.

MS. WOOD: Laura Wood from Tisch Library. I'm curious about whether the library would be considered one of those learning spaces. I don't believe there's a library voice on the IT Committee.

PROF. McVEY: That's a good question. I'm assuming that you would want that to be included with representation, perhaps?

MS. WOOD: Yes.

PROF. McVEY: So in the past, what we've done is we've had ad hoc members come in when there are issues being discussed that might be relevant to particular spaces, and we could do it that way. Or I guess with the bylaw change, we could include someone from the library as well. I'm interested in hearing what you think.

MS. WOOD: Well, I just think there's a question of how the charge of the IT Committee would overlap the charge of the Library Committee. And that may be something that the two committees want to discuss together.

PROF. McVEY: I think that's a good idea.

DEAN STANTON: I'm Paul Stanton. I'm Dean of Student Services over in Dowling, and once upon a time, I was in charge of what was called the Classroom Committee, which just looked at very traditional flexible spaces where classes were taught. And the committee was informal. It was mostly staff. There were some faculty representation, but it was very ad hoc. And most of the discussion was about construction, and to a certain degree technology, and the library classrooms were considered in the [inaudible] classrooms because they were more or less traditional.

The inclusion into the IT Committee is for two major reasons. One, to formalize the connection of structured faculty committees to what is going on in classrooms. The second is that with the learning spaces study, what Lois is going to talk about soon, is this invigorated discussion about how students learn pedagogy and how it stretches beyond the traditional boundaries of the traditional 30 chairs with tablet around the classroom that we need to expand into other areas.

If you've been to 574 Boston Ave. -- I suggest you go if you haven't -- but that's the first
sign of how things can be treated differently. So it's not about the library spaces, but it is about learning spaces, and of course that's a broad brush that covers all of the library, and not just the rooms on the third floor.

PROF. EICHENBERG: Richard Eichenberg from political science. Laura, you and I served on the provost's task force I think a couple of years ago, enabling technology for administration and learning or something. It was very important. And it was at that time that I learned a lot about the plans in the library, many of which implemented, which led to the fact that some of our most advanced learning spaces are in fact in your building. And that alone would suggest to me that the IT Committee should be involved somehow. I'll leave it to the committee to decide how.

I'll emphasize that the types of spaces you have, and have so nicely equipped, especially for group projects, research and group projects, collaborative studying, are the wave of the future. It's what our students want and what they need. So you definitely have to be part of the conversation. You have the best stuff for it.

PROF. TOBIN: So the third amendment or third change to the bylaws that we are going to discuss has to do with how we do votes in this faculty. Several times last year, the executive committee received requests or suggestions that certain votes should be taken electronically, should be done online rather than simply in this room. Some of those had to do with the provost's reorganization proposals, but also some of them had to do with proposals from EPC.

And it got us looking at what are the bylaws regarding electronic voting and what policies might we want to put in place about that. So if you actually have nothing else to do late at night and have trouble sleeping, you could pull out the bylaws and start reading them, and you would discover that they're almost completely silent about how votes should actually be taken in this faculty. I think probably when they were written, it was just assumed that they would be taken at meetings of this sort.

However, there is a precedent, as you no doubt are aware, some years back, we instituted online balloting for committee elections. And that was done by an explicit amendment to the bylaws to authorize it. So our feeling was that we ought to follow that same precedent if we wanted to do any other kind of online voting. It shouldn't just be done ad hoc. We should have a discussion and make some rules about how we're going to do it.

So this is the beginning of that process. So it has two parts. The first part of it is a bylaw amendment which is very broad, simply to authorize the taking of votes of this faculty by remote means, and it's intentionally vague about what those might be. It doesn't say electronic, it doesn't say online, because who knows what the remote needs might be. It just says by mail or other secure balloting procedure, which is exactly the same wording that's there at the committee elections.

Provided that the matter we vote on has been discussed at a meeting prior to a balloting
-- we felt that's important, but we don't want to completely take away the role of these meetings. It's the primary place where we can actually get together face-to-face and discuss important matters. So that's the first part, and that was a bylaw change, and we will vote on that, assuming we're ready to at a subsequent meeting.

Then there's the question of how that would be implemented, and our feeling was that it would be better not to put all of that in the bylaws because this may be in a work in progress. We may decide that this is how we want to do all of our votes, or maybe we'll decide we want to do almost none of our votes this way. So we felt it was better to separate out a policy of the faculty for how this bylaw change would be implemented from the bylaws themselves.

So there's a separate policy on remote balloting which is more detailed about the circumstances under which remote or online balloting might be used and how a decision would be made. So the way that's structured is, first of all, we thought about, “Do we just do all votes this way?” And our feeling was that was not a good idea. For one thing, we all don't want our inboxes inundated with all these votes we're taking, and also there are costs involved, and also it sort of devalues these meetings completely if we feel like all the voting happens elsewhere.

So our feeling was that this should be limited to issues that are of broad importance and where there has been ample opportunity for discussion before the vote is taken. So then who decides that. We propose that the executive committee makes an initial decision about that and announces it ahead of time.

That could be overturned in either direction by vote of this faculty in this meeting. That is the faculty could say, “We don't want to have an online vote about this.” The faculty could say, “You didn't want to have an online vote, but we think we should.” In either case, that wouldn't happen immediately. There would have to be additional opportunity for discussion.

So you can read all the details of this. I won't go through every point. And the last thing I guess is that this would be administered by the Secretary of the Faculty, and the technology for that might evolve over time. Presumably, it would generally be similar to what's used for the committee elections vote. So with that, I think I'll just open this up to questions or comments or suggestions.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. Do we have data on the relative level of participation before and after the change to electronic voting for committee members?

PROF. TOBIN: Yes, we do. I asked Jillian this question, and you have more up-to-date data, but the data that you gave me was that it went from about 25 percent to about 60 percent when we went to online voting. Is that still about right? Jillian is nodding.
MS. DUBMAN: It ranges in the 50 to 70 percent.

PROF. MIRKIN: Sergei Mirkin, biology. I think it would be a good idea to videotape our discussions here, important discussion, and people who are not here can watch it online and then vote. Would that be feasible?

PROF. TOBIN: I see head shakes from the back of the room.

MS. DUBMAN: It would be very expensive.

DEAN GLASER: Jim Glaser, dean of arts and sciences, but in this capacity, political science. I must say that this proposal appeals to me as a political scientist as I think about the role of the executive committee and strong faculty governance.

Having a committee that controls the agenda of these meetings, which the executive committee already does, and then adding to that, managing the terms of the vote and the discussion, which the committee already does manage in terms of discussion and setting the time limits that each piece on the agenda, will have actually makes it very consistent and strengthens I think the faculty governance here. So it actually makes it very parallel to the House of Representatives. I don't know how much people want to do that.

But the fact of the matter is that it really creates an executive committee that acts like a rules committee in the house, and I think that's an excellent change.

PROF. MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. A question is does that mean that on important issues, we would not actually vote at all in this meeting? It has to be one way or the other, doesn't it?

PROF. TOBIN: Yes, I think it would have to be one way or the other. I think that would mean that if the voting is being done remotely, then it would not be done in this meeting. Otherwise, we'd have to track who voted in the meeting, and no, we're not going to do that, just as we do with votes for committees, one or the other.

PROF. MANZ: You might find, then, that the increase would not be as much as you think, because you would then be asking two things, in a sense, of people, that they come to the meeting and that they vote. And I also want to point out one other thing that I have mixed feelings about, not necessarily negative, and that is voting on committees is very different, because we never discuss the candidates in an open meeting anyhow. So this isn't just an addition. It's really quite a significant change, I think.

PROF. TOBIN: I agree that it's a significant change, and I think we do want to do it carefully, if we want to do it at all. I think it has opportunities, but also pitfalls.

PROVOST HARRIS: A clarification question. So if this bylaw were not to pass, is the
implication that you can just in an ad hoc way have electronic votes, or you couldn't have any electronic votes?

PROF. TOBIN: Well, that's a good question. As I say, the current bylaws are silent on the matter. And it's the interpretation of the current executive committee that we don't want to do electronic votes without authorization from this faculty, but it's not clear to me that that couldn't be interpreted differently by some future executive committee.

PROF. ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology. My question is actually not related to this topic. It's actually the previous one. I notice that it says “A&S&E,” and I would just like the bylaws to be consistent throughout. Is it AS&E, or is it A&S&E? It just feels like we might as well be cleaning up both if we have the opportunity.

MS. DUBMAN: It's AS&E.

PROF. ORIANS: When we vote for Mitch's, we could make that little change and vote the whole thing at once?

PROF. TOBIN: I changed it on my copy. We can do that. There are some other places in the bylaws where that ampersand appears also, and I don't think I'm going to bring those as separate items when we vote.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. So I wonder if people are worried about voters missing the discussion, when a request for a vote comes out, it could be linked to the online minutes of the meeting where that was discussed and with a little hint as to where to find that particular discussion within the minutes. So I think that technologically, it would be easy to at least have people aware of what was discussed, even if they didn't have the opportunity to participate in the discussion.

MS. DUBMAN: Just something about that. So there's a lag time in between getting the minutes for a meeting and when a vote might actually happen. So it might not be congruent to wait for the minutes to be formatted and everything before -- it takes some time.

PROF. TOBIN: If there are no further comments, we will return to this at a future meeting.

**UPDATE ON MEDFORD CAMPUS CLASSROOM UPGRADES SUMMER ’16**

PROF. TOBIN: So the last item on our agenda, we turn to this issue of learning spaces. There's been quite an effort involved. As we all know, many learning spaces on this campus could use a little work, and we bring Lois Stanley to tell us how that's happening.

MS. STANLEY: Thanks, Roger. I'm Lois Stanley. I know many of you. I'm Director of Campus Planning here at Tufts University. And as some of you may be aware, one of
the major studies to come out of my office in the past couple of years, we call it the “Learning Spaces Planning Study.” This was a comprehensive look at our inventory of learning spaces defined for the study as classrooms, auditoria, teaching labs, computer labs.

So we did a comprehensive inventory to understand the condition of these spaces, where there were opportunities for upgrades. But in addition -- and I think this was the most important part and relevant to today's meeting -- is we brought in these fantastic consultants, Biddison Hier out of Washington and expert in higher ed instruction, as well as Sasaki Associates, a terrific campus planner locally.

At any rate, we brought in these consultants to also help us with our processes around learning spaces, specifically how do we upgrade learning spaces. And we got some great recommendations and great advice.

So the study wrapped up in spring of '15, just under a year ago. You can actually see the study and the full report. It's about 300 pages, and there's also a smaller executive summary on a Trunk site. We recently set up a Trunk site -- Colin, how do we find the Trunk site?

MR. SIMMONS: You have to look up learning spaces, planning and upgrades.

MS. STANLEY: So if you do end up Googling on Trunk, look up learning spaces, planning and upgrades, and you'll find the full report.

We are now into our first year of what I would call “implementation of the recommendations” of that study, both in terms of process and how we think about upgrades. And that's why I'm here today. I'm here basically to do a broader outreach to AS&E faculty on what's taking place with this process to let you know what's happened already, but also the next steps between now and the series of upgrades over the summer of 2016.

Before I get into what classrooms we're proposing to upgrade, I'd like to introduce the Learning Spaces Committee. Actually, we don't call ourselves “committee.” We call ourselves a “learning spaces working group.” We're here to make recommendations, to do the investigation, basically the groundwork that then we will be sharing with the academic community in terms of execution.

So the members of the learning spaces working group are comprised of the folks who essentially were very much involved in the study itself. So if you could stand up, I'd really appreciate it. Paul Stanton and Nikki Reppucci from Dowling; from TTS, we have Paul Bergen and Kyle Pope; from planning, we have me, Lois Stanley. I led the study itself, but Colin Simmons, my colleague, is leading the implementation of upgrades planning.
And I expect that there will be questions right after my very brief presentation here, and that all of us are available to answer questions. Not here is Alicia Russell from CELT, and we have representatives from the deans' offices also on our working group. And when I say deans' offices, I mean AS&E as well as Fletcher. Fletcher has been actively involved in this study and the implementation.

So the process. So the process has been, based on the recommendations of the study, is that this working group, we meet just about monthly -- actually, I think we might have even met biweekly for a while there -- to develop a list of classrooms and learning spaces to be upgraded over a targeted time period. Right now, we're targeting summer of 2016.

And we base that on our knowledge as administrators of classrooms. We've been doing these meetings probably since about mid-summer, and we are able to reach out to the faculty in two ways. Some of us are participants on faculty committees. I participate, or at least I'm often invited to the Campus Planning and Development Committee, where I discuss the learning spaces study, and at least three of us, the two Pauls and Kyle, I believe, are on Mitch's Information Technology Committee. And in that way, we have ways of making sure the information flow is going in both directions, and we expect further discussions and further interaction.

So the process goes that we interact with the committees, but we're also developing in the meantime this list of potential classrooms for summer upgrades. That's tricky. We take that list of classrooms to the deans' offices with cost estimates so that we can get backing, essentially funding, to implement the summer upgrades. So all that has taken place.

The next step is the most important step in my opinion, which is we have a list of classrooms -- and I'll go through the buildings, at least, that we're targeting in just a minute here. But the next step is really important. Now that we have a sense of the funding, we have a sense of the scope, the rooms that we would like to do some interventions in, we have design documents for each of these rooms, and we would like to engage the teaching faculty who primarily teach in the rooms that we're targeting in design review.

These are actually some of the most fun meetings that I participate in. We've done this recently with Robinson 253, a few years back in Cohen Auditorium. We'll do it in smaller classrooms actually for the summer upgrades. And this is an important check-in moment to make sure that we, as the working group, are recommending -- and we're working with an architect as well -- are recommending for these upgrades is what the teaching faculty, those who teach in these rooms, actually need or want. And it won't be a match right off the bat. So we'd like to have these design reviews with you, and we look forward to your comments.

And we will then as much as possible get into the final design, which then goes into implementation in the summer. And these typically would be given right after classes.
end, right after commencement, depending on the use of the class -- Jonathan, you're here. So Jonathan Dudley for AS&E dean's office is here as well and is a key member on our team.

So the classrooms that we're targeting -- and I'm hoping to do this each year and to come to the AS&E Campus Planning and Development Committee to say the classrooms we're targeting for the next summer. I'm not going to give room numbers, but give you a sense of the buildings that we're targeting.

Aidekman. There's about six rooms in Aidekman that we're targeting for upgrades. Two rooms in Eaton. Three rooms in Braker. In Olin Hall, five rooms. And it's about 30 rooms altogether. Miner Hall, five rooms. Halligan, one classroom. Pearson, I'm throwing it into the mix because I've been working about two years on Pearson 204, analytical lab upgrade, and I'm going to count that towards this upgrade, because that was a heck of a big one, with great support from the dean's office.

And then we have also four classrooms that are being upgraded in the Fletcher complex that may be relevant, actually I think relevant to all of us. Two in Mugar, and then there's two top floor rooms in Cabot that many of us use for events.

When I talk about the outreach to the teaching faculty, Colin and I did a search actually with the registrar with Nicole's help which faculty to reach out to. So we're thinking that we'll reach out to the faculty who primarily teach in this room. It could end up being every department, but I think we had some sort of a rubric if more than three or four classes were taught by a department, we would invite them into the design review.

So for example, in Aidekman, we would bring in drama, art and art history, history and religion, those departments or key faculty into a design review. In Eaton, the resident departments are the ones that we'd be most interested in speaking with, sociology and religion. Braker, the same thing. Economics teaches predominantly in those Braker classrooms. Olin Hall, GRALL and romance, the language departments. Miner Hall is another one that's fairly cross-cutting: education, English, history, philosophy, and political science. We would engage those teaching faculty as a group in the design review of the five classrooms. Halligan, CS and ECE. And Pearson, as I said, I've been working closely with the chemistry department for almost two years, maybe it's been a year and a half, on that design.

In this first batch of classes -- we actually did a few classrooms last year, and this summer, we looked at -- because you're probably thinking to yourself, “Why isn't my classroom on that list?” One, we couldn't get every classroom on the list. There are 250 learning spaces on the Medford Somerville campus. We do hope and intend to get to all these spaces over the next I would say five years, as recommended by the study. And that's an exciting moment to have that sort of commitment from the university for learning spaces which has such great impact in a broad brush way with our students and our faculty.
Let me be clear, the upgrades that we're thinking are not necessarily gut renovations. The study told us that actually our classrooms are pretty good, and we're not looking for standards, for a one size fits all. We're looking for upgrades that are relative to a particular classroom where particular pedagogies are taught. We are looking for as much -- pedagogies, I probably used that term incorrectly, I'm sorry -- where particular types of courses are taught.

We are trying to make the classes as flexible as possible to allow for expansion of the way the teaching faculty teach in those groups. So, for example, in this list of 30 or so classrooms could be minor interventions, which could be as simple as painting, lighting adjustments, new boards, black/white boards, and new window treatments. Lighting control turned out to be one of the most important things that we found faculty were looking for, and students.

There's also modern intervention, which could include more comprehensive finish upgrades to the floors, the walls, Asian panels in the doors for the late arrivers. Ceilings often need to be addressed. In virtually all cases, we are upgrading or updating furniture and A/V.

So with that, I am opening the floor to questions.

PROF. RIDGE: One thing that I've experienced and I know a little bit about is that there seems to be a shortage of classrooms for more than 40 students. If you try to have a seminar speaker come in, there's often not a room that you can find at the time that you want, late in the afternoon. And related to that, because Barnum's going to be refurbished, what's going to happen to the lecture rooms in Barnum which will make that problem even more acute?

MS. STANLEY: I would call it the reuse of Barnum will not make the problem more acute, even if it were to be refurbished, and that's down the road, funding dependent. At least the planner would be recommending -- and I think I have support on this -- the classrooms in Barnum would remain, certainly during the time of reuse.

Addressing the first question, we heard this a lot from the faculty and actually from deans as well, that there was a shortage of classrooms that sat seating of 50 students or more. The study actually showed that we have a good supply of large classrooms. What we have is a serious mismatch of class size, class enrollment with seat count. That's due for a number of reasons that I can get into, if you'd like, but improving that match could take time. It's based in part on policy for how rooms are allocated for classes. But we do have a good inventory of the larger classrooms. It's a matter of access to them and better matching the class size with needs.

PROF. FREUDENREICH: Catherine Freudenreich, biology. I just want to state a plea that when you design classrooms that you leave space both for a screen and for
somewhere to write, because even though we're not lecturing always on blackboards and whiteboards anymore, we still need a place to draw things out or write.

And in many of the classrooms I've taught in, there's a giant screen with nothing to write around it, or like maybe there was a blackboard, and they put a screen over it that was twice as big as you need, and then you can't use the blackboard unless you put the screen up. So I just would like to state that it's very useful in a classroom to have a screen, but somewhere to the left or to the right of it a place where you can write and use the two techniques simultaneously.

MS. STANLEY: So that is our goal, Catherine, and through the design reviews, the teaching faculty will actually be able to check that for us. It was a major complaint. Sometimes there aren't choices there, but still, we should be considering the size of the screens. Actually, that was a significant recommendation of the staff.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson; German, Russian, Asian. I'm glad someone still writes on the board. I do. But what I wanted to ask is in this process, how flexible are you to, let's say, changes in the university which will necessitate certain classrooms?

For example, we have a new film and media studies major -- Malcolm Turvey, our program director is here -- which I think will necessitate these classes -- now, we have about 60. We will be bringing out more courses in film and media studies. I don't believe that we have increased viewing rooms for film, not like in the chemistry department or whatever. But it's Tisch and it's Olin, two rooms in Olin, that haven't been changed since '91, when the building came on. And I gather there is a room that may be coming in there.

Also, of course SMFA, which is coming on in the fall, how many students will be coming from there to here. So my question really is are you tracking these sort of trends and ready to respond to them?

MS. STANLEY: I'd like to say that we are, but we aren't yet. I could see the working group tracking those in the future. I'm involved in the SMFA effort and imagine that could influence how the Learning Spaces Working Group thinks. Other trends, I think we need help from the faculty and from the deans' offices. But ultimately, we are flexible.

PROF. TURVEY: Malcolm Turvey, art and art history. I'm the director of the new film and media studies program. So what we're finding is, just to follow up on a point, there are great spaces for film projection up to about 50, maybe 70 people, but there are no mid-size spaces. So it's very hard to invite, for example, filmmakers to campus, because there's really nowhere to show their work, where you have high-quality projection and a large enough auditorium to accommodate, say, 100 or 150 people. So it is that mid-size space I think that is really lacking with high-quality projections.
MS. STANLEY: So this is really useful for us just to hear this. I've been hearing a little bit of this in my SMFA effort with Nancy Bauer, but it's good to hear with that much detail.

PROF. McVEY: I'm just curious in terms of the number of groups that have been meeting over the past few years to try to have input into these conversations. Is there an attempt being made to try to integrate all of this, because I know there are a lot of individual efforts, but sometimes I think those groups aren't sure their voices are actually reaching where they should be.

MS. STANLEY: So I'd appreciate your advice on how to do that. I know how to run a study, I know how to get a planning study, I know how to get a project developed, but where I struggle -- actually, Paul, would you like to answer that -- where I struggle is to do exactly what you're talking about.

DEAN STANTON: I was just going to say the motion for the IT Committee to take on the responsibility for overview of learning spaces kills that ad hoc classroom committee that sporadically came into view when there was budgeting to make improvements, and it went away when there was not. And that was a major portion of that push. So now, it's within the purview of a committee that you currently chair to take that seriously on a very regular basis.

It also takes what is a new group, which is the working group, which is looking at the nuts and bolts, talking to vendors for classroom instructional technology and carpeting and so forth, the kinds of things that faculty need to appreciate once they have new stuff, but don't necessarily need to be involved in the details. But those groups will be connected through your committee.

So the learning spaces group will be reporting in to your committee on a regular basis. So we've tried to reduce the ad hoc nature of discussions going on and planning. It's also the first time in my 23 years here of a strong connection with a centrally-led organization, Lois is from operations, to the faculty. So I think we've made an important step in that direction, but as Laura Wood pointed out, there are other intersections in terms of other communities, too. So it's always good to be bringing that to the forefront.

And when Lois asked me in our learning spaces group about how often I thought there should be a presentation full of AS&E faculty, I said, “At least once a year so that people, especially new school faculty, are integrated into the process of what is going on and what the goals and objective are.”

PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: I'm Sharon Schwartzberg. Lois, forgive me if you've answered my question, but since I've been in the summer school committee, I'm just wondering about the pool of students in the summer and what impact this would have on existing needed space for not classrooms, but parking. Because if I recall, a lot of the summer school students do not live on campus. I don't know if that's still the case. So
I'm just wondering about the relationship between the planning and the summer school plan.

DEAN STANTON: So summer session right now reports in to a dual reporting relationship to Nancy Bauer in the dean's office and to me in Dowling. So in the connect-the-dots world, we try to avoid the situation where summer session is the default residence of classes after we do everything that we think we need to do during the summer. And the learning spaces group is also looking at how we can accomplish some of our goals during winter break and spring break, especially when you're getting into the room just to upgrade with technology.

It doesn't necessarily have to be a summer thing. In fact, the vendors who provide those classroom technologies hate being asked during the summer to do work because everybody wants it done then. So we're trying to be creative about that, but we're very aware of the summer session in terms of what they need for courses.

MS. STANLEY: And that's typical for the project execution involving classrooms, and we're in touch with summer school, the registrar.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Just a quick point. I appreciate the fact that you're looking at current usage of rooms and trying to involve those faculty members and planning for these upgrades, but I'm wondering oftentimes, the renovations will involve switch out of furniture for the students moving from tablet arms to movable tables, chairs, etcetera for a better working experience. And that frequently actually decreases the occupancy, and so you may in fact be converting the rooms to spaces that those faculty will no longer be interested in because they have larger enrollments. So at some point, I hope that new (inaudible) will be sort of publicly aired (inaudible) so that the people looking at particular size enrollments can understand what might be available and have input ahead of time for those rooms.

MS. STANLEY: Thanks, that's a good question. So we call that right-size. And the changing of furniture from its plethora of -- when needed or when proposed from this plethora of the tablet arm chairs -- actually they don't often do this. They're often quite fixed -- to something different. The study recommends tables and chairs for flexibility as seminar use, lots of different ways tables and chairs can be used. But it does have definitely an impact on seat count, which then has an impact on the possible classes that can be taught in that room. So we work closely with the registrar on the potential impact. We're not making that type of impact unless we can. We're not proposing it unless we can, given the current courses being taught in "X" room. So that's one way we're going to train ourselves. If it were me, I would be getting rid of all the tablet arm chairs, because as tall as I am, I just don't fit in them very well.

The other way we're looking at is -- and the design review of this will come up as well -- the teaching faculty in those design reviews will see the before and after seat counts, whether there's a difference or not. But that's a big part of the design.
DEAN STANTON: One of the things that came out in the learning spaces study, too, is that something that the registrar's office has been doing since I got here is giving the home court advantage to faculty in terms of the classroom that's across the hall from your office. And that's led to problems in terms of the number of chairs in classrooms and so forth. But they took us to task for that, saying just because you can get 60 seats in a room doesn't mean it's a 60-seat classroom.

So there's kind of an unpleasant aspect of making those spaces more accommodating. We could show you photographs of classrooms where you'd swear you'd have to be air-dropped from the ceiling in order to get into a seat in the room, and you know which ones I'm talking about. So they said to kind of ease off of that -- you know, if it's not a specialized classroom, ease off of that in order to make a more comfortable and more effective learning space. But there's a price to pay. There's a paying point in that.

PROF. JOHNSON: A followup on something Paul had said earlier. Vida Johnson; German, Russian, Asian, and not GRALL. We actually don't like being called GRALL. But setting that aside, about bringing in faculty, or when to bring in faculty, obviously there's some awareness that one needs too. But I'll just give you a specific example.

In Olin 012, they replaced all the computers, etcetera, but they're in the stand where I have to bend down -- and there's no light -- I have to bend down to about 12 inches to feel around where the knob is to get the DVD player to open up. And luckily, I ski, and I'm very flexible, but I just wonder what I look like to my students, as I have my butt up in the air, fiddling around down there because I forget a flashlight. I volunteer to be a guinea pig to test me out there about what I'm doing in the classroom and where the equipment is, because it's absolutely ridiculous.

DEAN STANTON: Vida, thank you. This is a great commercial for what I was saying before about the integration. When you have an ad hoc committee that meets to look at the singular classroom or singular building, and they go away, and then you ask for different people to come in at different times, you end up with results like that. So that's what I mean when I say the folks in operation now are working in a much closer way with faculty to avoid something like that. Thanks for giving us a good example of what not to do.

PROF. ROGERS: Hi, Laura Rogers from education and SAS. So I'm not going to put my education hat on, which would say, “How could a basement in East Hall not be in your first 30?” Instead, what I'd like to do is follow up on this comment.

So we have a Department of Occupational Therapy. I don't know if you know what their expertise is, but it's addressing questions exactly like what we're talking about here, and they are also well-versed in designing spaces that are highly accessible. It goes beyond media. It goes to like really thinking through how space is used and how people move in it. So I really encourage you to consult with them or get them on your committee if
they're not on it.

MS. STANLEY: That's a great suggestion. And I'm actually quite familiar with OT and worked with them on CLIC in the past couple of years. So we'll reach out to them. Thanks.

On your first non-question, though, I would have loved to have had those rooms in East Hall and Jackson in our first list. The reason they are not is for a couple of years during the science and engineering construction, complex construction, we're down classrooms as a result of needing to take Robinson offline and a few of the Anderson classrooms as well during certain times of the day. So right now, we're a little bit tight.

When that complex is fully constructed, which occupancy will be fall of 2017, and those classrooms will be back, my guess is those rooms will be on the summer 2017 upgrade list. My hope is to simply take the Jackson rooms off of the list entirely, that they are not classrooms. They're something else. With the plan, we're talking making locker rooms or office space or something.

DEAN STANTON: Back to what they originally were.

PROF. COUCH: Just a very quick comment. Alva Couch, computer science. I fill up my classrooms all the time because I have extreme demand in my classes. Let me say a very simple comment. When you fill a capacity 60 classroom to 60 students, it's darn near impossible to give a mid-term.

PROF. TOBIN: I think we need to close this off. Before we all leave, I would like to make a plea to everyone to take your debris from the lunch and put it in the trashcans. Otherwise, it falls to our lovely Jillian and Bryanna, and they shouldn't have to do that. So please take your own stuff.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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