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PROF. TOBIN: Welcome. Get your food, take your seats. We have an interesting agenda today, our last substantive faculty meeting of this academic year. To begin with, there are a couple of announcements, one of which is not on the agenda. Jillian, do you have an announcement?

MS. DUBMAN: Hi, everybody. I just wanted to introduce everybody to Lindsay Riordan, our new administrative assistant. You will see her at faculty meetings going forward. She came to us working from a documentary film company, and we are very happy to have her. She looks forward to working with all of you, for the committees, and at faculty meetings. So please welcome her.

(Applause)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

RECEPTION TO WELCOME SMFA FACULTY TO TUFTS
PROF. TOBIN: Thanks, Jillian. Welcome, Lindsay. So next we have an announcement from Nancy Bauer regarding a reception for the new members of our faculty.

DEAN BAUER: Hi, everybody. You see on the agenda here we are having a little party to welcome the SMFA faculty to Tufts. It’s going to happen next Thursday, the 12th of May, from 6:00 to 8:00 in the Remis Sculpture Court in the Aidekman Arts Center and the art gallery will be open during that time. We know everybody is super busy and there are lots of other end-of-semester meetings happening and other events, but it would be great if we could see faculty at that meeting. Please tell faculty in your department that they’re all invited, including part-time faculty. We’ve invited all the faculty from the SMFA, and we’re hoping we have a nice event to welcome those folks. Thank you.

MARK DEVOTO: Do you have a list of names?

DEAN BAUER: I have a list of names of people. We are offering jobs to literally every single faculty member who is there at the moment. But I don't have a list of names yet. I mean, we haven't given contracts out, so I don't quite have a list of names. But I will have name tags for people when they're there, and if you have a particular question I can probably give you a response. They're roughly speaking about eighty faculty members.

OLD BUSINESS

VOTE ON AS&E BYLAW CHANGES: FACULTY ADVISORY BOARD (FAB) AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF THE AS&E EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PROF. TOBIN: Any other questions about that? We have two items of old business here. This was discussed at the last faculty meeting. This is part of our effort to clean up the
bylaws. So there were two proposals to revise the bylaw descriptions of the roles of the Faculty Advisory Board for Administration and the Executive Committee. Again, when we started looking at this last year, we realized that much of what was in the description for FAB was really working as a liaison between the faculty and administration that has really devolved to the Executive Committee. And what isn't under the description of FAB is what it really mostly does, which is review administrators. So we wrote a revision through FAB and that's what's in front of you. It became their general power to initiate investigative inquiries so that there is that official ability and it puts in there explicitly the responsibility to review administrators. So we're going to vote on that. There will just be a preview and then the second part is revision of the charge of the Executive Committee taking some of the language regarding acting as a liaison between faculty and administration that is formerly known as a FAB description (inaudible).

So first let's deal with the FAB revisions. Are there any questions or discussions regarding those proposals? Seeing none, we'll proceed to a vote on this. So all those in favor of adopting this revision please raise your hands. All opposed? Anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining? We can say that motion passes.

PROF. TOBIN: So the second proposal is to the revisions of the Executive Committee. One other thing, the provision there, it's a small thing, it empowers the committee to choose a representative to the Trustee Committees from the membership of the other elected committees of AS&E rather than it having to be someone from the Executive Committee. In particular, we think it might often be helpful for someone from Budget & Priorities Committee to represent the faculty or the Administration and Finance Committee rather than someone from the Executive Committee. Any discussion about those proposals? Let's vote on this. I think it doesn't require a second, right? All in favor please raise your hands. All opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.

I'm going to turn this over to the co-chair. By the way, Judith will be stepping off the Executive Committee after this year and her two years serving as co-chair. And I want to thank you very much for your great work and excellent --

(Applause)

NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND TUFTS UNIVERSITY

PROF. HABER: Now we have a resolution on climate change at Tufts University. This is a three-part resolution. The three parts will be voted separately on a paper ballot which will be handed out. The resolution will be presented by Paul Joseph and Luke Sherman, an undergraduate student, who will, as is our practice, leave after the discussion and before the paper ballot.
PROF. JOSEPH: So just to briefly introduce this, we had a discussion on divestment in December, the end of last semester. Just to recapitulate some of those themes and bring you up to date. The divestment for fossil fuel companies in our investment endowment is a significant symbolic act that really affirms the urgency of our current situation with respect to climate change. We’ve also affirmed that there are responsible communities that recognize the importance of science and are committed to important values, such as civic engagement, respect to the environment, and the realization that future generations as well as our own must become a benchmark to measure our actions. Divestment of holdings in fossil fuel companies places our actions in line with our values and underscores the need to transition to new forms of energy production. Divestment registers that the established political process has so far been too weak or compromised by this information and the rejection of science encouraged by some of the very companies that we held as investments ourselves.

Divestment states that we must change a fundamental weakness of our position. We can no longer expect and should no longer rely on making a profit from investments in the very places that will threaten our capacity to grow food, live in coastal cities, protect our home, and maintain the already fragile commitment that we have to social justice on this planet.

Continued investment of fossil fuels undermines our security and our integrity. Perhaps most importantly, divestment is an affirmation of our leadership as a learning and teaching community.

A couple of bullet points on the severity of the situation that we are facing. Yesterday, the New York Times published an article on resettling the first American climate refugees. Perhaps not by coincidence the group slated to move from low-lying islands in southeastern Louisiana are Native Americans.

A recent World Bank report that climate change could push more than 100 million people into extreme poverty by 2030. In March a group of climate scientists from the internal atmosphere of chemistry and physics surveyed the most recent findings and concluded, "We are in danger of handing young people a situation that is out of their control. They're positive that the collapse in food production, polar ice caps, the need to abandon cities along the coast, and the climatic change could relatively predict the weather pattern such as monsoons is a matter of decades, not centuries."

More recently an Oxford University study noted that A, this is on the urgency of our current situation, adding any new fossil fuel power plants beyond 2018 will likely bring the world above two degrees Celsius compared to pre-industrial levels.

The tendency when we think about this situation is to look at 2050 or to look at 2100, and I really think that that is a mistake. I think Jonathan from the chemistry department is going to show us a little bit of information later on that underscores that point.
When discussing this situation about divestment from our portfolio at the faculty meeting last semester, the issue of a possible cost came to the surface. Specifically, there was a reference to a report two years ago that estimated that cost at seventy-five million dollars over five years. I think there are reasons to challenge his estimate, and indeed more recently the investment office offers a substantially lower estimate, a range of estimates, because no one can tell for sure in a precise way what the cost to divest will be.

Much of the cost of divestment is associated with the difficulties of associating ourselves getting out of co-mingled funds, not from the value of the fossil fuel themselves, but with reconfiguring our whole investment portfolio so that it no longer sits in places, in funds, that we share with other institutional investors that hold fossil fuels. They're limiting right now the availability of those funds.

The series of resolutions that we have proposed here are compromised in an attempt to grapple with costs even as we argue about how much the cost actually would be.

Resolution B continues to affirm the goal of divesting entirely in principle the delays it's operationalization until we're able to examine the issue of cost in more detail. It also allows us an opportunity to exercise leadership as a university by joining with other academic institutions to create more fossil fuel funds and experienced fund managers.

It also turns out that not all of our investment portfolio is in co-mingled funds. That's different than what we knew in December. We have a small fund or a series of funds, I'm not sure if it's one or several, that are controlled by ourselves and separately from other investors. As of January 31st a significant portion of investment in those funds, the ones that we control directly, were in fossil fuel companies, 8.6 percent to be exact.

Resolution A calls for divestment of those fossil fuel companies over the next year. This will not generate the same cost that is involved with disassociating ourselves from all the fossil fuel holdings in the endowment. It's an entirely separate process. There may be minor transactional costs. There may not be any cost at all. We have not received a clear answer on this question from the investors.

The resolutions reflect the fact about the general movement where divestment is taking place in many different settings, not just colleges and universities, but investment funds, pension funds, and the like. It doesn't all look the same in each place. Some universities and colleges have direct holdings and shareholders decide to sell those off. If our investments look that way perhaps we would be able to -- we might have already voted in favor of divesting from those direct holdings.

Yale University, Stanford, and Syracuse are three examples of institutions that are moving towards divestment and Luke Sherman will tell us a little bit more about that.
As investors and financial regulators are becoming more aware of climate change they're also looking more generally at reconceptualizing this idea of cost. Costs are not always measured in terms of what happens when you sell your particular investment. But what are the externalities? What, for example, is the cost of our downtown campus perhaps being flooded sometime over the next twenty, thirty, or forty years? There's a significant cost in that.

What is the impact of climate change not only on companies that might have a refinery close to a coast that are not refundable in that case, but more generally on all the financial assets? A recent study estimated there's a climate risk to all companies if we follow our business as usual pattern at 1.8 percent. We need to look at this idea of financial fiduciary responsibility and take a more expansive, more all-encompassing way of looking at cost.

We have an opportunity to distinguish ourselves, we at Tufts University, when it comes to confronting climate change. There are multiple levels of responsibility; personal, state, national, and international. But experts tell us that personal change alone will not be sufficient. Many, if not most, of the experts tell us that the national and international steps are inadequate as well. Personal, state and national, and international. The missing word in that sequence is institutional. That's us. Institutional change is not the only answer, but it's a necessary part of any answer. The suggestions and resolution three reflect the recognition of our committee that we also have to internalize the necessary changes as well, not just have an impact on the outside. We have to live by our own values.

Taken together we feel very strongly that these three resolutions are a terrific opportunity for us as a university to distinguish ourselves and to demonstrate strong leadership on this critical question. Thank you.

(Applause)

LUKE SHERMAN: Hi everyone. My name is Luke Sherman, and I'm a senior undergraduate student. I first just want to say thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak to you today about the fossil fuel divestment movement here on this campus. The first thing I'm going to talk about is some history of the divestment movement. For those of you who have been in academia at least since the 1980s you might remember the divestment movement that sought to pressure companies that were operating with the apartheid state that was South Africa to change their investment policies as a means to pressure the South African government from instituting apartheid regime. In 1987, after a ten-year long divestment campaign, Tufts did join a number of other universities that divested from those companies. And I think what demonstrated to international leaders the importance of the divestment movement was when Nelson Mandela, who later became president of South Africa, when he came to the United States shortly after the apartheid state was dismantled. He came first to the University of California campus to thank
students for re-energizing the conversation about moral limits of our investments as well as on the responsibility to ensure democratic societies. Several years later in the mid-90s Tufts divested from a company called Hydro-Quebec, and in a number of other cases that don't apply directly to Tufts, universities and other academic institutions have divested from cigarette companies, from companies operating in the South Sudan, and others that are tied to genocide, and to distortions of public health and to democracy.

I think that one of the ways that Tufts distinguishes itself from its peer institutions is commitment and dedication to active citizenship. That personally is one of the main reasons why I chose to enroll in this university. Tisch College is really something that sets us apart from a number of other universities across the country and our commitment to democracy is well-known.

I think I speak for a number of students when we say that we are disappointed that the university is failing to lead on this issue of fossil fuel divestment. In a number of documents affirmed by a number of different Tufts presidents and by the Board of Trustees, Tufts has announced its commitment to environmental sustainability and a commitment to democracy in the belief that democracy makes the world a better place.

In 1990, a number of university leaders from across the globe called on universities to mobilize internal and external resources to move to globalize their resources, to respond to the increasing threat of environmental destruction. This document was groundbreaking and defined the role of universities and the transformations (inaudible) of economy.

In my belief, our endowment does constitute either an internal or external resource depending on how you look at it, and then it would be disingenuous to continue to promote our belief to sustainability and to our commitment to democracy while financing the very corporations that are dooming us to destruction by stronger storms and by heat waves that are damning millions upon tens of millions of the poorest and most vulnerable members of our society to death and to incredible marginalization and that have time and again committed massive human rights abuses and have thwarted democracy at every turn.

Here in the United States, the Charles and David Koch brothers; industrialists who have announced, for example, that they will spend 889 million dollars of their own wealth on the 2016 presidential election alone. This is not counting the amount of money that they spend to disseminate junk science about climate change, to influence school board elections across the country, to pressure state teachers to not teach climate change in middle schools and high schools, and to elect those who question the science of climate change in every single, what appears to be, every public appearance that they have. Clearly, the fossil fuel industry then is not -- investing in the fossil fuel industry does not mean that we are investing in corporations or institutions that support democracy and support a transformation to sustainable development.
As Professor Joseph mentioned, a number of other academic institutions have already taken the step, either partially or fully divesting from fossil fuel companies, including Yale University, Stanford University, (inaudible), University of Massachusetts Amherst, Hampshire College and College of the Atlantic. A number of other institutions have divested as well, and there is a great effort being led by a Tufts graduate, Tufts alumnus, Senator Ben Downing to divest the Massachusetts pension funds as well.

Being the face of threat as large as climate change, there is this tendency to shirk our responsibility, and I encourage the faculty to join with the student body that voted overwhelmingly in the fall of 2013 to call on the university to divest from fossil fuels, to join the TCU Senate which passed a resolution twenty-five to one, calling on the university to divest, and to join the number of other alumni and individual professors and staff who also believe that the university must divest its direct holdings in the fossil fuel industry, as well as reconsider the full cost of divestment of fossil fuel funds in a more democratic and transparent fashion. Thank you.

PROF. HABER: Thank you, both. We'll have a discussion. Since I imagine you'll be asked back, do you want to lead the discussion or do you want me to? Okay, discussions, questions?

PROF. RICHARDS: Dan Richards, economics. I guess I have several questions. I don't think (inaudible) but I'll express them anyhow. One is that I think that the current endowment is between one and a half and two percent invested in fossil fuels. So that any signal we're going to be sending is a movement of around ninety-eight percent no fossil fuels to 100 percent. It's a fairly weak signal just on those grounds. So I don't know that -- and it has absolutely no impact on a number of plans or any other major aspect of fossil fuels. So it's a weak signal in that case, but I also think it's inconsistent for two major reasons. One is that right here on this campus whose research and graduate students are scheduled to be funded by fossil fuel companies, and I find it odd to say that we don't want to have those stocks in our portfolio to fund our grads and other research. In addition to the $1.6 billion funds that we have in the endowment, there is $1.2 billion in our retirement funds, and that has the same kind of co-mingling as the endowment does. So I think that the signal that is being sent by a call for divestment is weak at best, more aptly described as inconsistent, and to some would seem hypocritical.

I also want to be clear about a couple things. One is the $1.6 billion invested in the endowment, about 0.5 is in what is called direct funds or directly owned funds, about $15 million, about three-tenths of one percent. We don't know the cost of getting rid of that. It probably is not large but we don't know the cost. But when other schools often say that they've divested, that's what they mean. It doesn't mean that they've gotten rid of co-mingled funds. They typically still have their funds in co-mingled funds because it's very difficult to undo that. The estimated cost for us to do it over a five year horizon is around a
$75 million hit to the endowment. That is a large cost. And it's a very expensive price to pay for a weak and inconsistent signal.

I think there are much better alternatives. I'm very happy to say that my own alma mater Oberlin College has not divested, but it has signed something called the American University and College Climate Commitment, which requires it as a signatory to make inventory of all of its emissions and to take action, form a plan, and become carbon neutral. It has done that. It plans to be carbon neutral by 2025 and has worked with the town of Oberlin to make a general climate commitment or to achieve roughly the same thing, the same objective. And I think that is a more engaged, a more academic, and a more serious response to the very serious challenge of climate change that the planet is facing. So I don't have much trouble with Part C of this. Part B is slightly watered down because it doesn't put a time table as far as I can see. But I don't think the divestment overall as a whole is very meaningful. I don't think it's very meaningful. I think it's somewhat inconsistent, and I think it foregoes the thing that academic institutions are supposed to do, namely, come up with plans and address it in a fundamental way. In this particular juncture of Americans, not world history, but certainly Americans, where virtually all public discourse has been dominated increasingly by the bumper sticker and by the sound bite culture. I think the really moral thing for Tufts to do is not to simply go for a meaningless or very weakly meaningful and inconsistent symbol that might have very serious causes to the university, but to instead take a very serious action to sign the climate commitment, and to move to achieve that kind of serious response.

So I'm going to offer a friendly, or maybe not so friendly amendment, which is to strike A and B full stop, and then to replace C with the fact that this university calls upon the administration to become signatories to the American University and College Climate Commitment.

PROF. HABER: Before you reply as is your choice, President Monaco as you wish.

PRESIDENT MONACO: Just to say that we have signed that commitment. So we'll be making an action plan like other university leaders.

PROF. RICHARDS: I talked to Patricia, and you hadn't signed it yet.

PRESIDENT MONACO: I thought I signed it. I paid dues to it.

PROF. HABER: There's an amendment suggested.

PROF. RICHARDS: Well, strike the amendment if we've already signed it.

PROF. AGYEMAN: This is not a resolution on climate change. It's a resolution on climate justice. I would also like to see that as an amendment. The word justice is not frequently in
association with climate change. And more recently student activism around the world, especially by indigenous peoples, has linked the word justice. So I think we should start to think about this as social justice and a climate justice issue. So the decision then really is about social justice. It's the same decision that I made in 1977 when I and several other hundreds of thousands of British students divested from Barclay’s Bank, which was the biggest institutional investor in South Africa at the time. Actually, Nelson Mandela came over to various universities in the UK as well to thank the universities for their role in the divestment campaign.

It's a social justice issue because all the evidence points to the fact that the first and worst affected by climate change are the poorest people, not just in the United States, but around the world. If we think inequality is growing, this will drive the biggest wedge in our society that we've ever seen.

The second point I'd like to make is this is something we can do something about. This resolution, albeit, a resolution on climate justice, is, I think, a great three-part resolution. It's something we can do something about and Dan's absolutely right. This is no silver bullet. We need many different forms of action to support climate justice.

Finally, I just want to think about our students. Some have been doing research into this generation called millennials who are now students. This is the biggest generation in our history and they are absolutely pro-climate change solutions, climate justice solutions. Can we really look at our students in the face and say we voted this down? Can we really look at them that way? What's the first mover advantage by the other universities who are divesting? At Tufts, we've always been on the edge, the cutting edge. I'm here because we're on the cutting edge. We need to take our values seriously and make a moral decision here to divest from fossil fuels. Thank you.

PROF. WOLF: Maryanne Wolf, child study and human development. I recently returned from a trip to the Vatican which had a meeting on sustainability climate change and what all of us can do. Dan, everything that you said is not exclusive. The things that you mentioned are all part of what Pope Francis and others like Jeffrey Sachs and Aronoff were pleading everyone there to do with their own institutions. One of the most important things they said is that we cannot, just as Professor Joseph said, think in terms of the future 2030, but what is happening now. There are those of us at this institution who are conducting research in places like Ethiopia, where only last month half of my research was lost because of the drought dispersed in the villages there. So there are very immediate issues that affect us as scholars, and even though my name is not on this document, I was waiting to work with Jeff Sachs, a climatologist from the University of California on specifics, is the direction that I would hope all of us can make by signing this.

PROF. HABER: Thank you.
PROF. KENNY: Jonathan Kenny. I want to start out by saying to some of my colleagues who think, “Why bother with divestment? It won't accomplish anything.” I thought about that a little while and I said to myself, “Well, we've got the student fight for divestment a year ago was unsuccessful in that we didn't divest at the time.” But what were the other results of the Tufts Climate Action students’ sit-in for divestment? Basically, the students, besides going through a disciplinary system where most of them got probation one, there were three items in the agreement that they changed with the administration. The first would say that the students would be granted a meeting with the trustees. That has happened and that has allowed us to give the students a chance to discuss climate change issues with the trustees and with the chair of the Board of Trustees reminding us that there are other things that universities do besides divest. Those other things, research and teaching, have been incorporated into the plans ever since.

The second part of the settlement was a two-day symposium, which we had very recently. Now, climate change is defined by many or is believed by many to be the issue of this generation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology spent a year of self-study trying to decide what we as an institution can do about climate change, and came up with a lengthy plan, an eighty-page report, to do more research and more teaching. In fact, they decided not to divest. But they spent a year as a community deciding how they would deal with the most important issue of our times.

Tufts got the two-day symposium. Without the students sit-in for divestment we may have had nothing at all in terms of a full participation community discussing these most important issues.

The third thing is the university has committed to additional support for research and teaching on climate change at Tufts. So these three things that I think are very significant would not have happened except for those students clamoring for divestment. We can hardly say that the fight for divestment hasn't accomplished anything especially here at Tufts.

I can say a bit about what happened at the symposium for those of you who weren't there or weren't at one of the sessions. I have a brief recap of some of the highlights from the words of students in my environmental chemistry class who attended the symposium and wrote about it in their journals that they keep. Matthew Yee said, "I have attended the keynote address on Professor Jeffrey Sachs of Columbia University at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 31st in Pearson 104. Sachs was quite impressive in delivering his entire address on this topic without any notes or reference. In his analysis of the role of various stakeholders in combating climate change he offered some fresh take-aways for me. As Sachs pointed out during COP 21, “Everybody is finally scared of it.” That sounds to me like the potential for incentives to align in a much more probable atmosphere for international collaboration. Who knows if it was too little too late, though. Finally, Sachs’ emphasis that a plan for a deep decarbonization was needed."
I've got a slide show to show you. I've got one slide. This is one slide that Sachs presented also, using it as a blunt instrument about the challenge that really faces us. I think it's imperative that we make a moral statement about how important it is to face these issues. Most people believe we have to do something about climate change. Despite that, virtually nothing has happened especially at the national level and international level. We need some sort of signal that we give to each other who are already mobilized and move on this challenge.

So the vertical access is carbon dioxide admissions. In 2016 we figured about 40 billion tons of CO2 are being permitted by the entire world. The line up top labeled "BAU," I hope people have decided to recognize that abbreviation and get sick of it because BAU, business as usual, is a road for disaster. That's where we are. If we stay on that path instead of forty or thirty or fifty, we'd be at about eighty billion tons of CO2 per year by 2050 and that would be a total disaster. According to the best science that we have the goal that we defined last year in 2015 was that we need to do anything that we could to have at least a two-thirds chance of not going out to sea. To make that goal, that's where we need to be with carbon conditions and when we have to be there. In 2050, zero carbon conditions.

Practically speaking, that means every time a power plant goes down because it's reached the end of its lifetime, it has to be replaced by a power plant that doesn't use carbon or that (inaudible) that carbon isn't produced. That is starting in 2015. Every day that goes by that we don't make these changes the goal just gets tougher and tougher.

Two more short quotes from students. Matty Bernstein writes, "This is feasible to do and not even all that expensive. Technology has been proven to lower the costs of zero carbon energy. Transfer will cost one percent of national income per year, one trillion per year world-wide, $200 billion for U.S. alone per year, not really a problem. Sachs called it a “fifth-year assessment” because of the amount of infrastructure that had to be changed over a short period of time, and he felt that while as 2050 is only thirty-four years away it might take us around fifty years to accomplish this."

But really, the students who prepared these notes were quite good at recording accurate numbers and getting the quantitative part of the message. So continuing (Maddy), “Do we scrap what we have? When the old one ends we put out the new one, zero carbon, almost every vehicle to be electric by 2030.”

“How do universities play into this? One, climate science. You need to tell us our options. Move fast. Two, engineering. Smart solution. Three, public policy. The move would do this, actually make a serious plan. We need to decarbonize. Universities need to behave as a moral community. Ethics; investors shouldn't support things that fundamentally threaten human well-being. Lousy investment.”
So Sachs strongly came out with a recommendation that his university and Tufts both divest for both ethical reasons and for financial reasons, because investing in fossil fuel is not going to be a winning strategy in terms of making money.

Finally, Melanie writes, "Knowing that universities are a community with moral responsibility to this problem was a great addition to this his keynote speech.”

So I think that we need to continue listening to our students and continuing following where they lead because it's the right thing to do.

(Applause)

PROF. AMMONS: Thanks. Liz Ammons in the English department, and I'll be very brief. Our discussion here started with two important points. One, about the cost of divesting. Second, the idea that this is a weak step. The subsequent speakers in my opinion have pointed out that the cost of not doing this is much, much too high and we need to take this step. Is it a weak step? If it is, it's a first step, and it's very important to start down this path. So let me just remind us of what many people are telling us, but I'll appeal to the contemporary Native American environmental (inaudible) who says that what we need right now is a significant, a major cultural climate change. This is a first small step at Tufts towards that cultural climate change which we need to participate in.

PROF. HABER: Thank you, Liz. I think Barbara Grossman has a comment.

PROF. GROSSMAN: Thank you. I'll be brief too. Barbara Grossman, drama. I just want to say JFK's favorite quote allegedly was a paraphrase of a quote in Dante's Inferno that, "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in times of moral crisis preserve their neutrality." I think related to that is I think of Holocaust and genocide and how facing history in ourselves in the education they do with young people of all ages talk about how in genocidal situations you have perpetrators but then you also have the bystanders, who by their inaction, by their timidity, by their adherence to neutrality or whatever they call it, take no action. And they always urge kids to be upstanding. So I think that notwithstanding the complexity of all of these issues, I mean we live in a time of such urgency and stridency, but notwithstanding the complexity of these issues, I think we have to listen to our own consciences and think about the world that we hope to live in and leave to our children and the rest of the children of the world.

PROF. ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology and environmental studies. I also want to come out strongly in favor of this document. It's a very, very small first step, but it's time to turn the page so we can start moving on to the other issues that are really important. If we keep talking about divestment forever and ever and ever, we won't be able to work on those other big issues, getting engineers engaged and start coming up with solutions. We need to turn the tables to the next chapter of fixing this problem. This problem is huge. It's not just
about divestment. But we know that State Street and many other financial institutions are getting ready to create fossil free co-mingled funds. So it's just a matter of time that we can do this without a huge hit to the university. Like I said before, it's a first step, and it's a really important first step. Thank you.

PROF. HABER: Thank you. Anyone else?

PROF. GARDULSKI: Anne Gardulski, earth and ocean sciences. I have to say I'm actually not in favor of this. I think it is -- I understand the idea of it being symbolic and a first step and all that, but I also think that this is such a tragic and such an important issue that it is just too simplistic to step away from the fossil fuel investments as we're divesting from them. There are so many other places that take those fossil fuels and they are the ones that are releasing them into the atmosphere. I would like to see a more complex nuanced way of dealing with that rather than simply saying stop the drilling, stop the -- or whatever, which essentially is what this is saying. I think we're missing in that, like it or not, petro chemicals are going to be in the world and how do we deal with them? How do we deal with carbon sequestration, whatever is required? Simply divesting I don't think truly accomplishes what we're trying to do.

PROF. RICHARDS: I just want to say that there is absolutely no doubt that this is a very serious problem, that climate change probably is the issue of this generation and of this time and moment. But divesting does not do anything about that per se. And it particularly doesn't do anything if we continue to (inaudible), support our research, and we continue to have an equally sized endowment or retirement fund that is also co- mingled in fossil fuels. It doesn't do anything. I don't see that it's a big moral statement when it has that kind of inconsistency and ineffectiveness.

PROF. ROY: Modhumita Roy, English. I appreciate what my colleagues are pointing out. This is a very complex issue and this is a simplistic step. But as Julian reminded us of the divestment from the South Africa instance, these are exactly the kinds of things we heard then. This is too simplistic. It's not going to achieve what we set out to achieve and so on. And I don't think anyone is suggesting as soon as we divest we are going to live in paradise. It is a first step. It's an important step. We've discussed this now for quite a while, and I hope that people now vote towards a vote.

PROF. MIRKIN: Well, I have no vote on divestment. But I think we can make a stronger statement if the funds that we divested from will be invested into alternative energy sources. My personal preference is nuclear, which I don't know how popular, but there are other alternatives. I think the way to defeat this problem is to develop alternative sources of energy. So right now some things seem somewhat promising. I'm not a physicist, but from what I read about there are some problems there. But even still (inaudible) in terms of environment. So I think we can make a stronger statement if whatever money we divest from this in our industry, we invest in the environment and alternative energy sources.
PROF. HABER: We've had two discussions on this, and we have the response that we asked for from the provost and the administration on the Work/Life Committee.

PROF. JOSEPH: Can I have two minutes?

PROF. HABER: Sure.

PROF. JOSEPH: So Dan, I have to shake my head when you say that fossil fuel companies are contributing funding for research as carried out in the university, and if we divest we jeopardize the source of those funds. I'm assuming that that research is being published by the peer review and by the highest of professional standards here and it's not being beholden for the fossil fuel companies.

PROF. RICHARDS: I'm not saying (inaudible) I'm saying funds in our portfolio (inaudible).

PROF. JOSEPH: So the transition with where we are now with the dependency on fossil fuels for many different activities, all of us are invested individually, institutionally in that process. And it is tricky. It's difficult how to imagine how we change while also recognizing that we're kind of stuck in engaging in a situation. That doesn't mean, I don't think, that can be an argument that we shouldn't try to change even though it's going to carry with it many kinds of challenges and intentions. Because if we turn around and say every time we look that we stamped by the fact that I drove to work instead of taking a bicycle, that funding is coming from the sources, we would never be able to do anything. That can't be the argument for saying that we shouldn't look for a resolution. So that's disturbing to me about this.

In terms of the weak signal or the symbolic signal, I think at the end of the day several people have said divestment is not a solution by itself. It's just calling attention to a problem. At the end of the day I would bet that our most important contribution is going to be individual researchers and teachers and concerned academic citizens. That will be the place where we can make the biggest impact. But we are as an institution also a kind of citizen in this outside society. So we should, I think, as an institution signal, point to the severity of the problem. We are headed here. We need to go here. It's just saying we are here. We need to take steps in this direction. It doesn't absolve us of personal responsibility, our individual investments. It doesn't mean that we shouldn't go after retirement funds to look at those other kinds of questions too. I think you're right about that. But we need to move in this direction. Tufts University is saying as best we can, we need to move in this direction. That's what I think we're looking at.

LUKE SHERMAN: I just want to briefly address a couple of the points that were raised. The first is about the cost of fossil fuel divestment. So in resolution A, it calls on the
university to divest solely from the direct holdings, those investments that we hold as a university in coal, oil, and gas companies. Resolution B calls on the university to move towards a broader and more democratic and transparent analysis of the cost associated with full fossil fuel divestment. The cost that was generated in the fall of 2013 of full fossil fuel divestment was seventy-five million dollars. Professor Joseph and I and the rest of this committee and a number of other faculty members take issue with that analysis for a number of reasons. The principle one, why that we must also vote -- or why the faculty should vote in favor of resolution B is because that process was not transparent. Students who served on the committee that look at full fossil fuel divestment were not allowed after suggesting this for an independent analysis of the cost of this move generated, and I do believe that assisting more responsible investor, should have the ability to look at what the cost would be so that we could have a more fair analysis. We were also told then that there were no direct holdings in fossil fuel companies and now we know that's not the case.

The last thing I will say is about the university's current investment in fossil fuels. As Professor Richards mentioned, about one to two percent of our endowment is controlled of fossil fuels. So we are moving from a ninety-eight percent fossil fuel free endowment to a full fossil fuel free endowment, so what is the point?: I would say that the reason why it's ninety-eight percent, which I'm not even sure that is totally agreed upon by everyone, that we are free of those fossil fuels is not because of some moral or scientific standpoint. It's simply because investment managers want to diversify our funds and are recognizing that energy stocks are doing quite, are quite volatile. Investments in coal are being sold quite dramatically as coal tanks. So if we were to divest from fossil fuel companies it would be for a very different reason. It wouldn't be because we want a more diversified investment portfolio or because energy stocks aren't doing that well. It would be because we know that fossil fuel companies are standing in the way of a transition to a more just, democratic, and sustainable society. I think that's a key distinction to make, and I think that along with this, if the university were to divest, these resolutions call on the university to make a public statement explaining its decision to do so which would add to the immense value.

PRESIDENT MONACO: I would like Patricia Campbell just to comment on the first one because I think that there is some mis-information about us holding investments in single fossil fuel companies. And I think I would like that to be clarified before we move on.

PROF. HABER: Sure. I just want to say before Patricia Campbell speaks that the votes are only to be taken by people who are full-time faculty members.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CAMPBELL: So just to clarify the facts about what’s in our endowment. Today we have about .27 percent in directly held investments that have fossil fuel investments in them. And the difference is between a fund where we invest with lots of other people and the fund is held in the name of the fund manager but we're an investor with that fund manager. So when we're talking about direct investments, it's not
really a direct investment. It's a separately held investment, which is slightly different. We're in a fund that many people, many different institutions and people are invested in, but they segregate the amount of the fund that is Tufts’ investment versus other institution's investments. So that's a little bit of clarity on that.

The numbers do change. Frankly, every day they change because the markets are moving in different directions. So the differences between the numbers -- where's our student? -- is because the investments change over time, not because we haven't been sharing the information. And the data is correct. Of the 3,200 that we know about, we have tried to scrub very, very carefully what's in and out of our investment, so that we can share with you, and it's just under two percent of the entire endowment, whether it's separately managed or co-mingled in terms of its management. So that's the actual data.

PROF. HABER: Thank you, Patricia. Can somebody call the question?

MARK DEVOTO: Is there a motion to close debate?

PROF. MAHONEY: Move to close debate.

PROF. HABER: Any objections? Hearing none, we may vote, full-time faculty only on each of these three proposals in favor, opposed, or abstaining. Jillian will collect them.

ADMINISTRATION'S RESPONSE TO WORK/LIFE COMMITTEE REPORT
PROF. HABER: In the meantime, I hope you're not too distracted, because Provost Harris and Julien Carter will give the administration's response to the Work/Life Committee report.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thank you. So let me just start talking now while you're still voting because we have only fifteen minutes remaining, and I don't want to lose time for this important issue.

So I'll just say a few brief words and then pass it over to my colleague, Julien Carter. In 2013, as you probably recall, the Arts, Sciences and Engineering faculty Work/Life Committee started meeting. It was a standing committee. That was after having a task force. In the fall of 2014 this body requested that the provost lead a university-wide committee on work/life. Towards the end of that academic year we did, indeed, start meeting. So about a year ago the university Work/Life Committee held its first meeting. The people here -- put up your hand if you're on the university's Work/Life Committee. So you can see some of your colleagues who are here, representing every school in the university and representing every division of the university. The charge of this group is to advise the administration on policies that have an impact on work/life and recommend policies and changes and practices to the university. We look at a number of things, but today what I want to do is let you know it is standing in itself. It's not going away after this.
year. What I want to do is to turn to my colleague, Julien Carter, who is the VP of HR to give you an update on where we are on a numbers issue. Dependent care is part of it, but the charge of this group, or the work of this group, is much broader. Julien.

VICE PRESIDENT CARTER: So first of all let me say I'd like to thank the Arts, Sciences and Engineering Work/Life Committee as well as the campus Work/Life Committee for all of the issues and the work we have done so far collaboratively about this issue, and specifically I'd like to commend Elizabeth Remick. We've worked very closely when the report came out in February around a number of issues to see what progress we could make or what additional information we could gather in order to charter a course through the recommendations and report. We've done that through thick or thin. One part I remember is when the Human Resources’ fire alarms went off and Liz and I continued to meet as we evacuated the building and continued to meet in the parking garage because we knew this was a very important issue, so we tried to keep it going.

One of the things that came out of as part of the recommendations was that we wanted to find out the value of the vendors, also more information about the benefits, and also how important benefits were to the dependent care resources for the workforce. So we in March launched a voluntary benefits survey and included in that Care.com as well as Bright Horizons. The survey went out to around 4,000 people. We had about a twenty-five percent response rate and today's presentation I'll just give highlights that are relevant to this issue.

Among those who responded it largely appears that of the university at large we did have more staff who responded than faculty. Probably a greater response rate for Grafton than we did for Medford. Then you see the age of the response that might've resonated differently in the different age groups.

As far as the quality of the benefits, the dependent care report highlighted getting the word out about benefits in general is something that is very challenging. This is a hard chart to read, but as you look, the voluntary benefits that we have in the university that have been here for quite some time, there's of course greater awareness for those. It's taken overtime. People have been able to gather enough information to know what those benefits are.

PROF. ORIANS: I'm sorry, I can't read the slides.

VICE PRESIDENT CARTER: As you get to the bottom as you can see, once again as the dependent care report highlighted, Bright Horizons, and Health Care Everett, and also Care.com, that there was a lot more need to do some communication with that.

Also in the mix was to determine the relative importance to those surveyed for the voluntary benefit. So the ones that we have, as you kind of look down the list, these were from the top. A long-term disability insurance, which I know from the Work/Life Committee and specifically the Arts, Sciences and Engineering, this is a top priority that
we've been talking through. This is one that also resonates to be very important to the campus community. Then as you go down you see as far as the bottom with Care.com and Bright Horizons, as far as relative importance overall. But as we get to a subsequent slide it may explain why that's where it is.

Some information about Bright Horizons that was in the report, the latest statistics. The Teele Square Center is approximately seventy-eight percent occupied. There's no wait list. Currently there are thirteen Tufts families enrolled. We wanted to explore why there isn't greater utilization of the Bright Horizons Teele Square Center. A recent Bright Horizons family survey came out of those who are using the Bright Horizons facility and the average score of all of the families participating in the survey was 3.96 out of possible four rating on friendliness, welcoming environment, facilities, and so forth. There was another issue that was also raised in part from the report and it was just fortunate that this survey was recently done by Bright Horizons and we'll give you additional information about that in the near future.

Suggestions on benefit improvement with Bright Horizons. If you look at this, some of the top issues that are connected to this particular one is inconvenient location. On-site child care is preferred. Remember we survey across all three campuses, so Medford, Boston, and Grafton. So you would expect that the Boston and Grafton area, also the Medford area, that that's going to be an issue. Too expensive was an issue and that was also in the dependent care report. Once again, if you look at one of the biggest slices of this pie, other campus employees would like a similar service, which really gets to the implication that this particular facility is not available to all because of location, residential address and so forth.

So one of the things we did in HR, we're going to try to analyze this a little bit further, since the issue was to understand why the Bright Horizon facility was not more fully utilized. The best data set we have is the health plan enrollment of dependents that are in the health plan and with children enrolled who are six years old or younger. Those would be the ones where this dependent care issue would be the issue.

We have 225 faculty and staff who have combined 284 dependents that are six years of age or younger. Fifty-five of those live in the Medford, Somerville, Cambridge area and of that, twenty-eight children are younger than three years. It's important to note that 2.9, three years of age is when Bright Horizons has their enrollment right now for childcare. Then seven children are five years or older. It's also important to note as we look at kindergarten enrollment at Bright Horizons that they said anecdotally that the Medford/Somerville/Cambridge Public Schools have full-day kindergarten. So as soon as people can get into that they offer the full-day kindergarten. We also looked for other full-day kindergartens in other areas where our employees live. That lists that and later on that will factor in to part of the recommendation that we're trying to focus on.
The other thing is I wanted to see the data if I take those 225 faculty and staff members and the ZIP codes of where they reside, and then we have put this into a GIS format. So it's probably pretty obvious, but for me it's helpful to see it graphically. Of course, we have some concentrations. If you look at the blue dot, that's the Tufts Medford campus. The Grafton campus I think you can see to your far left. And the red is the Boston campus. As you can see, we do have some concentrations around the Medford area, but you can see we are significantly dispersed throughout the metropolitan area and campuses where we have faculty and staff. So whatever strategies that we look at with respect to dependent care issues, it's important to note that it may not always be an issue with Bright Horizons itself, but it may be just factors of where we live and how we commute.

Early thoughts: focus on Bright Horizons Teele Square may not address the needs of eighty percent of our families. As I said, nineteen percent seem to live in the general area of Bright Horizons. Those who have children, clearly Bright Horizons has the shortcoming of not having an infant or toddler services that they provide. I visited with them about that and the feasibility of having that added and there are some issues that seem to make it impractical. That's something that we'll continue to follow-up with them on.

Other areas of exploration, explore connecting families with public school early childhood and after school programs in the communities. Also, focus on Care.com and some enhancements that we're working on. Care.com is only for drop-in and back-up care. It's not for primary care. But at least part of that service you can advertise for regular primary care services through that service.

Additionally, as the data suggests we need to do a far better job of trying to get the word out about what benefits we have. We are currently working with an individual to kind of refresh our website because it's a result of reorganizations of services and also things have been added over the years or dropped off. It's important that we do a significant refresh.

We'll try to do a much better effort with employee orientation. We'll also try to plug information in at points of service. So for example, I believe if someone has indicated they're going out on family medical leave or the birth of a child, we may want to try and put in some marketing about the dependent care resources that we have, like Bright Horizons and so forth. So we're going to try to look for other touch points as people have a readiness and an interest to learn that information.

We've also established quarterly meetings with Bright Horizons. Tomorrow, in fact, I have one.

Any questions about the Bright Horizons before I move on to Care.com? As I said, that's primarily a primary care issue and Care.com is the other issue for drop-in and back-up care.
The voluntary benefits survey looked at how people felt it could be improved. Remember one of the dependent care survey recommendations is that we evaluate vendors. So on this particular one was how can we use it, because this was not being utilized heavily. So they said the rate was too expensive or they needed “more flexibility” and also “availability for out of state” were some of the high comments. But still, there's only twenty-nine who have responded to this out of 1,001 respondents.

So here's the update on Care.com as of this month. We've negotiated with Care.com. Instead of $16 per hour, it is now $8 per hour for back-up care. This can be used whether it's in-home or if you're traveling out of state. If you're in California at a conference or whatever and in a hotel -- I was talking to one nursing mother and she indicated, “Oh, this is great, because when I travel for conferences I was really worried how I was going to take care of my child. Now I can take my child with me. At the hotel there will be someone there to help out.” There is a four-hour minimum for this particular back-up care. But if you want to drop your child off at a center it's $25 per child per day at child care centers. This can be used locally or throughout the United States. Depending on the location of where you go they may not have a facility but at least you can call perhaps ahead of time in order to determine the availability. It's good for up to twenty placements per year for in-home and back-up care or adult care. That's the other thing about Care.com. The dependent care report focused not only on childcare issues but also on adult care issues. So there were some adult care resources that have been added to this.

They also offer a corporate childcare service. If there are events and conferences and I've reached out to campus offices that plan events to see if this might be something they want to incorporate into their planning as well.

The rate is a co-pay that is subsidized by the university. So please note that although you're paying $8 per hour, the care givers earned between $16.50 and $20.00 per hour and is paid for by Care.com. Depending on the number of hours they work they also receive other benefits. These people who are highly screened, trained, and so it's important that they're treated very well.

To access the communication that we'll be sending out soon about Care.com, this is how you'll access the services. We have a site that has been created. You can use this right now. You use your employee ID in order to access it and set up your account. There's an 800 number you can call for back-up and drop-in care services. You can also on this site search for infant care or toddler under primary care. As I said, this is just a back-up, drop-in service, but you can search for full-time care, nannies, and so forth to take care of your children in your home. You can also use this to search for adult care, pet care, and home/lifestyle care. Life-style meaning you need somebody to help you clean.

One other issue was raised and that we're exploring is fundraising for child care scholarships, current areas of exploration. I reached out to Mary Jeka in University
Relations about the feasibility, could this be something that would appeal to the Tufts community, that perhaps members of the university can donate to. So we've started that. We've just had preliminary conversations.

University advancement, to reach out to if they think there might be donors or is there something that could be in the campaign. It's something that they're going to -- they will research, but priorities are being set for that now. We'll just have to see what happens with that.

We've also looked at other resources, like looking at forfeited flexible spending balances. That's where if you put it in your flexible spending account and you don't use it, you lose it. Are there any balances that could be used that might be able to be redirected to this? So far that hasn't really panned out. It's not a consistent or substantial source of funding. So we continue to look to see what we can do to explore what the recommendation was on that report.

Adult care, as I said, Care.com provides some resources for them along the lines of what the report recommended. In addition, they'll offer something in the fall that's called the AGIS Network. This will be a new service because it also gives us a chance and benefit that we haven't had for quite some time, which is long-term care. They also provide a very robust service around connecting people with resources around adult care issues throughout the United States. So between Care.com and this we hope it gives the campus what we need.

As I said, communication of benefits, we are working with someone right now to do a refresh. We will focus around dependent care benefits and she's working on that content now.

Next steps, we'll continue working closely with the Work/Life Committees, the campus-wide committee as well, and the Arts, Science, and Engineering.

Any questions or comments?

PROF. HABER: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

PROF. HABER: Are there results to be given out or will we give them out later? If you want to wait, I believe we can tell you the results but we won't lock you in.

PROF. TOBIN: Can I just remind everyone, take care of your own dishes. Are we ready?

MS. DUBMAN: I just want to check one more time.
PROF. TOBIN: I think we'll have to disseminate this.

MS. DUBMAN: Yes. I just want to make sure they're right. So this afternoon I will send an email out.

PROF. HABER: Meeting adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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