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PROF. HABER: We have a very packed agenda today, so we'd like to start. First of all, we want to introduce this year's Executive Committee. I am the co-chair, Judith Haber, from English.

PROF. TOBIN: And I'm the other co-chair, Roger Tobin from Physics and Astronomy.

PROF. BERNHEIM: Harry Bernheim from Biology.

PROF. RIDGE: Jack Ridge from Earth and Ocean Sciences.

PROF. RUANE: Kim Ruane from the Math Department.

PROF. COUCH: Alva Couch, Computer Science School of Engineering.

PROF. HABER: We were setting a bad example, because it is very important that when you speak, you wait for the mic so that this is recorded properly. So the first thing on the agenda is an announcement from Elizabeth Remick of the Committee of Faculty Work/Life.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
UPCOMING LAUNCH OF AS&E FACULTY WORK/LIFE WEBSITE
PROF. REMICK: I am speaking to let you know that very shortly there will be a new part of Jillian Dubman's Secretary of the Faculty website that will be all about faculty work/life issues. This is a really important thing, because it's the first official site that we have and talks about work/life issues for faculty, as opposed to the informal wiki that my committee has been running for several years. So it's a really exciting thing.

I would like to thank Margery Davies and Lauren Baise for working really hard on the content, Jillian for agreeing to host it and putting a lot of work on it as well, Cheryl Conte and Heidi Brown as well. It was supposed to roll out today, but I just missed some dates, so it's my fault and it's not coming out today. I want to take responsibility for that. But it will be out shortly after we iron out a few minor details. So please look for that. There will be an email announcement sent out from the committee and Jillian in the next couple of weeks. Thanks.

NEW BUSINESS
RESOLUTION ON THE PASSING OF CHRISTOPHER SCHMIDT-NOWARA
PROF. HABER: Thank you, Elizabeth. Now we have an announcement from Dean Jim Glaser and Dean Nancy Bauer about -- I'm sorry, wait. That's good, I get to tell the dean to wait. I'm really sorry. Yes, we have a resolution on the passing of Christopher Schmidt-Nowara from Elizabeth Foster of history.

PROF. FOSTER: The history department invites the Tufts community to join us in remembering and celebrating the life of our dear friend and colleague, Christopher Ebert Schmidt-Nowara, the Prince of Asturias Chair of Spanish Culture and Civilization.
Chris passed away unexpectedly after a brief illness on June 27, 2015 in Paris, France, where he was visiting his beloved daughter, Althea. We are shocked and heartbroken by his death at the age of 48. Chris was born in Cleveland, Ohio and grew up in Albuquerque, New Mexico. He graduated from Kenyon College with a B.A. and highest honors in history in 1988. While at Kenyon, he spent a year in New York University’s program in Madrid, which stoked his scholarly interest in the Iberian world. He then pursued his doctoral work at the University of Michigan under the direction of Rebecca Scott and Geoff Eley, where he was both a Mellon fellow and a Fulbright recipient. In 1995, he completed his Ph.D. with a dissertation entitled, "The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Capital."

Chris’s career took him first to a lectureship at Stanford, and then a tenure track job at Fordham University, where he rose swiftly from Assistant Professor of History to Full Professor between 1998 and 2008. At Fordham, he served variously as the Associate Chair of the History Department and the Director of the Latin American & Latino Studies Institute. We were lucky enough to woo him away from Fordham in 2011, when he became the third holder of the Prince of Asturias Chair.

Chris’s wide-ranging scholarship examined slavery, abolition, colonialism, and nationalism in Spain’s Atlantic empire and Latin America in the long 19th century. At the very core of Chris’s being lay a sense of justice that informed his interest in these topics. His three books are all widely recognized as seminal contributions to his field: Empire and Antislavery: Spain, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, 1833-1874, which came out with the University of Pittsburgh Press in 1999; The Conquest of History: Spanish Colonialism and National Histories in the 19th Century, which also came out with PIP in 2006; and Slavery, Freedom and Abolition in Latin America and the Atlantic World, which came with the University of New Mexico Press in 2011.

He was likewise the co-editor of two collections of essays, the editor of a special issue of Social History, and the author of numerous articles. His work is esteemed by scholars of Spain, the Caribbean, and Latin America alike. He was committed to a transnational and global approach to history, and he brought that sensibility to his writing and his teaching with great effect.

At the time of his death, he had just completed a manuscript entitled “Flight to Freedom: A Spanish Prisoner in Napoleon’s Europe, 1814,” an edition of Lieutenant Fernando Blanco White’s account of his escape from captivity during the crisis of the Napoleonic Empire. Family and colleagues are working to make sure that it appears in print in the future.

Chris was thus a star in his field, but you would never hear it from him. Although he was a serious scholar, he never took himself too seriously. He was famously easygoing and laid back, a true breath of fresh air. He treated students, colleagues, and staff alike with courtesy and generosity. He loved to prepare delicious meals for faculty and staff friends, and he organized an informal dinner each semester to encourage fellowship among the graduate students, for whom he was a treasured mentor and advocate.
He formed and nurtured connections across the university with colleagues in the library, in Latin American Studies, in the Consortium of Studies on Race, Colonialism and Diaspora, and beyond. Among his many contributions to our community, Chris worked with the donor of his endowed chair to secure a generous gift to purchase materials for Tisch Library in the fields of Spanish and Latin American history. Chris collaborated closely with the librarians to fill gaps in the collection and to enable the library to support a richer experience for students conducting research in Atlantic history.

Chris's move to Tufts was actually a homecoming of sorts. Throughout his youth, he spent many summers in New England with family, and was particularly close to his grandparents, Dr. Robert H. Ebert, a former dean of the Harvard Medical School, and Emily Hirsch Ebert. One consequence of this time "out East" was his devotion to New England sports teams, particularly the Red Sox, but also the Patriots. After suffering through the lean years of Boston baseball and football from afar, he arrived here triumphant when his teams were ascendant. He had an encyclopedic knowledge of sports trivia stretching back to the 1970s and was equally at home discussing pitching rotations as slavery in the Caribbean. Whether it was world cup soccer or the NHL, Chris could talk sports intelligently with anyone. In addition, he was a true connoisseur of film noir and crime novels.

Chris's passion for sports was just one way in which he displayed his dry, yet sparkling sense of humor. Among friends and family, he was known for his hilarious one line emails and texts about anything under the sun. He loved delicious food and drink, and delighted in relating comical personal and professional anecdotes over a good beer. Simply put, he knew how to live well and how to bring joy to others. It was always a pleasure to spend time with him, no matter what the context. His loss has occasioned an outpouring of grief and love from the many students, colleagues, and friends he touched across the Americas and Europe.

During Chris's first year at Tufts, his daughter Althea was born, and it seems fitting to close this resolution with a mention of how much fatherhood meant to him. He adored Althea and delighted in sharing the latest pictures of her with colleagues in the department. Just a few months ago, he was beaming with pride when telling friends that she had learned to ride a bike. Indeed, the greatest cruelty of his loss is that he was taken from her so early in her life.

We ask that this resolution be included in the minutes of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, and that a copy be sent to Chris's parents, Elizabeth Ebert Schmidt-Nowara and Dr. Wolfgang Schmidt-Nowara, his siblings Molly and Peter Schmidt-Nowara, and his daughter Althea Rose Spieler-Nowara.

PROF. HABER: Thank you, Elizabeth. I move that the resolution be spread across the minutes and that copies be sent, as indicated. All in favor? Now the always worth waiting for, Dean Jim Glaser.
UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL OF THE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS

[Discussion on Tufts University relationship with the School of the Museum of Fine Arts]

DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES FOR FACULTY RESEARCH AWARDS COMMITTEE

PROF. TOBIN: The next two items on the agenda are bylaw changes, and I want to remind everyone that the way this works is when there's a bylaw change proposed, it is discussed, announced and discussed at one faculty meeting, but not voted on until the subsequent meeting. So this will be a presentation and discussion of these proposals, but if they are brought forward to a vote, that would be at the next AS&E meeting.

So the first of those is a proposed change for FRAC, Faculty Research Awards Committee. Jeff Berry and Behrouz Abedian are presenting that, or maybe just Jeff.

PROF. BERRY: My name is Jeff Berry. I'm chairing the Faculty Research Awards Committee this year with Behrouz Abedian. By way of background, there are 11 voting members of the committee, faculty members, who decide on the applications. In addition to that membership, there's a number of administrators or representatives of administrators who sit ex officio, and they play a very important role, because there's ongoing questions about grants administration. We also administer funds that the university has raised, the non-Tufts fund grants, fellowships, and they ask us to administer those as well, and there's always questions about eligibility.

That said, the only change we're making is the title of somebody who sits ex officio. We're changing it from one term to the other. So if you don't have this in front of you, we are changing the words from “Director of Research Administration” to “Associate Vice Provost of Research Administration.” We're simply reflecting changes that have been made in the administration. That's all it is. There's no implications for how FRAC operates. So if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. I'm not sure there's much that's controversial. Thank you.

DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES FOR THE TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you. So now that we've put all of you to asleep with that one, here's the next non-controversial proposal. Mark Golomb has proposals from the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Just to give a little background, in the spring of 2015, engineering created an Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion with respect to the school, and that committee considered in conjunction with faculty meetings at the school four different options. One was to leave things as they are; that is, we currently have a six-member committee on the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
The second option was to increase the size of T&P from its current six members to eight members and to require that at least two members of the expanded T&P be from the School of Engineering. The third option was to create two five-member subdivisions of AS&E’s Tenure and Promotion Committee, one subdivision for math and natural sciences and engineering, and another for arts, humanities and social sciences. And the fourth was to create a separate T&P Committee for the School of Engineering entirely.

After considerable discussion and voting, it became clear that the option that received the most support was to increase the size of T&P from six to eight and to increase the representation of the School of Engineering on that committee. So with that support, it established that we conduct an informal poll of eligible faculty in the School of Engineering, and that showed that there was indeed support for running for the additional spot that would be opened up.

Now, at the same time, the T&P Committee itself has noted that the increased size of the faculty and the increased depth of scholarship carried out by the faculty led us to propose that we would be better able to do our job if we had a larger pool of members on the committee. So independently, we would like to propose an increase in the size of T&P from six to eight. So the consequence of these two factors leads us to believe that now is an ideal time to act on the proposal. And you have a copy of the proposed changes in the bylaws in front of you.

Just to reiterate, the first change is to increase the size of T&P from six to eight. The second change is to increase the number of representation from arts and sciences from three to four. And the third change is to increase the number of representation of engineering from one to two. And also some minor technical changes. One is to remove the position of secretary, which has not been filled for many years now and we propose to remove the requirement that one-third of the committee be elected each year as to be practical to carry it out, given the natural turnover in the committee that takes place regularly.

And with that, I'd like to ask for questions and comments, discussion.

PROF. HOFKOSH: I'm just wondering what you would put in place of the current system of placing one-third of the committee every year?

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: So that actually naturally takes care of itself because of the way the committee is structured. So basically the answer is it happens roughly in any case.

PROF. MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. I think it's a good idea. I remember deciding against it some years ago, but times have changed, and it seems to me that really given the increased load in the last couple of years, and as Mark says, the increasing specificity of our work that this is probably just about the right time to do this. And as someone who's been on T&P and cares a great deal about it, I would say that I think it's an excellent idea. Thank you.
PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, German, Russian, Asian, former member, former chair of T&P, as was Beatrice. The workload certainly has I think led most of us to the breaking point. The number of cases has increased significantly. Just three years that I was there, they increased by 30 or 40 percent to the effect that we had some 28 cases last year between T&P and promotion. And Mark's very modest, counting on how many hours one spends is a lot of time preparation. It's definitely two courses worth of work, not one -- I mean, each semester, not just one.

I want to make sure that the committee is increased, that those two members will also get the course releases, that there will be no attempt to cut back the course releases by increasing the numbers. I'm not sure where that is decided, but it must end up somewhere, that there will be -- with the provost, okay. No, the Provost is shaking his head. AS&E, both?

I was first -- last year when it was raised, and I was chair, I was first sort of suspicious of it. My sense was that if we increase the number of people, it will take longer to then discuss each case, because more people end up speaking. But that's really not true. Everybody doesn't speak on every case. So I'm convinced that this may work.

The question is, as you pointed out, that it's been, in fact, only one member of the engineering school that has served, and that's not because we have not wanted to have more members. I think that's something like a third of the cases. I think last year, they were a quarter from engineering, but only a sixth of the effort came from engineering. It also meant that more arts and sciences are people in the Sciences, etcetera, but sometimes the humanities were working on engineering cases.

So one of the issues is will there be enough engineering faculty who would be willing to serve? And the other is whether they've considered -- they come out for election, because there are 80 engineers, and the rest of us are 300, or whatever. Then engineers, not because we don't like them, but they just don't get elected, because people don't know them.

My suggestion might be if you want more engineers to think about some kind of an election process that might change the bylaws, too, that maybe the engineering school picks those two members. That leads towards a kind of separation, I know. The downside is how do you get enough engineers volunteering to run for the position, and then how do we get them elected?

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: I think the problem of having engineers choose engineers is that this is a committee of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, and the faculty in arts and sciences should have the right to have a say in who from engineering is going to be adjudicating the case.

PROF. EVRIGENIS: Ioannis Evrigenis, classics and political science, and in this case, chairman for the Committee on Committees.

So a couple of relevant considerations here. In recent years, when we've tried to run elections to fill an engineering slot, we've had great difficulty in finding candidates. So I'm going to use the image that was used earlier. Our deliberations yielded a blinking green light that operates with a
token, because the weight here has to fall on the incentives that are going to be given to those who will be running.

So I think that the deans, I guess -- this is not the provost's responsibility. So if the deans are responsible for this, we feel that it has to be made clear what sorts of incentives and disincentives would be involved in participating on T&P.

Jillian ran a list of eligible people, which by the time you factored in leaves, ineligibility because people from a certain department are already represented, people cycling off and so on and so forth, you end up with a very small list of possible candidates. I mention this for a couple of reasons, because there is an informal procedure that has been operating for a number of years, which is to not go to associate professors for T&P. This is not written anywhere, but this has been a matter of debate both within the Committee on Committees, on T&P, and within departments.

I'm not sure that it would make things any easier for the faculty to discuss this and come up with a policy, but to those who oppose the participation of associate professors who are on T&P, I have to say that it may well come down to having to tap associate professors for membership on the ballots, simply because there's no one else to run. And I'll mention the most recent example, which was our North Korean election of last year, where we fielded a single candidate for single positions. And people objected to this, but this was the result of contacting every single eligible professor in engineering and getting one person to run. Thank you.

PROF. HOFKOSH: Sonia in English again. In response to that, it's curious to me that this has been -- not asking associate professors has been an unofficial policy, when, in fact, the official policy involves including associate professors, and I don't think we've ever discussed that issue as full faculty. So I'm just expressing a little reservation, having served on T&P as an associate professor, and I know I have colleagues who have also served as associate professors on T&P. So I'm just curious about this whole angle, sort of where it came from and whether it's something that ought to be discussed more broadly and decided in some official way, rather than have it be unofficial?

PROF. EVRIGENIS: So it's not a policy. It has been the subject of debate at various levels, including the Committee on Committees, T&P, and various departments. It reflects a series of things, some of which are I guess quasi-official policy, such as the preference for professors to be chairs of departments and so on and so forth.

So I'm not exactly clear what the policy is, but I know that there are people who have very strong feelings, either way. It is something that I think needs to be discussed and maybe something that needs to be included in the bylaws. I am offering it as a word of caution to those who have strong feelings on the side of simply having professors serve on it to be aware of the fact that you can't accommodate both preferences. You can't say that you want just professors on there, and then ask the professors and have not enough candidates to run. So it's simply a statement of fact, not a policy, and it's certainly not been a policy of the Committee of Committees.
When people approach candidates, they use a variety of criteria that include experience, past service, evidence of good work on other committees, and so on and so forth. So I think what I'm saying is that we require more clarity on whether there is strong feeling, either way, but that that is a consideration for at least some members of the faculty.

PROF. QUINTO: So I'm Todd Quinto, I'm in the math department, and I'm on T&P this year. I feel that there are two issues. One is the role of associate professors on T&P, and that I can say is probably a separate issue from the issue that we now have. The work demands so much time, and the faculty is growing, and the percentage of engineers versus arts and sciences are growing, that I think the motion, as it stands, is important.

I'd also like to ask you, Mark, I think you surveyed engineering faculty, and perhaps you could give information about the survey that you did regarding who would be able to be on T&P from engineering?

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Well, without putting anybody on the spot, I can say that the informal survey did yield certainly enough positive responses to be able to reassure Ioannis that when the time comes to build a slate of candidates, enough people are willing to serve. With the additional representation of the School of Engineering on the committee of T&P, when it comes to the additional responsibility, it should be fully understood.

PROF. RUANE: Kim Ruane from the Math Department. I just learned, being on the Executive Committee, that -- I've never been on T&P, but I realize there's also representatives from each of what it says here, humanities and arts and math, like you try to keep that representation. Is that a rule? I don't even know.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Yes.

PROF. RUANE: Is it possible to get a broader group of people to be able to serve to relax that role? Because, like I said, I've never served on T&P. I'm not saying you should have four math people on T&P at one time. But in the interest of balancing some of these things, when I first heard that, I was wondering, “Well, why couldn't there be an imbalance in that, when it's supposed to be you're really judging the person on some broad level anyway?” I don't know. I just am curious. I've never served on T&P, I want to make that clear that I have no idea how that works other than that I've gone through it. So just thought I'd bring that up.

PROF. HESCOTT: I'm Ben Hescott in computer science. I'm a junior engineer coming up next year, and I'm very supportive of this, so I wanted to sort of speak to the question that Todd had, in that this seems very transparent, the idea that there would be more engineers, or mathematicians would work, too, maybe for me. But the idea that we're represented and that people will be able to judge my case fairly, appropriately, and confidently so that when I'm on the other side of that, I know that it was done properly. That feels really good. So I am in full support.
PROF. TOBIN:  Maybe we could just have one more question so we can get on with the rest of
the agenda, and reminding everyone that we still have to come back for this faculty at the next
meeting.

PROF. JOHNSON:  Vida Johnson, again.  Just a reminder that last year, there was concern on
the committee that when a whole area, like humanities and arts, is not represented -- for example,
when a member of the committee, the sole member from that area has to recuse him or herself
because the case is in their department, and we did vote here now that we will actually ask from
past membership, ask faculty to replace, to serve on just that specific committee.

So if you can imagine that if the only engineers were not there, it would create a problem.   And I
think there is some sense that although, yes, we will (inaudible), but it is also important to have
some expertise, especially on theory, on approaches, etcetera that may be different among the
various groups.

So we sort of did the opposite of what you're suggesting, and I suspect, to take words out of
Ioannis's mouth, that that has not really been a problem filling those spots, filling the three areas to
be represented.  The only area that was a problem filling in was engineering.

PROF. VOGEL:  Part of the reason it's difficult to find an engineer -- Richard Vogel, engineering.
I was on the T&P Committee; it was my favorite committee of all committees in my 30 years here
-- part of the reason it's hard to get engineers is because Tufts has changed.  We now have instead
of Arts, Sciences and Engineering in the school, we have two schools. Just evidenced from the
proposals that I heard from the ad hoc committee that was developed, they actually came up with
the idea of having a separate committee that I don't think would have ever happened in the past.
It's to our detriment to think about the engineering school separate from any other department here
at Tufts.

I've always felt that we're just one huge department, and we claim we love to be on this campus
amongst all the others.  How different is it from physics?  If there's a physics case, there's only
probably -- not even a person from physics. And do they, and are they arguing, needing more?
Anyway, I'm in favor of the proposal, on the one hand. On the other hand, I think in order to
constitute the committee with engineers, the administration is going to have to think really long
and hard how to get back these engineers to think about themselves as part of the entire
community.

PROF. TOBIN:  And that's a great note to end on. Thank you.

CONCUSSIONS AT TUFTS
PROF. TOBIN: So I think probably most of us have noticed in the past couple of years a marked
increase in emails regarding students having concussions, and I'm sure a lot of us are curious to
know if there's been an epidemic of concussions that never happened before, or what's going on.
So Margaret Higham and Carol Baffi-Dugan are going to tell us a little bit about what's going on and what Tufts' policies are.

DR. HIGHAM: Good afternoon, everyone. It's been a couple of years since I've been invited to address this group, so nice to be here again. I'm Dr. Margaret Higham. I'm the medical director of the health services. And yes, there is an epidemic of concussions. So Carol and I are here to talk to you about what we're seeing on the Tufts campus and how we're trying to deal with this situation. I do have a PowerPoint.

So I'm going to start off with five minutes of everything you ever needed to know about concussions, so basic grounding for you. So concussions are common mild traumatic brain injuries. We think what happens on the cellular level is that there's damage to how energy is brought into the cells, neurons of the brain. And when you have a concussion, the cells need more energy, and less energy is coming in. I'm sure there's a more specific biochemical thing that goes on, but I'm kind of a practical person, so I just think about it like that.

So the cells need more energy, and the brain is actually -- the blood flow is actually providing less energy. So the brain cells really can't work as well as they usually do. We don't know how to best diagnose it or how to best treat it.

We see a lot of concussions. We saw 187 students last year between health services and athletics for a total of 535 visits. Most students have multiple visits for a concussion. Some students only had one or two. There were a number of students who had ten or fifteen visits, but on average, it was about three.

And about half of the concussions happen on the athletic playing field, and about half of them happen in everyday life, often on the weekend. So why is there an epidemic of concussions? It's a rapidly evolving field. There's a lot of research going on. Our old definition of concussion was that you were knocked unconscious, and the new definition is much, much milder. It's diagnosed by symptoms. There is no specific. There's no blood test. There's no brain scan which diagnoses a concussion.

We do hope that will happen sometime, because it's very difficult to diagnose based on just symptoms. So the symptoms are a headache, and some feeling of fuzziness or fogginess, and some possible type of injury. That's pretty broad.

There is a focus now on more minor symptoms. So in the past, we would have said, “Oh, you just had a ‘bell ringer.’” That's what they used to say in football. Now we say, “Oh, that's a concussion.” And it does not take a very forceful impact to cause the concussion. The number of students who develop concussion symptoms with bumping their head on a bunk or reaching into a bus to get a bag out, banging their head a little bit, I mean, we do those things every single day. And if you were to have a little bit of a headache afterwards and feel a little foggy, we would actually call it a concussion.
So we don't really know how to diagnose it, and we don't know really exactly how to treat it, and it is an evolving field. It's clear that where the brain cells aren't getting enough energy that they have to be rested in order to heal. But exactly how much and for how long is a matter of debate. And since each concussion is so individual, it's really hard to be categorical and have strict criteria.

What we do know now is that -- we used to tell people they had to sit in a dark room doing nothing for weeks on end until they had absolutely no symptoms, and then they could start to resume cognitive work, but now we know that that's actually not the case. The initial period of rest just needs to be for a day or two, followed by gradual return to normal cognitive work to the level that it doesn't cause you much symptoms. So it's a real trial and error thing.

We talk about sub-symptom threshold. So we tell students, “Okay, try reading for fifteen minutes, and if that gives you a headache, set your timer for ten minutes, and then wait an hour, and then try it for ten minutes.” It's very individualized and very particular like that.

So I know concussions are bedevilment to you. They are to the clinicians and for the students mainly. It's scary to have a concussion. Some people are more likely to get concussions than others. As you might imagine, someone whose brain is somewhat vulnerable or who have other neurologic, psychiatric conditions are more susceptible to having concussions.

So, for instance, people with mental health conditions, learning disabilities, ADHD, and migraines are all people who are at risk of having a more prolonged and complicated concussion. On average, a concussion lasts anywhere from one to three weeks, but there is a huge amount of unpredictability. Sometimes I see someone who has been frankly knocked out, doesn't remember ten minutes of their life, and multiple underlying neuropsychiatric conditions, and they're better in five days. Someone else might have none of those risk factors, not have such a bad injury, and take weeks and weeks to get better.

So it's extremely unpredictable, and that is hard for you, it's hard for us, and it's hard for the student. So that's a basic grounding in concussions as we know them today. Does anybody want to ask questions about sort of that basic stuff before we have Carol come and talk about how we're asking you to help us work with the students?

PROF. COUCH: What risks are we dealing with? I was wondering what the actual risks are. Because you gave us the symptoms, and you gave us the possible length of recovery, but what kind of risk factors are there?

DR. HIGHAM: So we know that repeated minor traumatic brain injury over time leads to more permanent brain injury. So we see that on a football player on sort of a grosser level. Football players, boxers who have repeated concussions and develop dementia or memory loss, declining cognitive function over time. So we don't fully know of long-term risks for milder symptoms like that, because the data is on more severely infected people.
There are actually some pretty great studies being done. Actually, one is looking at alumni of several major academic institutions in this area, including Tufts — Tufts, Harvard, MIT — and they did a questionnaire for alumni who are now 23-40 years out from graduation and asked them if they had concussion symptoms during the course of their life and correlated that with mood, a variety of cognitive measures, and actually found a statistically significant decrease, based on that questionnaire. Now, you don't know for sure, but that's an initial piece of data that's coming out.

PROF. POTT: Hi, Martha Pott, child study and human development. Since so much of the diagnostic tools that you have, so many of them rely on self-report, how do you distinguish this from generalized internalizing symptoms or need for attention?

DR. HIGHAM: You don't. There is no way to. That's what's so hard about it. All right, Carol.

ASSOC. DEAN BAFFI-DUGAN: Thank you so much for having us. I'm Carol Baffi-Dugan. I'm one of the Associate Deans of Undergraduate Education. In the arts and sciences, we are lovingly called the alpha deans, as you may know.

It's really ironic that I'm here today. Margaret doesn't even know this. My husband suffered a concussion nine days ago, and he's a physician, but I was the medical expert because of all I've learned from Margaret.

So folks at Dowling, health services, and athletics started getting together in maybe the spring of 2014 to talk about this issue, to talk about ways we can best support our students, and frankly, just as importantly, to talk about ways we can best support you.

We're very cognizant in Dowling of the fact that while we are student advocates, we need to be faculty advocates also. You guys get badgered a lot, and we are here to support you as well. So we came up with a system, if you will, a protocol. We ran through it for the '14-'15 academic year. We met again this summer to fine tune it, what worked, what didn't work. So my show and tell, Exhibit A and Exhibit B, I hope you all picked up. Its two sides of one piece of paper. And it's the form letters that we created a year ago and fine-tuned this past year. Some of you get many of them. And frankly, other than the first sentence, you only have to read it once.

But I want to just show you what we fine-tuned and why. First of all, we send a letter to the students. So I find out from Margaret or one of the trainers that a student got a concussion. I send a letter to the student. Two things changed about that letter. We copied the parent. The first one I sent out this year, the response from the parent was, "Whoa, what happened?" That was the whole email.

So we are glad we're copying the parent, because we found last year that sometimes the student didn't say anything for three or four weeks, and then the student was asking for special accommodations, and the parents were calling us and yelling at us. So it's about this one change.
The other changes, we added some little words to that letter. If you continue to experience symptoms, basically you are responsible. You need to follow up with your healthcare provider, whether it's someone in athletics or someone in health services, and you need to follow up with your associate dean. And we included the words, “including a possible medical leave of absence.” Because if the symptoms continue for a long period of time, the students really need to start thinking about how they modify their academic course load, rather than expecting you all to completely modify your syllabi to accommodate them. So we decided we needed to put that word right in there from day one. It's possible -- it's not automatic, but parents see that word right away.

The thing we changed for you guys in your letter is specifically, again, talking about what happens after a period of time. In the case that symptoms continue, the student is responsible for following up with their healthcare provider. At that point, I will work closely with the student to discuss the viability of continuing the semester and/or refer to Student Accessibility Services.

So you guys know that if you have a student coming to you week four, still asking for a two-week extension on the paper or a make-up exam or something like that, you legitimately can say, “Are you working with your associate dean?” and send them back to us. Because at a certain point, frankly, they need more support. They're either pulling the wool over all our eyes, or they really need more support. They're in trouble. They need to meet with Linda Sullivan. Maybe they have long-term cognitive disability that needs to be evaluated, and they get accommodations, maybe not. Maybe they're doing what Martha said.

But in any case, those are changes we put in place, and we're hoping this year things will go smoother by the student understanding that they have that responsibility, and you won't be badgered at week four or five. And also, you won't get a letter from some random doc out in the community telling you that the student has a concussion that funneled through our process.

PROF. HASSOUN: Soha Hassoun from Computer Science. So this topic is dear to my heart, because my child who was at Tufts for three weeks had a concussion, and she was out the whole year. So she came back, and she was doing pretty well, but she would relapse intermittently every time the workload spiked.

So I appreciated very much all the help that we got from various people at Tufts, but when it really came down to it, there was nobody that could diagnose her properly, and they said you have to go get an assessment test. Anywhere in the Boston area, the wait time for an assessment test was ten weeks.

So she ended up dropping a couple of classes, and we kind of dealt with it. But I felt that -- you know, this is the part where the first set of slides that it was a mild brain traumatic injury. In her case, it was not mild, and I felt the policies at Tufts were not accommodating the case where the concussions were not mild. A ten-week wait was just -- I mean, we just wrote off a couple of classes and moved on. So I just want to point that out in case there's more stuff that we can do for
the people that have very tough cases like that. Thank you.

PROF. BEDELL: Gary Bedell from occupational therapy. We have a number of people who this is their expertise in our department. I have a few questions. One was for graduate students. It seems like this is signed by you. Is this going to be a policy or a procedure for all students, undergrads?

ASSOC. DEAN BAFFI-DUGAN: You're raising a very interesting point, because as we all know, graduate students don't have alpha deans. Marisel Perez is the Associate Dean of Student Affairs, and she winds up playing a lot of the roles that we play for graduate students. So if, for instance, one of us heard that a graduate student had a concussion, probably we would refer them to Marisel. I don't think there's any mechanism in place at health services, or is there?

DR. HIGHAM: Well, for graduate students, we would communicate -- like if it's a Fletcher student, with the registrar at Fletcher. For an AS&E graduate student, it would be Marisel. But yes, we do communicate with advisors who are upper-level people. I don't know all the structure of the hierarchy there for graduate students.

PROF. BEDELL: So it sounds like there still is some lack of clarity. So because of the seriousness of this, I think it does make sense to have a more specific policy in terms of direct communication for graduate students. And I do agree with the last comment about the seriousness of mild traumatic brain injuries as well as concussions, and I agree there need to be these policies, but there may be the situation where the student cannot contact anyone because of the severity of the symptoms. So we have to look back, and just like with any of this, we have to sort of determine if this is reasonable, if there are some problems as well. So I agree with the last comment related to the seriousness and that we may have to look at each case on a case-by-case basis.

DR. HIGHAM: Absolutely, each case is case-by-case. I think our problem with communicating with the graduate schools is that they don't necessarily have the structure. And if they don't have the structure in place that we have in the undergraduate -- so there isn't, like Carol says, an alpha dean for Arts, Sciences and Engineering. So we communicate with the people that the schools tell us want to hear about it.

PROF. BEDELL: Right, but we rely on the health services. So I think that we can -- I'm not putting the onus of the responsibility on you, Carol. I think the responsibility is on health services to take care of all students.

DR. HIGHAM: Didn't I just say that we did?

PROF. BEDELL: I think there needs to be direct communication. So I'm just talking about the seriousness of this, that's all.
DR. HIGHAM: You mean instead of from this group of people going down to --

PROF. BEDELL: Right. I think you might be part of that decision-making as well.

DEAN COOK: John and I just conversed here, and Marisel should be the contact person on this particular problem.

ASSOC. DEAN BAFFI-DUGAN: She's aware of this process, because she was on this committee. On a scale of one to ten, I don't know if she's at a ten, like we are, in terms of hit this button, hit that button. But it's a very good point, and I'm going to go back, and that's the first thing on my list, to just check in with her, is she already doing this. Because they're already notifying her if it's AS&E.

DR. HIGHAM: She's already doing it. There's your answer, she's already doing it.

PROF. REMICK: Elizabeth Remick, political science. My experience with this has been that students have often tried to come back too quickly. So they're really pushing themselves hard. And I had a student who for weeks was just sitting there with his eyes spinning and clearly not really processing what was going on, but he wasn't trying to get accommodated. So what I did was reach out to your office. Is that what you want us to do when that happens?

ASSOC. DEAN BAFFI-DUGAN: Yes, please do reach out. That's actually addressed in the letter. This isn't just about the student who is asking for too much for too long. It's also the opposite. I can't remember exactly what the words are, but -- "contact me if the student tries to resume academic work too soon." Same thing. You know, we have a lot of ambitious students who don't want to slow down, and we can talk to them.

One of the things we always say, all of us alphas, we have one full faculty that we work with. People are understanding. We can ask for two or three weeks and then see how it goes. So yeah, definitely refer them. They would have already gotten an email from us, but definitely send them.

PROF. REMICK: Sometimes, they don't report it.

ASSOC. DEAN BAFFI-DUGAN: Well, if they don't report it, you definitely want to send them to health services and us, for sure. They don't know.

DR. HIGHAM: If we're seeing a student with a concussion, we're seeing them frequently and checking in with. "How are you doing? How long were you able to do this, what kind of work can you do?" But it does rely on the report of the student, and the student does have to come in. So you all do have a role to play if you feel that they're not accessing the services we have.

PROF. BEDELL: What is your referral process for things that you can't manage?
DR. HIGHAM: So we're a primary care office on campus. We do a really high level job with the concussions, but if there was somebody who needed care beyond what we could do, then we work with the family and the student, depending on what their preference is or what their health insurance is to access specialty care. There are concussion clinics. There are neurologists available.

You don't get the same level -- there's a lot of difference in how concussions are handled, even among specialists. So I have had students who I've been dealing with who are clearly impaired, and they see a neurologist who says, “Oh, no, you're fine.” It's such a new field, and there are not a lot of hard indicators to go by. So there's a lot of nuance and clinical expertise that goes into it. Thank you.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you all.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Jillian Dubman
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering
Proposed Change to the Bylaws of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering

Presented to the AS&E Faculty on September 30, 2015

(k) A Committee on Faculty Research Awards, consisting of eleven members of the faculty of professorial rank, appointed for staggered five-year terms. The membership shall include at least one member from each of the following areas: arts, engineering, humanities, natural sciences and mathematics, and social sciences. The following shall be members ex officio without vote: the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences or designee and the Dean of the School of Engineering or designee; the Director of Research Administration or designee; and the Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations. The committee may appoint such additional members, without vote, as it deems appropriate. The committee shall elect its chair at the last meeting of the spring semester of each academic year and the Secretary of the Faculty share shall serve as secretary of the committee. The committee shall distribute funds made available to it for support of research conducted by members of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering. Determinations concerning the distribution of funds shall be made by majority vote; in the event of a tie, the chair shall vote to break the tie. The committee shall be responsible for reviewing applications submitted to it, and, where appropriate, shall review evaluations, in support of the applications, from persons within and outside the university. In making awards, the committee shall promote faculty development by funding selected small projects and providing seed money for larger ones. The committee shall represent the faculty in seeking new internal and external sources of funding for the awards which it administers.
Text of proposed amendment of the bylaws of AS&E, Section IV part c)
Presented to the AS&E Faculty on September 30, 2015
(Current as of 9/22/2015 revised)

(c) A Committee on Tenure and Promotion, consisting of six eight tenured members of this faculty elected by the entire voting faculty, and the provost, without vote. At all times, the committee membership shall include at least one two members of the Faculty of the School of Engineering and three four members from the Faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences. At least one member shall represent each of the following areas in School of Arts and Sciences: the humanities and arts; the social sciences; the natural sciences and mathematics. No more than one member of a single department may be a member of this committee at any one time.

The committee shall elect its own chair, and secretary and vice chair. In the event that an individual being considered is a member of the same department as the chair of the committee, the vice chair shall serve as chair.

This committee shall review the qualifications of all individuals who are proposed for consideration for a tenured position or who are proposed for promotion above the rank of assistant professor, or who request such consideration. It shall requisition and consider all evidence that has a bearing on the individual under consideration. This shall include a departmental statement, and a privately submitted evaluation and recommendation to the Chair of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion from each tenured member of the candidate's department(s); nontenured members are invited to submit evaluations and recommendations but are not required to do so. After review of the confidential letters by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, the committee will forward these letters along with the rest of the candidate's dossier to the administration, unless the case is tabled. Confidential letters will be kept secure by the Secretary of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering for three years from the date of official action by the Board of Trustees on the candidate's application, at which time the letters will be destroyed, unless the administration has been legally enjoined from doing so.

The departmental statement shall reflect the full range of opinion of department members who vote on the application, record the numerical vote, and be signed by all voting members. When department members cannot agree on a single statement, a signed minority statement shall be submitted. The statement(s), including a list of members who voted, shall be made available to the candidate who has the option to submit a timely written response to the department statement. When pertinent, the views of colleagues, both tenured and nontenured, in other departments, and of individuals from outside the university shall be obtained. The committee may ask any of the above persons, or the candidate, to appear in person. Each department will maintain records of student opinion of faculty members, from which information about a candidate will be made available to the committee when appropriate.
For each candidate under consideration for tenure, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall create an external subcommittee. Each External Subcommittee shall consist of: (a) two members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, one of whom shall serve as chair; (b) two members of the department(s) concerned, elected by the tenured member(s) of the department; and (c) one member, hereafter referred to as the outside expert, selected by the tenured members of the department(s) concerned. This outside expert should be from the same discipline as the candidate, or a related field.

Members of the External Subcommittee shall review and meet to discuss all the evidence presented in a candidate's case. At the request of any single member of the External Subcommittee, the External Subcommittee shall meet with all of the voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for further deliberations. Such request may be expressed prior to the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may take place immediately following the External Subcommittee meeting (for the convenience of the outside expert). Such request may also be expressed at the conclusion of the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may have to take place on a later date. Following the External Subcommittee meeting, and, if requested, the larger meeting with all voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion also present, the Subcommittee Chair will prepare a written report that reflects the discussions and findings of these meetings; this report shall be signed by all members of the External Subcommittee and shall become a permanent part of the case that goes forward to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion and to the Administration, unless the case is tabled. In no case shall the External Subcommittee vote on the qualifications of the candidate.

For candidates who already hold tenured positions at comparable institutions, and whose appointment at Tufts does not involve a promotion in rank, the Tenure and Promotion Committee may, upon request from the department and the appropriate dean, review the case without the formation of an external subcommittee. In all other tenure cases or if after initial review of the case the Tenure and Promotion Committee feels that it is necessary, an external subcommittee shall be constituted and meet as described above.

For candidates under consideration for promotion to full professor or in any case where an external subcommittee is not convened, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall create an internal two-person Tenure and Promotion subcommittee responsible for overseeing and presenting the details of the case to the committee. If after initial review of the case the Tenure and Promotion Committee feels that it is necessary, the Tenure and Promotion Committee retains the right to gather more information in accordance with the procedures outlined in Statement 11 (see Guidelines for the Application and Review Procedures for Tenure and Promotion).

The Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall review and deliberate on all the available evidence in the case. The Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall (a) vote on the merits of each case, and it shall submit a written report of its findings for each case, including a record of the vote, to the appropriate dean; or (b) vote to table the case and report the vote to table to the appropriate dean.
The internal deliberations of the committee shall be considered strictly confidential and shall not be discussed with anyone except the voting members of the committee. The committee as a whole; however, may meet with other concerned parties to discuss cases as prescribed in Statement 11. The committee's final division on the vote shall be conveyed to the candidate and the relevant department or unit chair by the chair of the committee at the time such information is transmitted to the appropriate dean. The committee's procedures shall ensure that the candidate is made aware of the names of all proposed referees, subcommittee members, and consultants, and of authors of all unsolicited communications regarding the candidate, in sufficient time to permit written objections and/or alternative suggestions to be considered prior to relevant actions. Confidentiality of communications received by or on behalf of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be honored to the fullest extent permitted by law.

The committee shall also, in consultation with the provost and the deans of the associated schools, prepare and review periodically the general criteria for tenure and promotion. These shall be made available in writing to this faculty.

Nomination and election of members of this committee shall take place in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws. With the exception of the Grievance Panel, membership on this committee shall not preclude membership on any other committee of this faculty. A member shall serve for three years, commencing on May 1 of the year specified on the ballot; with the exception of the first election, one-third of the members shall be elected each year.