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PROF. TOBIN: We have a very, very full agenda today, so we're going to try to move things along quickly, so I'm going to get things started, but please just try to take your food and take your seats, and we'll get things going. I do just want to remind people when we get to discussion parts, if you wish to speak, wait until you're recognized and please wait for the microphone. This is important for keeping the records, and also please remember to identify yourself with your name and your department or affiliation.

The first item is old business. This is an announcement of the T&P Committee election results. Ioannis.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

T&P COMMITTEE ELECTIONS
PROF. EVRIGENIS: Good afternoon, everybody. It's not the announcement of the results, but it's the announcement of the election. So as you know, after the recent vote, the membership of the T&P has increased to eight, including at least one individual engineer. So we need to elect three people in an election that's going to take place in December for terms to begin in May. Of the three, one needs to be an engineer, and two more can be from the other disciplines. We would prefer to have a balance among the disciplines.

And we thus far have five great candidates. We have Judith Haber from English, Christos Georgakis from chemical and biological engineering, George McNinch from mathematics, Adlai Murdoch from romance languages, and Anil Saigal from mechanical engineering. Jillian will be accepting nominations until next Tuesday the 8th, and the election is going to be launched on Wednesday, December 9 and will run through 5:00 p.m. on Friday, December 11, and Jillian will be announcing the results on Monday, December 14. I'm sorry to be rushing this, but I have to run, but I'll be happy to answer questions. Thank you.

PROF. TOBIN: You've got one more thing to do. The next item is a vote on the proposed bylaw change for the committee on committees.

OLD BUSINESS

VOTE ON PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
PROF. EVRIGENIS: So just to remind you that the proposal was to allow a change to the bylaw that would permit members who have served more than half a term in replacing somebody can run in the following election. And as I said last time, my understanding was that this was a revision that would prevent people from dominating the committee, and it's very clear that we have the opposite problem in that we can't find enough people to fill the committee. I'll be happy to answer questions.

PROF. TOBIN: Are we ready to vote? I believe this requires a two-thirds majority; is that correct?
PROF. DEVOTO: If the bylaws (inaudible), yes.

PROF. TOBIN: All in favor? Let's do it by hands so we can see. All in favor, please raise your hands. All opposed? Abstentions? Passes. Thank you.

**VOTE ON PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY**

PROF. TOBIN: We have another vote on a proposed bylaw change. This is the committee on the library.

PROF. ABRAMSON: This bylaw committee change is being proposed in consultation with Laura Wood, Director of Tisch Library who is downtown today, so I'm sorry she wasn't able to make it here. It's a very simple change, as detailed in the handout today that was given to you.

The current version of the bylaw regarding the committee's membership specifically designates as one of the ex-officio members the associate director at the library for teaching, research, and information resources. As the handout indicates, this is no longer a title in use. Moreover, the person to whom this title once belonged, Laura Walters, is retiring.

And so the proposed version, the proposed language merely indicates that the other person from the library administration besides the director would be an associate director or designee. So it just allows more flexibility among the library committee's membership in terms of staffing the library. Any questions about this?

PROF. TOBIN: Seeing none, I think we can proceed to a vote. All those in favor of this change, please raise your hands. Opposed? Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you.

Moving on to new business, as we all know, our much valued and beloved colleague Robyn Gittleman is stepping down as Director of the Experimental College, and we have a resolution on her retirement. Howard?

**NEW BUSINESS**

**RESOLUTION ON THE RETIREMENT OF ROBYN GITTELMAN**

PROF. WOOLF: On behalf of the Experimental College, I'm here before you today to ask you to celebrate with us the career of Robyn Gittleman in this, the year of her retirement. Robyn came to Tufts in the early sixties as, to use the parlance of the day, a young faculty wife. But Robyn was always a woman with her own ideas. And believe me, that has not changed. Soon after Robyn's arrival, while she was raising Julia, Peter, and Tom, and at the same time doing graduate work in our education department, then president, Nils Wessell, was trying to resolve a dilemma. He was searching for some way to make Tufts more than, and I quote, "a good, gray school."
Working with a small group of faculty that included Robyn's life partner, Sol, President Wessell developed a plan for what would grow into the Experimental College. A very exciting yet somewhat ad hoc pilot project for much of the sixties and early seventies, the Experimental College began to be taken seriously in 1975, when Robyn became its first director and an associate dean of undergraduate studies.

Early in her tenure as director, Robyn steered the ExCollege through a time of great change, when other related educational initiatives, all well intentioned, fell by the wayside. Robyn had an idea. The ExCollege was not going to be another alternative. She was determined to keep it at the center of Tufts' liberal arts mission and use it to push the educational envelope.

The result was that in 1979, by unanimous vote of the faculty of arts, sciences, and engineering, the Experimental College was chartered as a standing department. The mandate that opens the charter captures Robyn's vision. Here's what it says, those two short sentences:

"The purpose of the Experimental College is to emphasize Tufts University's commitment to undergraduate education and to aid in maintaining the vitality of university programs. The College serves to initiate and test new educational ideas and programs, and also to develop and house programs and courses which cross departmental lines or do not fit well within any of the arts and sciences departments."

This vision, really Robyn's vision, still guides the ExCollege today, and will do so well into the future.

Given a solid base from which to work with the charter, Robyn put her ideas into practice. One of her first and most important was the founding of Explorations -- and I know many of you over the years have been involved -- a seminar program for pre-major advising which incorporated two of her abiding beliefs: the necessity of collaboration among faculty and students, and the value of peer teaching.

In 1984, she received an award which named Explorations as "the outstanding institutional advising program" in the country. Legions of first semester students have been introduced to study and life at Tufts through Robyn's unique endeavor.

As time went on, Robyn led the ExCollege with imagination and passion. She worked closely with hundreds of faculty, students, and administrators to bring, literally, thousands of participatory, cutting edge courses to Tufts. Moreover, she helped establish new, important programs, including peace and justice studies, communications and media studies, the Institute for Global Leadership, and the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute.

And if that weren't enough, Robyn branched out beyond the ExCollege, lending her voice, support, and yes, ideas to faculty and student colleagues on such bodies as the educational policy committee, the Leonard Carmichael society advisory board, the Tisch College advisory board, the women's studies program board, the advising and counseling committee, and the center for interdisciplinary studies executive board.
Robyn’s dedication to Tufts and her achievements over four decades of service have been recognized through the receipt of the Distinguished Alumni Award and the Senior Class Award in 1982, the Valeria Knapp Award in 1998, presented to the outstanding woman in education in Greater Boston, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Outstanding Service Award in 2007, to name just a few.

Indeed, a distinguished career, to say the least. Yet to those of us who’ve worked with Robyn, the thing that makes all else pale by comparison is the impact she's had on the lives of countless numbers of Tufts students after they've graduated. It's hard to convey the depth of the bonds she's formed. The steady stream of emails, phone calls, cards, and visits now spans generations. For so many, including ones who've gone on to be Tufts faculty, administrators, and trustees, Robyn remains a lifelong mentor and friend.

So let me end by saying thank you, Robyn, for me personally, and for all those you've touched. You leave us as someone who, in a very real sense, has transformed the university.

And now, as is the time honored tradition, on behalf of the Experimental College, be it resolved that this resolution on the retirement of Robyn Gittleman be spread on the minutes of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, and that a copy be sent to our honored colleague.

PROF. TOBIN: I think we can take it the resolution has passed.

SYLLABUS DISABILITY ACCESS STATEMENT

PROF. TOBIN: The next item is actually a carryover from the last meeting. We ran out of time with the discussion of SFMA, so I really want to thank Mark and Linda for being flexible and being willing to carry it over to this meeting.

ASSOC. PROVOST BRIMHALL-VARGAS: Thank you very much. This is hopefully a very brief item. One of the things that we’ve been discovering in the work of the diversity working group is that there are some things that we can do that are fairly easy for certain populations, and we want to solicit the help of the faculty particularly in one, particularly with the issue of students who have disabilities.

We have a situation of course on campus where students are identified as having disabilities of increasing population and finding themselves in a situation where unlike their high school experience, they often have to be more proactive to initiate support.

So we're actually looking to help our students by asking you to help them connect with Linda and her office with something that really can be as simple as cut and paste in the syllabus and a few more items.

So today is really just about a small amount of effort that can have a large impact, and Linda wants to talk to you about some of those details. And thank you for much.

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mark. Thank you everyone for having us today. We really
just wanted to talk very briefly about students who need accommodations in the classroom. I'm sure many of you have received emails and letters from our office. We support students here in the Medford campus who need accommodations. So far this year, we've written nearly a thousand letters to faculty regarding the need for accommodations for students in the classroom.

Things that will help the students overall who may need accommodations and then those who have learning differences, but not necessarily disabilities, are things like universal design in the classroom experience. Universal design incorporates presenting information in multiple modalities for students.

So some students are very visual in their learning styles. Others are very auditory. Some are very kinetic, kinesthetic, in that they have to have actually hands-on experience for learning objectives. So as you're designing courses for your spring semester, please keep these things in mind.

Another thing that is very helpful for students is to have a syllabus statement in your class. So in your syllabi, if you have a statement that refers students who think they have learning needs or a need for accommodations to the student accessibility services office, that's really helpful.

If you tend to use a lot of visually presented materials, such as video clips, other kinds of movies, if you will, those things need to be captioned, particularly if you have a student in your classroom who is hard of hearing. If you post those movies to the worldwide web for public consumption, they absolutely must be captioned. Our office is here to help you. Feel free to contact us if you have any questions about that whatsoever.

As you're posting documents to your Trunk sites and your other sites, please don't be shy about contacting us. Our assistant technology coordinator, Brianna Giacoppe, is happy to work with you about creating accessible documents here in the students accessibility services office.

This is a sample syllabus statement that we have up on our website. Please feel free to come to our website, copy, cut, and paste it into your syllabus. It will send your students directly to us if they have any questions. That's really it. Other than that, I just want to say thank you all for a wonderful semester and the support that you provide the students with disabilities here on campus.

ASSOC. PROVOST BRIMHALL-VARGAS: Are there any questions that people have about this? Cut and paste. Thank you very much.

PROPOSAL FOR MAKE-UP DAYS FOR CAMPUS CLOSING FOR SPRING 2016
PROF. HABER: The next thing is a proposal for make-up days for campus closing for spring 2016. I want to make a note that this is only for spring, and that there is only one proposal. It's this, or we wing it.

PROF. MAHONEY: I'm Anne Mahoney, chair of EPC. And yes, as Judith says, we're just
talking about this spring. Later, we will have a proposal for make-up days for subsequent semesters, but we haven't worked that out yet.

So what we propose is to do this year, if we need it, what we did last year. If it snows too much -- God forbid -- and if we need to make up days -- and that will be at the discretion of the deans -- we propose that the first choice make-up day should be the February holiday, Presidents Day. Second choice, if we need more, or if it doesn't start snowing until after Presidents Day, would be the first day of reading period. Third choice, like last year, and with reluctance like last year, would be Patriot's Day, Marathon Day, the April holiday.

It will be up to the deans to determine whether we need a make-up day, and if so, what day of the week is going to be made up. Last term, we disproportionately lost Mondays. Were that to happen again, we might designate a Monday, or the days to be spread out through the year, through the week. Maybe we don't need a make-up.

Like last term, completely optional. If a make-up day is scheduled, it's up to us as faculty to decide whether we choose to use it for some of our classes, for all of our classes, whatever. And again, this only refers to this coming spring semester. We're working with the ad hoc committee and the academic calendar to design something going forward. We're not ready to talk about that now, just about this spring.

Please, God, it doesn't snow. Questions? Shall we vote? All in favor? Any opposed? Anyone wishing to be recorded as abstaining?

PROF. HABER: The motion passes. Thank you, Anne.

Next we have an important presentation on the inclusive classroom with President Monaco and Provost Harris and a number of other people.

DISCUSSION OF THE INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM
PRESIDENT MONACO: Thank you. When I arrived in 2011, I went to a lot of student forums to listen to the concerns of students of color in particular about the environment on campus, both inside and outside the classroom. That led to the Diversity Council and a report which you're all well aware of.

I recently went with Mark Brimhall-Vargas to see the students at the Africana center, and there still seems to be quite a major concern about the ability for faculty to create an inclusive classroom. This is something that I told him I would be happy to talk to the faculty about, I think at this stage, just for your information, to plant the seed even further, and maybe next semester, we can come back and talk about it further, maybe with some proposals.

But for this discussion, I would suggest that we have David Harris introduce Donna Qualters, the head of CELT, because one of the recommendations out of the diversity council report was to have some programming for faculty around an inclusive learning environment, so she can describe what she's done in that area. And secondly, we have excellent faculty in the psychology
department in Keith Maddox, Sam Sommers, and Jessica Remedios, who work in this area -- and I'd ask them just to say a few words about their worth, if possible. But again, we might not have time for discussions, but if we do, we'd be happy to hear a few comments, but I'd like to have a further discussion next semester. Thank you.

PROVOST HARRIS: Let me just start with a quick story. And some of you have heard me say this, but it's just an example of -- you know, I think of myself as a good liberal, progressive on all these issues. But there was one time my very first semester in teaching in which I created an environment that was far less inclusive than it needed to be for a student in my class.

And the mistake I made was -- and I'm sure there's been many others that I'm just not aware of -- but the mistake I made was in forgetting as the semester wore on that the fact that the vast majority of the students in my honors Intro to Sociology class, the vast majority of them were quite wealthy. I forgot about the fact that the vast majority are quite wealthy doesn't mean all of them are quite wealthy.

And, in fact, the young woman who fits our stereotype of not being poor -- she was quite blond, dressed as well as everybody else, and just sort of fell into this -- and she had the courage to tell me after one of the comments I had made that, "You know, it's really hard being in this class when you make comments that sort of imply that we're wealthy, and we don't understand the struggles of being poor."

And she told me how she was on full financial aid and so forth. And it was a great moment, because it forced me to realize that there's little things that I do that I don't need to do, and I need to be more confident in myself, because I want that young woman and everyone, of course, to achieve their full potential.

And I tell you that story because -- not too proud a moment, certainly, but I doubt I'm alone. And when I hear from students the little things that we do that we're just not even aware of. And this is not about censoring and saying be hyper-sensitive about everything. It is instead about those little things -- sometimes bigger things, but often little things that if we're more cognizant of, we can have an environment where all of our students achieve their full potential.

And the flip side of that is one of the things I'm most concerned about, incredibly concerned about is about the performance of our students.

I'm also concerned about the faculty, and I'm concerned about faculty self-censoring far more than you might need to. A concern that one wrong word is going to end up with you on the front page of The Daily or some such thing.

And so I'm really excited about this mission called TALES, and I'm excited about CELT. Because I think that what we're able to do here is to provide opportunities, and we can understand, and Donna will talk about this, a range of types of training, depending on -- I shouldn't say training -- a range of opportunities, depending on what field you're in and so forth to allow everyone and help everyone become even more comfortable with creating an inclusive class and in feeling more comfortable in talking about what we say, to do what we need to do to
push the hard issues without fearing more than we need to about being (inaudible).

So that's the long and short of it. Donna Qualters and the work they're doing in CELT. We've asked Donna to talk to us a little bit about what we are doing already, and if some of you have already taken advantage of it, about some of the things that are happening around the country briefly, and you'll hear more from some of our scholars in the area, just very briefly. Thanks, Donna.

DR. QUALTERS: Thank you. I hope to give you a very brief introduction in what I hope is ongoing, continuing, deep conversations among the faculty about this issue. Before I talk about what we do, I want to just tell you a little bit about why we're doing what we do. I think that it's important to understand the background.

The obvious question is what is inclusive teaching? What is an inclusive classroom? What does that mean? Well, we've heard many definitions. We've heard about universal design. We hear about active engaged learning. We hear about student-centered learning. And all of those are pedagogies that do lead towards inclusion, but it's not enough.

So what we've done at CELT is we've adopted the Salazar Intuit Model for inclusive excellence. I want to tell you a little bit about what it is, and that will tell you why we developed the programs that we developed.

The first level is what's called intrapersonal, and that's really the hardest level. That's where we look deeply at ourselves and our beliefs and our assumptions about who we are, what we teach, how we teach. As you know, assumptions drive practice, so we have to raise those, and we have to think about that.

The second level is the interpersonal, and that says as a community, faculty, staff, students, administrators, we have to develop the skills to have productive dialogues across differences. We have to know how to have those difficult dialogues, both in the class and outside of the class.

The third level is the curriculum, and this challenges us to broaden our curriculum, to add to it so that every student in our classroom can see themselves in the discipline.

And if we do the work in those three levels, we get to that wonderful fourth level, which is an inclusive culture on campus.

So as many of you know, under Annie Soisson's leadership and with my colleagues Alicia Russell and Ed Morgan, we have a three-year grant from the Davis Foundation. We've been thinking about this for a while. This is actually the third year of that grant.

So what we've done and what many of you have participated in and what we hope you'll start engaging in is under the first couple of levels, intra- and inter-, you had faculty learning communities where six to eight faculty had come together for a year to wrestle with these things. We had them on difficult dialogues and inclusive teaching, on inclusion and STEM disciplines.
This semester, we're running one on inclusive assessment, where we're going to explore how do you assess student learning that's equitable, but may not be homogenous. What do you do?

And then we also have one on inclusion in large classes reflective of spaces. How do you do that? How do you create it? We've done that. We also have had some transformative experiences in the past. If anyone here went to our two-day difficult dialogue workshop, you can't come out of that without thinking differently and thinking seriously about what your role is.

We've also worked with some departments who have come and asked us to have these conversations, to talk about inclusion. Arts and sciences and engineering very graciously has us do a full day with the new faculty on inclusion and inclusive teaching and inclusive pedagogy, what that means.

And the most exciting thing I want you to put on your calendars -- and I would make you take your IPhones out right now and do it -- but on May 23 and 24, we are having a two-day conference with our colleagues in ETS called “Inclusive Excellence, Teaching and Learning in a Global Interconnected World.”

We're bringing in some experts from across the country on this, but more importantly, we're having our faculty present to their colleagues, those who have been in the learning communities and those in the different campuses who are doing work. We're asking them to come and share what they're doing, how they're doing their inclusive classes, and how they're making a difference. So be on the lookout for that notice, May 23 and 24.

But more importantly, at CELT, we are infusing this model into everything we do. So if you're going to come to a learning institute, you want to be a CELT fellow, if you're going to come to our new learning assessment institute, if you're going to come to the book group, if you're going to even talk to us, we are going to talk about this inclusive excellence model. We are going to talk about how do we do this? It's not easy. It's hard work. And we need to do it together.

But the payoff for me is that what we'll do, if we do this work together, we all work to create that inclusive requirement, we are going to produce students who will be able to function, who will be leaders in this global interconnected inclusive world. So thank you for listening to me, and I'm going to turn it over to Keith and Sam, who are going to talk a little bit about (inaudible), which is really that (inaudible).

PROF. MADDOX: So we realize we don't have a whole lot of time address you, so we'll try and be somewhat brief and leave time for conversation.

But in general, as was pointed out by Tony and David and some others that we are in the psychology department and all have done research and have empirical focuses looking at some of these issues with respect to how people sort of think about themselves with respect to stereotyping and prejudice, the extent to which (inaudible) beliefs about yourself, the sort of implicit associations that you may use in terms of making judgments of some other people, your interactions with other people who belong to different groups.
And essentially, we've all been involved empirically in terms of documenting some of these kinds of challenges that are related to lots of different domains, but in particular in terms of education, with respect to those individuals who may be having those biases and using those biases to evaluate others, as well as Jessica's work and the extent to which you might be a person who's a member of these groups and seeing how that group membership, that level of stigmatization might affect you in terms of your outcomes and performance. And I think I can sort of speak for all of us to just basically say that in the environment here, the challenges that we face here at Tufts obviously are not unique to Tufts. They're all over the place. But again, there are ways in which you can use both empirical and anecdotal approaches, put them together and try to address these problems and challenges.

The issue facing us today, having to do with the idea of training and engaging faculty to think a little bit more about how these things can play out in the classrooms, all we can really offer is that we've all been involved in opportunities to engage in training of faculty members, things like that.

We understand that in that sense, we're enlightening people, giving them a perspective on ways in which they can think about themselves that may be different from what they thought before, and to some extent, some of those transformative experiences that might help them motivate you to make some change.

But ultimately, it's a mandate that we have because excellence is important. It's important for all our students, not just the students who are in certain groups. And the faculty basically has a mandate to make some of these types of changes to engage in these activities and make the environment better for all of our students.

I'm not sure if there's anything else that anyone else wants to add, but in general, again, this is a conversation that's going to be ongoing. I think the only other thing I would mention is that when we do these kinds of efforts, we need to not just sort of put them in play and sort of hope that they work. Again, through the Diversity Council Report and a number of other perspectives, it's important that we have an assessment and evaluation approach to these kinds of efforts.

So when we do something and we try something, we have to have metrics to try to understand whether or not it's working, but we also have to be able to have metrics to understand why it's working and whether or not there needs to be changes in order to make that program better.

So as long we're thinking about assessment and evaluation in addition to the kinds of trainings that we're going to offer, I think we're going to be in a much better position that when we make a change, it's going to be sustainable, and a change that's going to actually have impact on our students.

PRESIDENT MONACO: Any questions for the faculty or Donna or David and I? Concerns?

PROVOST HARRIS: I'd like to ask a question. Just reflecting on the conversation I had with
the physics department on Monday, one of the comments that was made there was I think most of us know that physics has been really ahead of many other fields in terms of trying to bring research about teaching -- do research on teaching and have it affect the ways in which physics is taught. Other fields have it. Physics is definitely on the right trail of that distribution.

And one of the comments someone made there was if we're going to do these things, it seems that it ought to be empirically based where at all possible. So I just want to make it explicit, which is clear to everyone, that that's part of why it's so important to have faculty members in psychology talking about this.

What we've set as a strategic plan, and I know Donna certainly believes deeply in CELT, is that this work around diversity and inclusive classrooms, it doesn't have to be, and it shouldn't be something that's just based on your values, we think X would be a good idea. There's rigorous research to help us understand what's good and what's less helpful. And so I'm really excited about finding ways to link up efforts with what's happening in CELT. Thanks.

PROF. BISHARA: I'm Amahl Bishara, anthropology. I just had a quick question. I'd love to hear more about the meeting with the students that you referenced, and also a broader question that we can't necessarily answer today, but I would love to think about. What can we do more in general to make sure that there are open routes of conversation between, among student activists and students in general and us in our meetings here, and between students and faculty more general on these important issues?

PRESIDENT MONACO: Well, thank you. At that meeting we had in the Africana Center, they raised a range of concerns. Many of them I had heard before, which led to the Diversity Council. So it was very similar concerns, maybe different (inaudible). This one, they were really pushing that they feel faculty should be mandated to do this type of, I'll call it training, you know, programming to help them in this area.

And I said, “Well, it's very difficult to get faculty to agree to be trained in something where everyone has to go through it. We want them to feel motivated to do these types of programs because they think it'll help their classroom and the students.” So that's why I agreed we would bring it to the faculty today to just make sure everyone understood what was available and what some of the scholarship and research is behind this area.

Then we got the demands from the students, which were very similar to the concerns. We had a very good meeting last night with another 30-plus students. There were about 12 administrators, and we went through the demands. We got through eight out of ten, and it was a very productive conversation, and we made a number of things which we agreed to that we'd be able to support to help them in their concerns, and then a number of issues which are much more complex and difficult.

For example, admissions, percentage of faculty. Those are much more difficult for us to get to where they would like us to be, but they're certainly aspirational goals. So at this point, we are going to write up what we agreed and give it back to the students to reflect on. But they seem
to be fine. They're very concerned right now about their finals and the workload they have. Whether we have another meeting with them before the break or we meet afterwards, I think this is going to be a continual conversation.

But I thought last night was very productive, and they were very articulate about their frustrations and how the administration and faculty could help them.

PROF. ORIANS: Colin Orians of biology. We all are short of time this time of year, and I feel like this is a really important issue, and I'm wondering if CELT has -- some of us teach classes 75-plus, some of us teach classes 35, 55. Some of us teach small seminars. Is there a two or three page cheat sheet that would be geared towards those kinds of inclusive issues if you're in a large classroom?

Because I think for any of us who want to engage, we need to have something small, short that we can read to think about in the context of the kinds of classroom dynamics we create in a large lecture class versus a small seminar. And if there was just something to help us sort of fake through it carefully, quickly, then maybe you could get more faculty to sort of jump on board.

PRESIDENT MONACO: Yes. I'll let Donna answer that, but I think that's really the question here. How do you scale up something that would benefit all faculty without having to mandate that they spend either a half a day or two days doing this type of training if they're not even motivated (inaudible).

DR. QUALTERS: Of course, we can come up -- we have tons of literature. We have tons of things we can come up with. But what I do want to talk about is taking that and thinking about it in the context of your own belief system and how this is implemented in what you do. It's not really an easy approach, if I do X, my class would be inclusive.

So yes, we can have those. We can put them up. We'll get them out. We'll get them on our website, teaching at Tufts website, but I think it's more than engaging and a discussion amongst faculty about what this means. But yes. My short answer is yes, and my long answer is also yes.

PRESIDENT MONACO: If there are any questions -- I really wanted to have this session. The first thing is I promised the students that we would talk about it. The second thing, I'd like to think about next semester maybe having a longer discussions with some proposals with some of the experts on what we might do to do better in this area so that our students don't have these frustrations and concerns about the classroom. Thank you very much.

PROF. HABER: Thank you, President Monaco, for opening discussion on this important topic, and we will continue it next semester.

The final item is an exploratory discussion of possible divestment of fossil fuels from the university's endowment funds led by Paul Joseph and Henry Jacqz. There will not be a vote on this. It's only an exploratory discussion.
DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE DIVESTMENT OF FOSSIL FUELS FROM THE UNIVERSITY’S ENDOWMENT FUNDS

PROF. JOSEPH: So I want to express first my thanks to the executive committee for carving out some time in a busy semester to address this issue and to also acknowledge that the core of this really comes from students -- the impetus to discuss this issue really comes from across the campus for the last two or three years.

So there's been a working committee of students and faculty who have been primed to look a little bit more closely about the events (inaudible) accomplished, and I'd just like to introduce briefly the other members of the committee besides myself: Ann Rappaport, Jonathan Kenny, and John Durant, who's somewhere here, and also some students on the committee, Shana Gallagher, Brian McGough, and Henry Jacqz, who are here as well.

This conversation has taken place in a lot of different arenas and a lot of different places, and I would also like to acknowledge one of the places where I'm proud to work at Tufts for a long, long time, the kind of place that it is. There's been a pretty good back and forth between ourselves and the administrators, too.

So Tony Monaco as president, Patricia Campbell, executive vice president in the back, also access to Peter Dolan, who's the chair of the board of trustees, Laurie Gabriel, head of the investment committee of the board of trustees, and Sally Duncan from the investment office.

So there's been a fair amount of transparency in conversation, which I think reflects well on the university as a whole. There are a lot of serious-minded people who are trying to grapple with this issue. There's no question of it being shoved underneath the rug.

So very briefly, this is the opening of a conversation. In our discussion, we don't really have a strong sense of where the faculty is at on divestment. It's of course very important to get some sense of where that is, and there's no resolution about that right now.

So the starting point for us is that something that I'm sure is shared by everyone in the room, is that with climate change being a very severe threat, the world as we know it is changing. The challenge to our perception, because the rate of the change doesn't map exactly with the life span.

But if you look at the life span of the planet, it's undeniable that there's change, large and small. There are climate scientists who are predicting that if the planet continues to warm three degrees Centigrade, there will be catastrophic consequences for agriculture, for people who are in the country, their existence.

For agriculture and the rest, large scale problems, all the way down to small scale problems, like members of the faculty of a university in the northeast all of a sudden making contingency plans for what will happen if there is a proliferation of storms like there was last year. Small change, but it's registering.

A second point I think that's especially important here is that the political process to grapple with
this is taking place at the state level, municipal level, national level, international level. And we are making some progress, hesitant, but so far, the sum of all those efforts is inadequate. We're meeting now in Paris, the major countries, NGOs, scientists, concerned citizens about this. Under the best case scenario, the resolutions, the treaties that may pass in Paris will still result in agreements that will curb emissions by only half of what we need to do.

So there is a political process, especially in our own country here in the United States that is flawed and is not grappling with this issue. The political process is also compromised. It's contaminated. It's greatly influenced, too, by the disproportional impact of the fossil fuel companies themselves. So there's a tax on science that has been supported by fossil fuel companies. The (inaudible) and paid contributions and personal tax (inaudible) who are pushing for greater realization of what changes are taking place.

I'd like to correct this perception many people have about divestment, which is that the target of it is not the fossil fuel companies themselves. This is really a symbolic act to send a message, a statement about the urgency, the importance of this particular issue. It signals an intent to move more strongly towards renewables. It stigmatizes a problem of carbon emissions more clearly than we've been able to do so far. It signals the importance, the necessity of the change that we must undertake.

It can have a profound impact on public education and awareness. (Inaudible) used in various times in the past to some success, and I think it's very important for us to take this step as well.

Another misperception about divestment in terms of other kinds of proposals, such as the adoption of a carbon pricing structure or a carbon tax. And we don't see this as an either/or kind of question. I think almost everyone on our committee, our group, would in fact favor the passage of carbon pricing at the national level, and we're toying with the idea of the possibilities that this could be implemented in some demonstration (inaudible) within the university as well.

Divestment is not the only answer, but it is a necessary part of the answer. It's a place of invigorating the political realm to look at the path that we're on and to really try to jump start a search for better alternatives.

Universities have a special responsibility in this process. We pride ourselves as being an environmental university. We pride ourselves on our global status. We pride ourselves on civic engagement and our commitment to all of those. But in its own way, the university is a type of citizen, or at the very least, we are a social actor of some significance.

Our decisions have an impact, and it's important to register those. I think it's important to change those. I think we have a special responsibility here in this respect to take actions that are commensurate with the problems that we face. And especially because we have the knowledge among ourselves to realize what is happening outside in the world, we have responsibility to try and make every effort we can to make those changes. We do that internally, and I think we need to send this statement to all. Thank you.
I'd like to introduce Henry, who's one of the students who has been involved in this process from the onset. He's got a few words to say.

MR. JACQZ: Thanks for having me. It's an honor getting to talk in front of all of our faculty. I'm representing the Tufts Climate Action Group at large.

I'm here as a student to address the issue of fossil fuel divestment. We have run a divestment campaign for four years, urging our administration to take action against what we see as one of the greatest injustices of our present day. Our university has refused to act, and has instead committed itself to upholding the current political status quo that is governed by the fossil fuel's disproportionate influence.

The fossil fuel industry has used its tremendous power to block the clear action necessary to deliver us to a just and sustainable future. Looking back at 30 years of this inaction, we see the devastating impact of climate in action and of irresponsible carbon extraction and emission. Impacts that have been felt first and most violently in the poor and marginalized communities that bear the greatest brunt of toxic mining projects, dangerous pipelines, including power plants.

Our university's inaction is complicity in this process. We must act. We must join the growing global movement calling for divestment in fossil fuels. As students looking forward, ahead, we recognize that our generation must confront the burden of climate change, create technologies, devise policies for adaption, learn to navigate a world where our livelihoods are fundamentally altered due to changing weather and serious resource constraints.

We look to front line communities in the United States, and elsewhere, they are already struggling to make ends meet under the current system of climate injustice. We empathize with their struggle, knowing ours may be similar to theirs in just a matter of years. Today, all of us stand at a decisive junction in history.

Alone, we as students will not be able to convince the board of trustees to divest from fossil fuels. However, with the voices of the faculty supporting our goal and with the courageous outpouring of other mission-based institutions, including other universities, divesting their own endowments, we can all together pave the way to a brighter future.

As a student, I am here to ask you, our professors, whether you will stand with us, whether you are comfortable passing on a massively injured planet to my generation, a planet that is less able to support life and love and pursuit of knowledge and justice, or whether you will demand our university, Tufts University, take the steps at our disposal? Thank you. I'm excited for the discussion.

PROF. HABER: Comments or questions from the floor?

PROF. MAHONEY: Anne Mahoney, classics. So what percentage of our endowment is tied up or implicated in the fossil fuel industry, even roughly?
PROF. JOSEPH: It's relatively small, only about two percent.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CAMPBELL: Yes, that's right. And we don't directly hold equity investments in fossil fuel companies. We invest with managers, who manage a particular kind of asset class, and they have the discretion to invest in a variety of ways, and some of them have investments in companies that are considered, you know, associated with fossil fuel. So they're not direct investments. It's indirectly held through a fund that we invest in.

PROF. JOSEPH: So divestment at Tufts is a complex process, because it's not as simple as selling two percent of our investments that are held directly. Those holdings are in, I believe they call them comingled funds. So you'd have to move out of those comingled funds, and that is a complicated process that would take time. The supporters of the divestment recognizes the complexity of this and don't see this as an immediate process that could be implemented overnight. Usually the time frame for this is five years.

PROF. JOHNSON: I had the same question about what is actually involved, but I'm disturbed to think that just because our hands are clean, sort of, we don't have direct investment, but somebody else is doing it for us doesn't sit very well with me, either. So what will it take -- I'm a pretty practical person. What will it take to get this moving, a resolution of the faculty, or what process? Obviously, you've been thinking of it for a long time. You know, I haven't heard such a good, rousing talk to action in probably, I don't know, 40 years. It certainly made me look back and think about what were we doing then? We were sitting in the president's office, and not getting punished for it. And so what I want to know is -- now I'm older and wiser, and I understand that things take a process and time, but I can't imagine that this isn't doable without damaging the finances of the university in the long run.

PROF. JOSEPH: Could we get just a variety of comments?

PROF. HABER: More comments?

PROF. HAMMER: David Hammer in education and physics. I'd like to say -- I'm going to start out giving some credentials for myself. I bike to and from every day, when I'm physically able. I have solar panels all over my house. The thermostat is set at 66, despite the complaints of visitors to our house. We have a Nest thermostat, and can turn it down -- it's at 62 right now. I care a lot about this issue.

I just want to express a concern for this and for other issues as well about vilifying the opposition. So I say I'm not sure it's the right thing to do to divest. I don't know -- the argument Paul gave about the gesture and the symbolism makes a lot of sense. But as an economic action, I'd love to talk with somebody. It seems like this is driven by consumers and not by investors. Would it make a difference if major investors -- I'd love to hear an analysis of whether it actually structurally would matter.

So I think there are reasonable -- and would it hurt the finances of the university? I guess it's
two percent of a (inaudible) version that doesn't seem like it would hurt the university so terribly. But I'd like to mainly ask for a stance and a rhetoric that assumes the other side has good intentions, and the other side is rational and sensible on this, as on other topics.

PROF. JOSEPH: The other side is who?

PROF. HAMMER: Those who may not stand with the students or the committee in support of divestment. They may not be evil people.

UNKNOWN FACULTY MEMBER: We're not.

PROF. METCALF: So Gib Metcalf of the Department of Economics. I have worked on this issue of greenhouse gas emissions for the past decade, and I've worked in the U.S. government on this issue. I'm going to Paris for the negotiations to be on a couple of panels this weekend.

So I'm thrilled to see the interest in the issue, and I want to thank Paul and Henry for leading this discussion. But having said that, I'm like David. I'm troubled by the initiative, and here are a few of the things that trouble me.

First -- and I think it's clear in the seven-page handout, the facts that were circulated for the meeting, divestment will have no material impact on the fossil fuel companies. The analysis is pretty clear on that. If universities sell their holdings, there are lots of other investors that will come in and buy those. Think India and China that are using fossil fuels.

So point one is that divestment will not lead to less fossil fuel use. It is government policies, like carbon pricing a regulation, like the EPA's power plant. These will lead to less fossil fuel use. That's point one.

Point two, as was pointed out, that it will have a material impact on the university. And the divestment report that a group put out I think it was last year I think articulates that quite well. I was looking at that yesterday. And the loss in market value to the endowment because of the ways that investing would have to change, were we to go ahead with this -- two percent is not the right thing to focus on. It's the change in investment practices that matter.

According to the report, the loss in market value is on the order of $75 million in the short run -- five-year period, three- to five-year period -- and as much as $1.7 to $2 billion in the long run. Well, at a four percent spending rate, that's money that's not available for financial aid, for inclusion education, or to hire faculty to work on the research to get us to a clean energy economy. So this strikes me as a very expensive gesture that we would be making.

And the last point I just want to make is that it's just -- divestment is just not tackling the right problem. And I think David Hammer really made an important point, this notion of stigmatizing the opposition I think is really unhelpful.

Because if we're ever going to get carbon pricing in the United States at the national level, or
even at the state level -- and the state senator, Mike Barrett from Lexington is pushing a state level carbon tax, and I encourage you to look at that -- we will need a bipartisan solution. We need Republicans on board for doing that.

So when I go to Washington to talk to hill staffers, it's really clear that the more we make this a stigmatizing effort or a moral crusade, the less easy it is to come to a bipartisan solution.

And I also think that we have limited bandwidth. The more time we're spending on divestment, the less time we're spending on getting our carbon price in place, which is really what we need to be doing.

So I just feel like we have a relative advantage or comparative advantage at universities of doing research that can help us design good policies, sufficient policies, and design the solution, the clean energy solutions, or the adaptation, the cultural adaptations that will lead to live in a warmer world. And I'm just troubled by such a simplistic solution to such a complex problem. So those are some of my concerns.

PROF. HABER: Others?

PROF. ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology and environmental studies. This is an issue that I really sort of struggle with. But I guess there are two comments that I want to make, because I find both sides quite compelling in their arguments. I do really believe there's a symbolic statement here about what we want as a university. But more than anything else, what troubles me is the behavior of some, but not all, fossil fuel companies.

Exxon has been in the news a lot. They're actively trying to deceive us about the science behind climate change. And for me, at a place of higher education, where we're trying to sort of understand new knowledge and come to a greater understanding, to have companies like Exxon constantly trying to undermine our understanding of this issue, to me is really problematic.

So while I'm not sure I think that sort of a blanket divestment of all fossil fuel companies, I do find myself really finding that companies like Exxon that support disinformation, deception is really unconscionable in this world. And so I'm trying to sort of wrestle with what does it mean to have investments perhaps in Exxon, for example?

It's a little bit like the tobacco companies and the way they try to deceive us about the knowledge of secondhand smoke. And so I just would like us to sort of think about we as an institute of higher education and our support through our stocks and our investments in the companies that are trying to deceive us.

PROF. HABER: Thanks, Colin. Others in the audience?

PROF. JOSEPH: I was hoping for more feedback, just center of gravity. Where are we at? I mean, we can have a debate here in response to Gib's comments, but I would love to hear more.
PROF. KRIMSKY: Hi, Shelly Krimsky in UEP. I also feel concerned about the symbolic importance of programs like this. I'm just wondering, Paul, has your group looked at how well Tufts is currently doing about its own carbon footprint? Years ago, we began thinking about that. How are we doing? We could be doing maybe a lot more just by looking at what kinds of energy we're using and how we're doing it and whether we can create more efficient uses of the resources that we have.

PRESIDENT MONACO: We did a sustainability council, which I chaired, starting in 2011, which came out with a report with a range of recommendations around carbon emissions, one that led to solar panels on top of Dowling, and we're looking for another site. There's a whole solar farm going out in Grafton, which is going to produce about 45 percent of their electricity. On Boston Ave., you can see the co-generation plant which is going up, which is going to save 20 percent carbon emissions and 12 percent cost on this campus. So there is a range of initiatives that we have started which is really going to reduce our footprint. And we do put out an annual report about --

PROF. KRIMSKY: Are they going to cost a lot?

PRESIDENT MONACO: The co-generation plant pays for itself in ten years. We got a very low interest loan to do that investment, and the solar panels, we don't pay the capital investment. We just have to purchase the electricity for 20 years. That's the way the contract works.

PROF. KRIMSKY: Is there more to do?

PRESIDENT MONACO: Yeah. There are a lot of behavioral things, and the students have been very active on recycling. There's a lot of work that's done on that on campus. We've also tried to look at water management as well as waste management. Those are the two other areas of the report, and the office of sustainability is monitoring all this. We've also changed our waste management group so that we have someone who can really measure all the recycling and tell us how we're doing.

One of the things that was mentioned was a possible carbon tax internally. I've had some experience with this, and it's a very good way of creating a cycling fund which allows you to invest in buildings. If we had metering on buildings, we could charge the departments how much they use in a small amount. That goes into a fund which then invests into buildings to make them more sustainable and reduce their cost.

Those are some of the ideas, and you're talking about it on the state and national level, but there are possibilities we could do at the university level. Thank you.

PROF. JOSEPH: There's a helpful figure in the sustainability report. I don't know if it survived all the multiple distributions, but it's in the FAQ about where Tufts is at now with its emissions and where it's supposed to be by the year 2050, where we would have to cut our emissions by 80 percent in order to reach those goals, which is very, very ambitious.
We're doing, as I understand it, short-term, more efficient, doing things better, but to move all the way down to where we would have to be by 2050 is very challenging. I don't think any one person has the answer how to do that, but it signifies the extent, the depth of the problems and the adjustments we would have to make, and they're very significant. I don't think there's an answer to that that's very easy.

PROF. POTT: Hi. Martha Pott, child study and human development. I want to say thank you so much for bringing this to your attention and for putting this effort. Obviously, this is a discussion that's going to go on for a long time, but it is really important. And for my department, I want you all to know that one of the most important things that young children worry about is climate. And they are thinking about it, and they are unfortunately being shouldered with the responsibility of doing something about it, and they're completely incapable of doing that.

So I think it's incumbent upon us to really take this on, and I think we have to do it small and large. We have to do it from the top down and from the bottom up. I'm going to give you three anecdotes. We're going to walk out of here, and most people, most of us are not going to throw our recycling into those well-labeled recycling bins.

Number two, I was the resident director at Hodgdon in 1985, and I called -- that's a dormitory, when I was a graduate student -- and I called and said it is so hot in here, the students have to have their windows open all winter long. And I drive by that dorm, and it's been renovated twice since then, and those windows are still open in the wintertime.

Number three, it is hot as blazes in here. And we can turn down the temperature, and we can also divest. We can also take on a symbol. Symbols are important.

PROF. JOHNSON: I have a question about the figures. It's always interesting how you get figures which obviously have built-in assumptions about how much we stand or lose on our endowment. Most of us, I think, when something happens, and we have to make adjustments, we make them, and we try to find new ways to stall the problem. Are these assumptions that we wouldn't be trying to find new ways to invest in other things? So I just wanted to know where those scary figures come from. Who produced those figures?

PROF. JOSEPH: I was going to address that. Are we moving toward the end here?

PROF. HABER: We have a little time if you want to address it. Patricia wants to address it.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CAMPBELL: I'm just here to be a resource. It's really your conversation, but if there's a question I can answer, I'm happy to do it. So Paul, it's up to you.

PROF. JOSEPH: Okay. Everyone can pitch in, too. But let me just give me an answer about the estimated costs that give the $75 million from the report, which is correct, which is cited in the report. And that is a large figure. It's about a reduction of one percent of our
return on our investment. And there's no shortage of places where that money could be used. It's daunting. It brings you up short. And it wouldn't be a surprise to anybody in this room that that figure is a place where in our discussions among ourselves and with administrators, we try to address and try to look at that.

This is a world that's changing, the investment world in terms of the possibilities of funds where we would invest that are fossil-free. The $75 million does reflect a certain set of assumptions about how much money of the endowment can go into any one fund, and what would be the track record of the manager who controls that fund before they would be eligible?

So one reason why the figure is so high is because we would -- in the existing investment world, we would run out of funds and run out of managers. And then a fair amount of our endowment gets displaced from earning stock market kind of returns to fixed assets, two or three percent kind of returns. The percentage of our endowment now that's fixed asset is ten percent. Under that assumption, it would go to eighteen percent. So at that much lower return, of course there's a reduction in our investment.

But I think as Vida just said, I don't think if someone said you had to divest right now, we would make the same kinds of assumptions that we currently make in governing our endowment. It would change. There are as time goes on more fossil-free funds. There are comparisons of the performance of the fossil-free funds with funds that continue to hold fossil fuel companies. And right now, they're running more or less in parallel.

So I can't say it would be free. I would be guilty of some psychological mistake if I was coming from my own standpoint if I said we can do this with nothing. It might be -- a fossil fuel performance on board, on the whole, and doing very poorly -- it might be, quote, free, unquote. We might even be doing a service to the university by pushing out of that sector more and more quickly. No one can say it would be this amount of dollars, this amount of dollars.

I think we can, as a university, continue to track (inaudible), and I'd like to quote one of the administrators about this, which is in the FAQ. "The emergence of a critical mass of fossil-free comingled funds that are managed by high-performance fund managers will make the problem, the potential cost of divestment, go away."

So I don't think we can go like that and say it's free. I think that would be disrespect a difficult process. It would disrespect the professionals who govern our endowment right now. But I think it's a world that the cost is diminishing, and I think we also have to introduce another potential cost, which is that we don't do anything in terms of the impact that we have on our endowment right now in terms of this particular threat.

To not do anything is also a cost. It's a different kind of cost, but it's a very significant cost that we forfeit that opportunity to not make an important statement that comes from universities, other organizations that are well situated to call attention to the severity of the problem and the need to go on a different path.
MR. JACQZ: Paul knows that I would love to talk about this as long as I could, because it's a really complicated issue, and I've spent many a night sitting in meetings, skipping classes, working with students so that I could try to understand investment and our goal as a university.

So I first want to address the political aspect that divestment offers. So 30 years ago, James Hanson, NASA scientist, brilliant geophysicist, talked in front of Congress and said that climate change is real. We've got to do something about it. We can't keep on burning carbon. Thirty years ago, and what have we done? We have seen emissions rise and rise and rise, and our politicians fail. How can we, at an institution of higher learning, not look at that and understand that clearly it is the influence of an industry that is set to lose huge profits if we restrict carbons? Of course, they're going to stymie and stall every single effort and every single good faith intention to reduce our emissions.

We can reduce our emissions as an individual at the university. We have done a fantastic job. Thank you, Tony. I really appreciate that. It's part of the solution. But we can't forget that we live in a political society where our ability to transition is determined by our laws. And right now, our laws are stacked in favor of the fossil fuel industry. We are continuing to subsidize the extraction of carbon that cannot be burned.

The carbon tracker initiative four years ago said that four-fifths of the carbon that fossil fuel companies have in reserve -- they're proven reserves, in the ground that they want to pull up and sell -- four-fifths of those reserves have to stay in the ground in order for us to avoid two degrees or possibly worse warming. And that would bring about ecological collapse.

So how do we keep four-fifths of those reserves in the ground? We do not invest in companies that have their value based on pulling those reserves up and selling them. As James Engel, a Harvard University professor said, investments in fossil fuels are only good under two assumptions: one, we will pull that carbon out of the ground; and two, we will see it burn.

So by investing in it, we are betting against the public interest. We are betting against our students' future. We are betting against addressing this huge issue, because we're saying, “Yeah, we're going to make money as these companies continue to devastate our climate so that they can profit.” Sixty percent of Americans would like to see stronger action on climate change. That's a majority.

Why haven't we seen that happen? Because our politicians are not listening to the majority. We have to open our eyes. It's scary. It's really scary saying how can we look beyond and have an impact beyond our walls. That is one of the most important aspects of a university.

I'm here trying to speak truth to power, truth to the power of my administrators and my faculty and my peers, and I expect my university, a university I chose to come to because of its mission to also speak truth to the power that is the fossil fuel industry. Are we a university as beholding to those special interests, as our politicians are? Why should we be? Out of fear of change? Out of convenience?
I think that that's irresponsible. I think that we can do better. I really hope that this isn't understood as a single conversation, because it's got to be a back and forth. And in terms of the money, in 2014, $50 billion had been divested. That's other institutions that think it's in their financial interest, in their admissions interest to divest, to make this statement. $50 billion. That's right before the 400,000-person march in New York that I brought a busload -- I and other Tufts climate action members brought two busloads of students to.

They said that by Paris next year, we're going to triple the amount of funds divested. Guess what? They didn't triple the amount. They increased it fifty-fold. This is a global movement. It went from $50 billion to $2.6 trillion of funds that are pledged to divest. That is a demand that the financial industry has seen and responded to through the creation of fossil-free funds, funds that our trustees can tell our Investment Committee to find and seek out and trust our money with.

We can do that, and it is our responsibility to rather than accept complexity as an issue, but to accept complexity as the source to be our best selves. I'm done.

PROF. GUYER: Hi, Sam Guyer, computer science. So it seems to me that the value of these investments is really primarily an indicator rather than something that you can directly affect. So it seems like you could also view this in primarily financial terms, that if we're successful on the substantive non-symbolic actions, that the stock price should go down, and the value of the investment should go down. So in some ways, if our goal really is to reduce fossil fuel usage, then our goal is to reduce the value of that investment, which to me suggests that it's not a good investment. We could let that happen on its own and say, “Look, if we're successful, these fund managers are going to sell these stocks, because their values are going to go down, or we could be more proactive.” But I think the success here means this investment would become a worse investment.

PROF. HABER: One more.

PROF. SAIGAL: Anil Saigal from mechanical engineering. I remember this discussion coming up in the '90s about the fossil fuel, and that's when TIAA-CREF made an adjustment in the CREF account started the CREF social account. I think just passing on every -- I completely agree with both sides here. It's one of those situations.

But I think we can take some actions, and the students can take action, rather than pushing everything to the university. The university will follow. And that's basically if you look at your accounts, your investment when you invest in CREF, CREF invest in (inaudible), get out of CREF account. How many of you have done that and put all your money in the CREF social account?

Where there is finality -- all of them invest. So I would leave it to the investment department to give us choices which are totally free of these companies that faculty invest, and the students talk to their parents and tell them what they invest to get out of those investment. Other things will follow. Thank you.
PROF. HABER: I saw some more hands, but unfortunately, we've run out of time. We will undoubtedly take this up again and possibly have a resolution. Meanwhile, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. So moved.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Announcements

T&P Committee Election
Due to the outcome of the vote at the October 28th AS&E Faculty Meeting, there is a need to elect 2 new members to join the T&P Committee in May 2016, one of whom must be an engineering faculty member. Due to a shortened term for Todd Quinto, there is a need to elect a third new member to join the committee in May 2016. This means 6 nominees, as required by the bylaws, need to be on the ballot for the upcoming election, which will take place via Qualtrics December 9-11, and the results will be announced on December 14, 2015. Nomination information and the eligibility list are available here: http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/committees/elections/tenurePromotion.htm

Old Business

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for the Committee on Committees

Speakers: Ioannis Evrigenis, Chair, Committee on Committees

Summary: Changing the bylaws to allow those replacing members on elected committees for more than half but less than a whole term to be able to stand for election in the next cycle.

Key Issues: Allowing those who have served less than a full term to do so if they are interested and have already acquired knowledge of the work involved, ensuring continuity and minimal disruption, as well as robust lists of candidates.

Current version:
(b) Re-election. An individual who has served either a full term or a partial term amounting to a half term or more shall be ineligible for re-election to that committee for two years.

Proposed version:
(b) Re-election. An individual who has served either a full term or a partial term amounting to a half term or more shall be ineligible for re-election to that committee for two years.

Rationale:
According to the Bylaws, "If a duly elected member of a committee cannot serve for any portion of the term, the runner-up for that committee at the most recent regular or special election shall be declared elected if the runner-up is available and is eligible" [3 (d)]. According to the existing version of 3 (b), if such a change occurs before the midpoint of a term, the member who has stepped onto the committee is not allowed to run for a full term for two years, even if he or she is willing to continue on the committee. The Committee on Committees recommends that those who have served less than a full term be allowed to complete one before becoming ineligible for re-election to the committee in question.

Action required: Vote on December 2, 2015
Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for the Committee on the Library

**Speakers:** Daniel Abramson, Chair, Library Committee, and Laura Wood, Director of Tisch Library

**Summary:** The current bylaws are very specific regarding the title of the “Associate Director for Teaching, Research, and Information Resources.” This title is no longer in use. With Laura Walter’s retirement in December, we propose revising the description to be flexible for evolving library roles/titles and to include the option of designee which is used in other committee bylaws. The request is to change the title to “Associate Director or designee.”

**Key Issues:** Keeping bylaws accurate.

**Current version:**
A Committee on the Library, consisting of four or more members, at least four of whom have professorial rank, with no more than one member from any one department; the Chair of the Committee on Budget and University Priorities; two undergraduate students designated by the TCU Senate; one graduate student designated by the Graduate Student Council; and ex officio members with voting privileges: the Director of Tisch Library and the Associate Director for Teaching, Research, and Information Resources, Tisch Library. The committee shall study and make recommendations concerning library policies, budget, collections, and services. It shall also assist in the dissemination of information about the library to constituent groups.

**Proposed Version:**
A Committee on the Library, consisting of four or more members, at least four of whom have professorial rank, with no more than one member from any one department; the Chair of the Committee on Budget and University Priorities; two undergraduate students designated by the TCU Senate; one graduate student designated by the Graduate Student Council; and ex officio members with voting privileges: the Director of Tisch Library and an Associate Director or designee. The committee shall study and make recommendations concerning library policies, budget, collections, and services. It shall also assist in the dissemination of information about the library to constituent groups.

**Action required:** Vote on December 2, 2015

**New Business**

**Resolution on the Retirement of Robyn Gittleman**

**Speaker:** Howard Woolf, Director, Experimental College

**Syllabus Disability Access Statement**

**Speakers:** Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Chief Diversity Officer, and Linda Sullivan, Director of Student Accessibility Services
Summary: In order to better serve students with disabilities at Tufts, we are asking faculty to add a statement on their syllabi providing information about disability access and services. The statement is optional, but very helpful in connecting students with needed support and resources.

Key Issues: Providing students with disabilities information about accessing reasonable accommodations in a classroom.

Action required: We are asking faculty to adopt a statement (already provided on the Student Accessibilities Services website) into their syllabi. Essentially, copy and paste.

Further Information:  http://students.tufts.edu/student-accessibility-services/faculty-members

Proposal for Make-up Days for Campus Closing, for Spring 2016

Speakers: Anne Mahoney, Chair, Educational Policy Committee

Summary: EPC proposes that, if make-up days are required in the spring 2016 term, we do as we did last year. That is, we would use Presidents' Day (15 February), the first day of reading period (3 May), and Patriots' Day (18 April), in that order of preference. The Deans will decide whether make-up days will be used at all, and, if so, what day of the week will be made up. Faculty who teach on that day of the week will then have a choice whether to hold make-up classes or not.

Action required: Faculty vote

Further Information: This is basically what we did last year, except that we didn't start discussing make-up days until we'd already lost a few instructional days, and by the time we could get the faculty to vote, it was already too late to use Presidents' Day. Last year, we lost 6 days to campus closures; if we only lose one or two, we don't necessarily need to schedule a make-up day at all.

EPC will also propose a make-up scheme for future years, in particular for those for which the Academic Calendar has not yet been voted, that reduces the chance of scheduling make-up classes on a holiday. We will bring this before the faculty in the spring.

Discussion of the Inclusive Classroom

Speakers: President Monaco and Provost Harris with Dr. Donna Qualters, Associate Professor Keith Maddox, and Associate Professor Samuel Sommers

Summary: Assuring an inclusive learning environment in the classroom has emerged as an increasingly important priority for our efforts to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion within the university community. It was recognized as an important area for further progress by the Council on Diversity in its 2013 report and recommendations and in the TALES initiative outlined in the T10 strategic plan, and has been highlighted in recent statements of concerns by Black students. As we look to strengthen inclusion in the classroom, we have the opportunity to build upon important research by members of our faculty.

Key Issues: Diversity and inclusion; pedagogy.

Action required: For information
Discussion of Possible Divestment of Fossil Fuels from the University’s Endowment Funds

Speakers: Paul Joseph, Sociology Department; Henry Jacqz, Undergraduate Student

Summary: Tufts University is already engaged in a variety of ways to reduce its carbon footprint. But we have not yet taken explicit steps to dissociate ourselves from an unsustainable fossil fuel economy. Divestment of fossil fuel from our endowment is a symbolic act that underscores the need for renewable energy sources.

Key Issues: Threat posed by climate change, the range of university responsibilities, use of the university’s endowment.

Action required: None. Possibility of a formal resolution next semester.

Further Information: Please see FAQs on divestment.
Resources for Student Inclusion and Universal Design in Learning

Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT)

Providing support for faculty development on teaching, learning, and research and Universal Design. 
http://provost.tufts.edu/celt/
celt@tufts.edu

Academic Resource Center

Offering students supports in Subject Tutoring, Writing Support, Time Management & Study Strategies, and Public Speaking
http://students.tufts.edu/academic-advice-and-support/academic-resource-center

Student Accessibility Services

Providing curricular and co-curricular accommodations for students with disabilities here in Medford. 
http://students.tufts.edu/student-accessibility-services
accessibility@tufts.edu

Sample Syllabus Statement:

“Tufts University values the diversity of our students, staff, and faculty; recognizing the important contribution each student makes to our unique community. Students with disabilities are assured that the Student Accessibility Services (SAS) office will work with each student individually to create access to all aspects of student life. Tufts is committed to providing equal access and support to all qualified students through the provision of reasonable accommodations so that each student may fully participate in the Tufts experience. If you have a disability that requires reasonable accommodations, please contact the Student Accessibility Services office at Accessibility@tufts.edu or 617-627-4539 to make an appointment with an SAS representative to determine appropriate accommodations.

Please be aware that accommodations cannot be enacted retroactively, making timeliness a critical aspect for their provision.”
FAQs REGARDING POSSIBLE DIVESTMENT FROM FOSSIL FUELS IN THE UNIVERSITY’S ENDOWMENT

Executive Summary

At its core, climate change is not just an “issue” that needs to be addressed but a process that threatens life as we know it. The science is clear: the planet is becoming significantly warmer and at an increasing rate. A series of negative social consequences are also emerging: climate change will mean more violence, the resulting storms and floods will continue to jeopardize vulnerable populations, and the disruptions to agriculture will exacerbate the already difficult position of the poor. Yet so far, the established political process has not generated the will or substantive policies necessary to address the required mitigation and adaption at scale.

Responding to climate change will require an innovative wave of science and technology, restructured markets, and new attention to the multiple impacts on people, the planet, and plant and animal life. Responding to climate change is also a moral issue. We face a series of interlocking instabilities whose consequences cannot be fully determined but which collectively represent an extreme threat. We can study but we must also act.

Universities have a special responsibility to confront climate change. They hold crucial resources in the physical and social sciences, and in the humanities. Universities also nurture reflection, education, and the civic responsibility to take responsible and effective action. Our mission statements commit us to environmental stewardship.

Tufts University is already engaged in a variety of ways to reduce its carbon footprint. But we have not yet taken explicit steps to dissociate ourselves from the current dependency on a destructive and unsustainable fossil fuel economy.

Divestment of fossil fuels from our endowment is a significant symbolic act. Divestment aligns our actions with our values, underscores the need to transition to renewable energy production, and registers that the established political process has so far been too weak or compromised by the disinformation and rejection of science encouraged by some of the very companies that we hold as investments. Divestment reaffirms our integrity and our commitment to assist in the transition toward a sustainable economy.

There may be financial costs to divestment, although it is difficult to arrive at a specific estimate. This cost, whatever it might be, must be weighed against other university expenditures. It must also be measured against the consequences of inaction, or avoiding our responsibility to reduce the threats posed by climate change.

Further details are elaborated below.

---

1 A student-faculty divestment working group drafted this document with the goal of promoting informed discussion among faculty. It was also circulated among several members of the Tufts administration who helped clarify some of the sections but should not be considered co-authors.
What are the key findings regarding climate change and its impacts?

In its most recent report (September 2013), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change proclaimed:

Continued emissions of greenhouse gases will cause further warming and changes in all components of the climate system. Limiting climate change will require substantial and sustained reductions of greenhouse gas emissions... Global surface temperature change for the end of the 21st century is likely to exceed 1.5°C relative to 1850 to 1900 and warming will [almost certainly] continue beyond 2100... Changes in the global water cycle in response to the warming over the 21st century will not be uniform. The contrast in precipitation between wet and dry regions and between wet and dry seasons will increase, although there may be regional exceptions...

The global ocean will continue to warm during the 21st century. Heat will penetrate from the surface to the deep ocean and affect ocean circulation... It is very likely that the Arctic sea ice cover will continue to shrink and thin and that Northern Hemisphere spring snow cover will decrease during the 21st century as global mean surface temperature rises. Global glacier volume will further decrease... Global mean sea level will continue to rise during the 21st century...

Cumulative emissions of CO2 largely determine global mean surface warming by the late 21st century and beyond. Most aspects of climate change will persist for many centuries even if emissions of CO2 are stopped. This represents a substantial multi-century climate change commitment created by past, present and future emissions of CO2.

The various IPCC reports discuss many of the physical impacts of climate change but largely ignore adverse social effects that are borne disproportionately by poorer countries and populations. Climate change is a threat to the planet’s environmental terms. As filtered through storms, drought, disrupted food chains, flooding, fires, and other disturbances, climate change is also a threat to societies and communities. An increased flow of refugees and greater social violence can be expected. For example, a recent study of the World Bank found that climate change could push more than 100 million people into extreme poverty by 2030. An increasing number of studies link the phenomena to a declining quality of life for the planet as a whole and to a growing divide between those who can protect themselves relatively easily and those who are more exposed and cannot.

What does “divestment” of fossil fuels from an endowment mean?

Within the divestment movement, the common standard is a pledge to remove from the endowment all holdings from the top 200 fossil fuel energy companies as named by the Carbon Underground or Carbon Tracker indexes. A time line, often five years, is established to carry out the necessary steps while minimizing the potential disruptions that might accompany this decision. However, “divesting” organizations have employed other measures. One relatively low bar is to sell only direct holdings of coal and/or tar sand companies. Other possible divestment strategies allow for a period of “constructive engagement” with individual companies to see if they might significantly reduce their carbon emissions.
If the engagement failed, then the holdings would be sold. Still another is to abstain from all future investments in fossil fuel companies.

Some universities, pension funds, municipalities and other organizations have agreed only to sell their direct holdings of fossil fuel energy companies. But Tufts does not have any direct holdings in this sector (or anywhere else). Instead, our endowment is largely invested in commingled funds, many of which include some fossil fuel companies. In order to divest, Tufts would have to remove itself not from fossil fuel companies per se but from the investment funds that include fossil fuel companies in their portfolio. This adds complexity and potential cost to divestment (discussed below).

(3) **What is the recent history of the divestment movement at Tufts?**
The Tufts divestment campaign began in 2012 and grew rapidly especially among students. The student government voted overwhelmingly in favor of divestment, and a student referendum asking, “Should Tufts University divest its endowment from fossil fuel companies provided that doing so does not adversely affect the financial status of the university?” passed with about 30 percent of students voting and 74 percent in favor. Petitions were circulated among alumni and faculty, and support was gained from local mayors Michael McGlynn and Joseph Curtatone, and state senator Ben Downing. This activity eventually led to the formation of a working group comprised of students, faculty and administrators to assess three questions: What might fossil fuel divestment mean for Tufts? Should a sustainability fund be established? What steps other than divestment should be considered to address climate change concerns?

After several months of meetings, the working group sent a report to the Tufts Investment Committee and then to the Board of Trustees concluding that fossil fuel divestment would be difficult and expensive for the university. Not all of the members of the working group agreed with this conclusion. In February 2014, the Board of Trustees decided "not to divest at this time." They also agreed that the issue should remain open for future review. The Board also established a Sustainability Fund, voiced support for other measures consistent with lowering our carbon footprint and expanded our research and curriculum around climate change. President Monaco explained the rationale for these decisions in an e-mail message to the community.

This past year, the Tufts student divestment campaign (now formally known as Tufts Climate Action or TCA) started to work with other student and community groups outside the university including the Divestment Student Network and the Multi-school Divestment Fund. Last spring, TCA participated in several actions linking divestment campaigns around the country. At Tufts, these commitments included a sit-in in President Monaco's office where 33 students stayed for three days in order to demand that Tufts to take additional leadership on this issue by divesting from fossil fuels.

During the sit-in, students were able to secure a promise to hold a follow-up meeting with Peter Dolan, the Chair of the Board of Trustees. This meeting, which occurred on October 5, 2015, was conducted in a respectful and productive manner. The immediate outcome was an agreement that Tufts should host a climate change symposium that would address the university's responsibility to engage this critical issue more systematically. This event will be the result of a collaborative effort among students, faculty and administrators and is currently being planned out of the Provost’s office.
What are the recent developments in the divestment movement outside of Tufts?

By the People’s Climate March in September 2014, it was reported that 181 institutions, representing $50 billion in assets had committed to divest their holdings of fossil fuel stocks. Advocates pledged to triple those numbers by the December 2015 UN climate negotiations in Paris. In fact, before the meetings even opened, the value of funds committed to fossil fuel divestment has increased fifty-fold, and has now reached more than $2.6 trillion in total assets. Although the divestment movement has its roots in mission-driven institutions such as faith-based organizations, universities, NGOs, and charitable foundations, 2015 has seen the growth of divestment campaigns and pledges from large pension funds and private-sector actors. University commitments have tripled in the last year with 40 educational institutions with $130 billion in assets now pledging some form of divestment. Full divestment commitments were made at Hampshire and Pitzer Colleges, The New School, Rhode Island School of Design and Syracuse University. Partial divestment commitments, usually from direct investment in coal and/or tar sands, have been made by Unity College, Georgetown, Stanford, California, Dayton, and Washington. In addition, some religious societies such as the World Council of Churches, the health sector led by the British and Canadian Medical Associations, pension funds including those of Norway and CalPERS, and municipal and state governments such as the City of New York and the State of California, have adopted some form of divestment. Again, since we do not have any direct holdings in fossil fuel companies, divestment at Tufts would be more demanding than the actions taken by some of these organizations.

Over the past few years, and alongside the growth of the divestment movement, the number of available fossil free investment funds has increased as well.

What is the history of Tufts University with other calls for divestment?

After voting, in 1986 and 1987, against total divestment from companies doing business in South Africa, Tufts finally did so in 1989:


In 1994, university trustees voted to divest from the $2 million of bonds it held with Hydro Quebec:

https://news.google.com/newspapers?id=2209&dat=19940227&id=W4hjAAAAIBAJ&sjid=_HkNAAAAIBAJ&pg=1890,5940880&hl=en

Is there a financial cost that would accompany divestment?

Because our endowment is largely invested in commingled funds, Tufts faces a set of complex choices when considering possible divestment of fossil fuel companies. Our investment office chooses individual managers who decide which stocks and other securities should be bought and sold from their particular fund. The university has guidelines for choosing funds (and managers) and specifically for determining how much of its endowment should be committed to any one fund or manager. Generally speaking Tufts holds only a small share of the total assets in any particular fund and limits the proportion its assets represent for a fund or manager. Within these commingled funds, fossil fuel companies generally comprise only a small proportion of total assets. Finally, the university has high expectations for the long term excess (above market) returns managers should produce.
At the request of the working group, the university investment office assessed what it would cost to eliminate investment in funds that do or could have holdings in fossil fuel companies. Based on this assessment, divestment would lead to significant switching costs and reduced future return. This assessment did not include any assumptions regarding the future returns of fossil fuel stocks. Why the adverse effect? Because there are currently only a limited number of fossil free commingled funds; because it will take at least five years to determine which members of this growing universe will survive and longer to determine which firms have skill; and because divestment would exclude a significant number of highly skilled fund managers who do not wish to be constrained in the pursuit of their goal of maximizing return by the elimination of any sector or group of securities from their potential selection set.

Creating a reliable, concrete dollar estimate of the cost of divestment is difficult, and the subject has produced the greatest differences between the administration representatives and the student-faculty working committee. The range of estimated costs is produced by different assumptions: Will the number of fossil free commingled funds continue to grow? What will be their performance? Will a new generation of proven fund managers emerge who have experience in fossil free investing? Could the university revisit its guidelines regarding the selection of funds and managers? What will be the price of fossil fuel stocks over the near and medium term future? The value of energy companies could be reduced still further if they are required by new policies to leave fossil fuel reserves in the ground, thus leaving them with “stranded assets.” An additional difference rests in competing notions of “fiduciary responsibility”: is this obligation, especially for the management of universities, conceived in strict financial terms, or does it require a commitment to environmental and social stewardship?

Divestment is probably not at this point cost-free even if we cannot fix a precise amount. The key issue here is the evolution of investment options. As one of the university’s investment professionals recently stated, “The emergence of a critical mass of fossil free commingled funds that are managed by high performance fund managers will make the problem [the potential cost of divestment] go away.”

7 What commitments has the University made to reduce its carbon footprint? Our formal goal as stated in the Sustainability Report is to reduce, by 2050, CO2 emissions to 75-85% below their 2001 level. This goal is shared by New England state governors and Eastern Canadian premiers and is considered necessary to reduce risks to lives and livelihoods. Tufts will have to make dramatic changes to achieve this goal (“Figure 3” from that Report is reproduced here)

The University has taken other steps such as creating a Sustainability Fund as part of its endowment, invested in more efficient technologies such as the new cogeneration plant now under construction and the installation of solar panels on the Grafton campus, promoted recycling and other “green” measures in our internal operations, encouraged curricular development, supported related research, and backed the development of basic “climate change” and “climate justice literacy” among non-specialist faculty.

(8) **Are there alternatives to divestment?**

Everyone who has engaged the problem of climate change at Tufts believes that it is important to adopt, at the national and international level, a new set of energy policies that address the problem of climate change. Many economists and other specialists support a system of carbon pricing (or “tax”) which should encourage more accurate perceptions of carbon use and accelerate conservation measures. By adopting some form of carbon pricing in its internal operations, Tufts University could also constitute itself as a type of “living laboratory” with the same goals in mind. The University could continue to exercise leadership in other ways: A letter from President Monaco and signed by other university leaders, roughly along the lines of the Talloires model, could recognize the urgency of lowering carbon emissions by 80% by 2050. We could take a more active role in countering disinformation on climate change. And we could work with other universities to encourage the growth of fossil free investment funds.

Many of these steps are complicated and would take time. Some might also involve financial cost. Another possibility would be for the university to establish a broad based working committee that could continue consideration of important steps, external and internal, that could help mitigate and adapt to
climate change. It would be important for this committee to carry out its mission with urgency and to not allow “study of the problem” to replace much needed “action on the problem.” The President’s Award on Citizenship and Public Service contains a quotation from Leonardo Da Vinci. The certificate reads: "I have been impressed with the urgency of doing. Knowing is not enough; we must apply. Being willing is not enough; we must do."

(9) Why divestment?
At the end of the day, divestment from fossil fuels in the university’s endowment would be a moral and symbolic action. Divestment will not directly lower the share prices of targeted companies or immediately impede their ability to raise capital.

It has been 30 years since climate change entered public discussion. Despite the widespread recognition that the problem is becoming ever more severe, the political system at the international, national and local levels has generated remarkably little by way of effective response.

The leading fossil fuel energy companies have employed lobbyists, leveraged campaign contributions, bankrolled climate science disinformation, and obstructed government action that could enable a transition to a clean and renewable energy.

We do need to price carbon responsibly. No one in the student-faculty committee rejects the idea of a carbon tax, and one of the students is a leader in the national movement to pass and implement legislation that would achieve this goal. The act of divestment does not replace the need for governmental action either. However, by recognizing and rejecting our complicity in business as usual, divestment stigmatizes our current reliance on the fossil fuel economy. The act signals that passivity in the face of unfolding catastrophe is unacceptable. In its potential to revoke the social license of the fossil fuel industry, divestment serves as both a complement and a key to strengthening our transition to solar and other technologies central to a green economy. Divestment underscores urgency.

On his first visit to the United States as the newly elected President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela visited several universities and thanked student and faculty activists who had pushed divestment from the corporations during business in his country during the apartheid era. More recently, South African Archbishop, and recipient of an honorary degree from Tufts University, Desmond Tutu declared, “Just as we argued in the 1980s that those who conducted business with apartheid South Africa were aiding and abetting an immoral system, we can say that nobody should profit from rising temperatures, seas, and human suffering caused by the burning of fossil fuels.”

John Durant, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Shana Gallagher, Undergraduate
Henry Jacqz, Undergraduate
Paul Joseph, Sociology
Jonathan Kenny, Chemistry
Brian McGough, Undergraduate
Ann Rappaport, UEP