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DEAN GLASER: Welcome, everybody. Our meeting is underway. I would like to first note that the video link to the SMFA is over here, and I don’t think it’s working exactly as we had hoped, but the audio is definitely working, and we’re working on the video. So to our friends and colleagues over at the SMFA, you’ll be able to hear us, hopefully at some point you’ll be able to see us. And I would like to remind everybody here that if you do speak, please introduce yourself and your department, not only for each other, but for our colleagues on Huntington Avenue.

We’re going to start with announcements, and I’m not sure who’s announcing this first item. Bárbara?

ANNOUNCEMENTS

A&S Retirement Policy

DEAN BRIZUELA: Bárbara Brizuela. I’m the Dean of Academic Affairs, Professor of Education. You have a handout – I hope all of you got it at the front – which is our new retirement policy. This will make its way into the handbook hopefully in the next month or so, Jillian, right? And we’ve already announced this at a chair’s meeting.

Christine Cousineau and myself have also offered to visit department meetings to talk about non-academic leaves, and when we do, we will be also sharing the retirement policy with the departments who agree to our self-invitation to department meetings. But the new retirement policy allows for a two-year option, as well as – this is for tenure-track faculty members only – allows for a two-year option as well as the one-year option.

So the one-year option, faculty members get a semester – tenured faculty members get a semester leave, and then the two-year option, they have a leave in one year at full pay, a semester leave in one year at full pay, and in the second year, they can teach half-time at half-pay. That’s for anyone who doesn’t want to give up their teaching that quickly and wants to phase out more gradually. Do we have time for questions in case anyone has questions?

DEAN GLASER: Sure, yeah.

DEAN BRIZUELA: You can also always email us with questions.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, international literary and cultural studies. My question is: who was involved in considering this revised policy? Who was consulted? Did you do any questionnaires – I didn’t see one – to people who might be concerned, who might be thinking about retiring? Just how did you come about – how did this come...
DEAN BRIZUELA: So the one-year option has been in practice for a number of years. I don’t know how long. The two-year option, we implemented because full-time lecturers in the collective bargaining agreement now have an opportunity to phase out of teaching as well, and because that opportunity was being given to full-time lecturers, we wanted to provide the same opportunity to tenure-track faculty.

DEAN GLASER: I would also note that we’ve already had a few people who have inquired about this. So I think there’s some sense that it was something that people would desire – I’m not sure where that’s coming from. Any other questions?

PROF. DHINGRA: Pawan Dhingra, sociology. Is this negotiated between the faculty person and the deans, or do chairs have any role in this at all?

DEAN BRIZUELA: Usually between the faculty member and the deans. Any other questions, feel free to email me or email your academic dean. Thanks.

DEAN GLASER: Joe.

Faculty Roundtable on Trigger Warnings and Safe Spaces Friday, October 28
DEAN AUNER: You should have received an email that we’re having a faculty roundtable, “Trigger Warnings and Safe Spaces,” this coming Friday. It starts at 12:45 PM with food, and the event runs 1:00 to 2:30 PM. It’s at Cabot, and seats are going fast. There were seven yesterday. Now there are only five remaining slots. So please let Laura DiBacco know if you’re going to be there.

DEAN GLASER: Does anybody have any other announcements for faculty? Let’s move to the new business, and I call on David Proctor of the Curriculum Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

LA&J Curricula Committee Proposals
PROF. PROCTOR: Good afternoon. So we have a pretty short agenda. David Proctor, LA&J Curricula. So what we’re going to be looking at are courses in Liberal Arts and Jackson that require the vote of all arts and sciences faculty.

So Item 1 on your agenda is a new course from the anthropology department, Anthropology 44, Primate Social Behavior. Are there any questions or concerns on that?
Item Number 2, a new course in the economics department, EC 90, Applied Economics Independent Study. Questions or concerns on that?

Item Number 3 from the education department, Education 10, Teaching and Learning in K-12 History and Social Studies. Questions or concerns on that?

Item Number 4, a new course from environmental studies, ENV 120, Introduction to Environmental Fieldwork: From Classroom to Community. Questions or concerns on that one?

Item Number 5, from the Department of History, History 101, Alexander the Great: History, Myth, Legend, and Legacy. Questions or concerns on that course?

Item Number 6 from the History Department, History 139, Women and Gender in East Asian Tradition. Questions or concerns on that course?

Item Number 7 from romance languages, Spanish 128, Medical Spanish. Questions or concerns on that course?

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. I know that in the Ex College offering, that’s enormously popular, and I was wondering, I couldn’t really tell from the description whether the prerequisites for that course have changed. It seemed to state that there were two courses that were required before this, but I couldn’t tell.

PROF. PROCTOR: Is there someone from romance languages who’d like to field that question? Apparently not. I think the understanding that we have with the romance language department was that this would be a course that would require some advanced training in Spanish. So we’ll double-check on this, but our thought is it maybe was somewhere above the 22 level, but we’ll double-check on that and clarify that. Any other questions on Item Number 7?

Item Number 8 from the religion department, Religion 76, After God: Atheism and Secularism. Questions or concerns on that?

Item Number 9 from the sociology department, Sociology of Latinxs. Questions or concerns on that?

DEAN GLASER: I actually have a question. Why don’t you say something about the spelling of L-a-t-i-n-x-s? Is Helen here?

PROF. MARROW: Hi. Thank you. I expected to receive that question. We are having a larger discussion within the program of Latino studies about new development and
debates in the naming of Latinos, both in Spanish and in English and in versions in between, also in Portuguese. There are differences and new debates and new directions.

But Latinxs is a term that started in 2004, and it’s gained a particular traction as of about two years ago. You will hear a lot of students using it. You will hear a lot of people in the public realm, particularly activists, using it increasingly. And it’s a term that’s trying to be more gender neutral and inclusive than Latinos, than Latinas, or even Latino with an ampersand.

And so we’re having larger discussions about what to do with the name of the Latino studies program, but I have stepped back from those, and I’m going to talk to various constituencies, Latino studies, the RCD, the Latino Center, and its students who are having their own discussions about it over there, and even Latin American studies before making any other decisions. But as far as the actual course, it seems to be okay with everyone to move to the new emerging term. But we’ll talk about it in the course as well.

DEAN GLASER: Can I ask a follow-up, which is it seems like the entirety of the Spanish language is highly gendered, and it seems like this is a small little thing when dealing with the entire language. The other impression I have is that people will be reading transcripts and may not understand what this actually means. Has that been considered?

PROF. MARROW: We are talking about that. I just had a discussion with the LAS faculty meeting yesterday about it in terms of – we’re considering it very strongly. Dean Brizuela brought it up in terms of the minors being changed.

And it may be one reason we don’t change it over time. One of the things we consider is that the history experience of Latinos overlaps obviously with the immigrant origin histories of many Latin American populations, but it’s fundamentally U.S.-based, and it’s not necessarily based even in Spanish. It’s also in English or parts in between. And so much of the move towards this use is actually to recognize that Spanish is a gendered language. And even the term Latino is gendered, and it comes from French. But there’s no one term that will fix it, but we are talking about these, and we’re considering them more strongly with the program name change than the courses.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you.

PROF. PROCTOR: Any other questions on Item 9?

Item 10, the last item, sociology department, Sociology 106, Political Sociology. Questions or concerns on that?
All right, then do I hear a motion to approve Items 1 through 10? Is there a second? All in favor? All opposed? Abstentions? Excellent.

I just have one very brief announcement. For those of you in Liberal Arts and Jackson who are department chairs or program directors who are submitting petitions to the Curricula Committee for new course, course revisions, and so forth, we’re still having a little glitch with our technical system in that some people are getting a bounced back email.

The emails have been trained to forward to me and to Jillian and to Jillian’s staff. One of her staff who left quite a while ago is still listed on the email exchange, and we have been unable to get the IT folks to actually fix that. So we will continue to work on that, but if you get a bounce back, let me know, and I will assure you that we have received whatever you submitted.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, David.

A&S Year in Philanthropy

As dean, I spend quite a bit of time with our colleagues in the Advancement Office, and I am very pleased to tell you that we have really an outstanding group of development officers led by Nancy Mahler for arts and sciences. Of course, Nancy reports to Margot Biggin and Eric Johnson who are in the central advancement unit. And as you know, we had a very successful year last year, thanks to the efforts of the entire unit.

But in arts and sciences, we had a very successful year as well, and that’s heavily due to the fact that we have such an outstanding staff. So I thought I would invite Nancy to give a brief report on the year in philanthropy last year, and I saw her earlier, but I don’t know where she is. There she is. Nancy?

MS. MAHLER: Good afternoon and it’s a pleasure to be here today. Before we talk about how we did last year and where we stand this year in terms of fundraising, I thought I’d take a quick moment to give you an overview of the advancement division, because a lot of people ask me, “Is it advancement? Is it development?” and “What do you all do at 80 George Street?” And 80 George Street is where most of the advancement team on the Medford campus resides.

Our entire unit is called advancement, that’s the division, and within advancement, we have a variety of departments. We have our front line fundraisers, and they’re called development officers, and that’s where the word development comes into play. We have some frontline fundraisers, like myself, who work with individuals to support the
school. So alumni, parents, and friends of the university.

And friends have no affiliation to Tufts. They didn’t go to Tufts, nor do they have a child here or a child who went here. They simply have an interest in the school. The best example of a friend or friends are the Friedmans. The Friedmans have no affiliation to Tufts, but they had an interest in nutrition and the work that the nutrition school was doing, and they made a very generous gift to name the school of nutrition. In the advancement world, we call those close friends, and they’re friends that we like to have.

We have some frontline fundraisers who work with a subset of individuals. Those are individuals who want to leave Tufts in their estate plans, either through bequest or maybe Tufts is a beneficiary of their retirement plan or establishing a gift through a charitable trust.

We have another group of fundraisers who work with corporations and foundations. And many of you might know Donna Tyson. She’s the corporations and foundations development officer who works with the School of Arts and Sciences, and we’re very fortunate to have her working with us.

Once we close a gift – that’s when the gift comes in – we need to make sure that we’re stewarding it properly. That means we need to make sure that we are using it as we’re supposed to and that we’re providing the donor with any necessary reporting. And we have a steward team that helps us do that.

We also, as you can imagine, have an alumni relations team. Within alumni relations, we have about 60 chapters throughout the country and the world, Tufts chapters. We also have another 38 affinity groups. And the affinity groups and the alumni chapters enable alumni to stay connected to the school.

In addition to all the people who are out in front with alumni and donors, we also have a back office. We process about in a given month 4,500 gifts. That jumps to 11,000 in December. So as you can imagine, the gift processing team is incredibly busy. Not only are they processing gifts, but they’re making sure every donor receives their tax acknowledgment letter.

And as most of you know, when you file your tax returns, you need that tax acknowledgment letter to substantiate your gift. And this is why we want the gifts to flow through advancement. We want to make sure the donor gets the proper tax acknowledgment letter and any other necessary documentation.

We also have about 100,000 alumni, and that’s across the entire university. About 45,000 of those are arts and sciences. So you can imagine there’s a lot of data that we
need to stay on top of, so we have a team that helps us with that. So it really does take a village in order for us to be successful.

So now let’s look at the numbers. Now, I started in 2014, and these years are based on the fiscal year, and our fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30. And I started with 2014 because we are in the nucleus phase of the campaign. And all gifts starting 2014 will count towards our campaign goal.

Now, our campaign goal will be in the order of magnitude of $1.4 to $1.5 billion, and we’re in the process of determining where we’ll land in that range. And we need to determine that by the time we launch our campaign, and we will be launching our campaign in the fall of 2017. So that’s about a year from now.

And when you launch a campaign, you go from the nucleus phase, or sometimes you’ll hear it called the quiet phase, into the public phase. And that’s when you publicly say to the world beyond Tufts that, “Yes, Tufts University is in a campaign, this is how much we are going to raise, and this is when we’ll raise it by.”

So I’m just going to walk you through the slide, because there’s a lot of information on it, and we’re just going to first focus on fiscal year ‘14, ‘15, and ‘16. And you’ll notice at the top of each of those bars, there’s a number on top, and that represents the achievement that we did in each of those years, and that’s at the university level. So in 2014, we raised $92 million at the university level. In ‘15, it was $108.1, and then in ‘16, it was $151.8.

You’ll also notice – it might be hard to tell – there are two different color shades of blue, the bottom shade, that darker blue, represents what arts and sciences achieved in that given year. We’ll just focus on 2014 as an example. In 2014, the School of Arts and Sciences raised $28.4 million. The balance, that lighter blue, that $63.6 million represents what the other schools combined raised. So that’s engineering, nutrition, medical, and so on. So as you can see, in each of those three years, the School of Arts and Sciences represents about 30 percent of all the dollars raised.

So now we’re going to focus on 2017, and you’ll notice that bar looks a little bit different. That’s because we’re in fiscal year 2017, and we’re four months into the year, and the dark blue colors on the bottom show what we’ve raised to date. For the School of Arts and Sciences, it’s about $22 million. For the other schools combined, it’s about $11 million. And the (inaudible) $106 million, that’s what we need to raise in order to achieve our goal of $140 million.

Now, in the previous years, we surpassed our goal, and we’re hoping to surpass our goal this year. And I realize as I said that, I probably just jinxed us. Sorry Jim, Eric, and
Margot.

So now let’s look at just the School of Arts and Sciences. Before I talk about the numbers, I just want to take a moment and tell you how we raise money for the school. As Jim mentioned, I report up to advancement, Eric and Margot, but I work very closely with Jim to understand the priorities of the school, to understand what’s going on in the school. And we are making sure that we’re fundraising for those priorities as guided by the arts and sciences strategic plan.

As fundraisers, we are relationship managers and relationship builders. So that means we are out on the road a lot, because the best way to build a relationship is to be in front of someone. And when I looked at our numbers last year for visits, we had about 900 visits for our team. And Jim was part of that. Jim, I looked at your numbers, and you did 62, so thank you. And Jim has been a fantastic supporter of what we’re doing, and he’s really helping us advance the school through philanthropy.

When we are out on the road, we’re doing a couple of things. Actually, we’re doing a few things. We’re obviously in many cases asking for gifts. We call that solicitation. Other times, though, it’s the first time we are in front of the donor, or prospect. So we’re trying to figure out, “Do they have an interest in supporting the school, and do they have the capacity to do so?”

Other times, we’re there to cultivate that. We want to get them further engaged so that they will support the school. And then obviously at other times, we’re there to thank them for their recent gift. We have a saying in fundraising that your best prospect is your current donor. We want to make sure that once that donor makes a gift, they have a really good experience with how we’re using that gift so they’ll continue to support the school.

So that gives you a little bit of how the sausage is made. So now let’s look at how we did. The first bar, that 2016, that’s our goal from last year. Our goal was $35.6 million. And you’ll notice that goal consists of two components. We have our annual fund goal, which was $7.6 million, and then our capital goal, which are major gifts, anything over $50,000, anything that goes into the endowment, as well as to capital projects. The middle bar represents how we did. So you can see we outpaced our goal by over $4 million. And you’ll notice that we outpaced both our major gift goal and our annual fund goal.

Now, if I were you and I were sitting in the audience, I’d be wondering, “Okay, $39.8 million, that’s a lot of money. Where did it go?” I thought I’d beat you to the question. So I want to talk to you about some of the big gifts that came in, but I also want to let you know that that number up there, that $39.8 million, is not all cash in the door.
When a donor makes a major gift, they can pay it over a five-year period. So let’s say I made a $100,000 gift. I can pay $20,000 a year over the next five years. But the year in which the donor signs that gift agreement, that counts as achievement in that given year. Obviously in subsequent years when we get the pledged payments, we’re not then counting those payments as achievement.

Also, as I mentioned, there are donors who want to leave Tufts in their estate plan. If a donor says, “Yes, I have Tufts in my estate plan,” and they’re over a certain age – in this case, it’s 60 or older – and they provide us with the proper documentation, we can include that as achievement. So that achievement number includes – yes, it’s some cash, but it includes pledged payments, pledged agreements, as well as the (inaudible) intentions.

Now, some of the gifts that we received this year – we actually had a very good year – we received a $10 million gift to support the research of Mike Levin from the Paul Allen Foundation. We also received a $3.7 million gift to establish a joint Ph.D. program in Fletcher and the Department of Economics. We received $2.4 million in gifts for Ounjian field. And as many of you might know, that was dedicated over the weekend to honor the memory of Professor Ounjian, and that was at the request of the lead donor because Professor Ounjian had such an impact on him, he wanted to honor his memory.

We closed two professorships, one for women’s, gender, and sexuality studies and another for humanities for music. We also raised over $12 million in financial aid. So as you can see, the gifts we brought in are providing access to Tufts education and supporting the research and the scholarship and teaching that you are doing.

That last bar, that’s our goal for this year, 2017, and you notice it’s higher than the last years. That goes under the category of “no good deed goes unpunished.” The more you raise in a given year, the more you’re expected to raise.

I just want to conclude by thanking you. The success that we have in raising money is because of the work that you are doing. When we get a gift of $10 million from the Paul Allen Foundation to support a Tufts professor, and that foundation has no affiliation to Tufts, that’s pretty amazing, and that’s because of the research that Mike Levin is doing.

When we receive a $100,000 gift from a donor because of Klaus Miczek and the research he’s doing, that’s pretty amazing. That donor had no affiliation to Tufts. But he knew about Professor Miczek’s research and wanted to support it. We see it in the impact that you have on students. I just got a call from a parent of a student who graduated in May. They want to make a gift to the music department because the student had such a great experience with that department while she was here.
And then we see it from a donor who made a $600,000 gift to support graduate students in the Department of Economics. The donor made the gift because they had such an amazing experience here, and it literally changed this donor’s life and enabled him to have a successful career, because part of that was because of the professors he had, and I don’t know if Dan Richards is here, but he did say Dan Richards was one of them. Sorry, Dan.

The impact that you are having on students goes beyond their four years at Tufts. It resonates throughout their entire lives. And because of that, they are supporting Tufts. So thank you. Jillian, do I have time for questions?

MS. DUBMAN: Yes.

DEAN GLASER: I wonder if you could just say a little bit about endowment versus current use, and also the $20 million, whatever it is that this year includes the SMFA, and maybe it should have been referenced.

MS. MAHLER: I’m happy to. Another jump this year, or goal, which it does go up every year, part of that is because we brought in the SMFA, and they’re now part of the arts and sciences fundraising team. So that’s part of why that number went up. And then in terms of endowment versus annual fund. Annual fund – we’re trying to create actually a culture of philanthropy at Tufts, both at the student level – we actually have a student fund where we’re encouraging the students to give back, so when they leave and they graduate from Tufts, they’ll continue – they’ll be in the habit of supporting the school.

We’re also trying to get donors in the habit of giving each year. So the annual fund represents dollars we’ll use in the given year. And that actually gets cash in the door. There’s no gift agreement, and it’s not a pledge payment.

Major gifts are gifts, as I mentioned, that are over $50,000 or more, and some of those gifts go to the endowment. So it’s not that I make $100,000 gift that’s endowed. It’s invested in endowment. We’re not invading the principal of that $100,000, but we’re getting a distribution each year from that $100,000. And the goal is that it’s here for perpetuity, and we can always use it for its stated purpose.

PROF. DENNETT: Dan Dennett. What restrictions does Tufts put on constraints and requirements for the use of money? And what is unacceptable, what’s acceptable? I can remember in the distant past, this was a major issue a few times. I wanted to know what the rules are today in general terms.

MS. MAHLER: I hate to say it depends. I must admit, I’m a former lawyer. So it does
depend on the gift and what the donor wants to do. There are some restrictions. And we got a call from a donor who wanted to establish an endowed scholarship for a woman. And we can’t discriminate based on gender. So there are things that we cannot do legally. But again, it depends on the gift. And I know I didn’t fully answer your question.

MR. JOHNSON: Eric Johnson. I’ll just follow up because I might know where Professor Dennett is coming from. One of the things we try and do is work very closely with Jim, the president and the provost, and not accept gifts that aren’t having priority and that end up costing Tufts long-term. So we try very hard to work with our donors to make sure that their interests and their gifts are in line with what our priorities are and they don’t end up costing the university long-term and that it’s beneficial for the university long-term.

PROF. DENNETT: Further benefit of faculty who weren’t here then, a little tale from the past. Tufts faced an endowment of a chair in East Asian politics. This was to be the Ferdinand Marcos Chair in East Asian Politics. Imelda Marcos had taken a big shine to our president at the time. And we had quite a fight over whether this was acceptable. And my colleague, Hugo Bedau, investigated and to this day it was a good policy – is that we’ll take atonement money, but we won’t take money that is being used to shore up the reputation of somebody who’s still doing evil. And if you apply that rule, we can think of lots of people who we shouldn’t take money from, no matter how noble the cause.

I mean, we take Rockefeller money and Carnegie money, a lot of rich people who repent and who want to turn their wealth into something valuable. That’s fine. But if they’re using it to cover up for their deeds so they can go on doing their misdeeds, then that’s another matter, like Donald Trump money.

MS. MAHLER: Any other questions? Thank you.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you. And thank you all for partnering with Nancy’s outfit when they call. I know that she frequently calls upon faculty to participate in either the pitching to a donor or the stewardship of a donor, and that’s really very important as we attempt to accomplish our goals.

Admissions Update
DEAN GLASER: As I think everybody here knows, our Dean of Admissions, Lee Coffin, left last July, last June, and we have a new Dean of Admissions in Karen Richardson. She was introduced at the first faculty meeting of the year, but she just stood up and sat down, and I thought I would invite her to address the faculty and talk a
little bit about some of her priorities and her hopes and dreams for admissions. It’s so important to us that we have a vibrant admissions group here. So Karen Richardson.

DEAN RICHARDSON: Good afternoon, everyone. It is my pleasure to be here to introduce myself to some of you, but to reintroduce myself to a lot of you as well. I’m actually starting my ninth year here at Tufts. I came to Tufts sort of by happy accident. I like to tell the story a little bit.

I was working for the Boston Public Schools and leading the office of family and community engagement back in 2008. And I came here to a meeting that Lee was hosting with local deans of admissions and some of the Boston Public School headmasters to talk about what Tufts and other schools like Tufts were looking for in college applications. And I was just very much interested.

I had already had some experience in admissions at Princeton, and I was very much interested in learning about what the local schools were going to talk to our public headmasters about. So I actually emailed Lee and asked him if I could come to this meeting.

I left very impressed with Tufts itself, but also with Lee and with the team as they talked about their holistic process and how they looked at students and applicants and how they tried to figure out ways to include students, as opposed to ways to exclude them. And I was impressed. And later that day, I actually sent him an email and said that I was impressed about it, and literally about a week later, the director of diversity recruitment position was open, and I applied for it, and here I am nine years later. So it’s very exciting for me to be here.

As I mentioned, I spent about seven years with the Boston Public Schools, and I feel like I bring different experiences, having worked in the K-12 system, having worked in the central office, and particularly working with the office of family and community engagement, because the work that we do in admissions is so family-oriented. It’s not just about a student, but it's also about their families and how they’re making choices about where they’re going to spend their next four years.

My first six years here at Tufts, I spent, as I mentioned, as associate director and director of diversity recruitment. In 2014, Lee actually asked me to head up the Office of Graduate Admissions for Arts and Sciences and Engineering, which was a thrill to do, and I was happy to work with a lot of you as we worked on the graduate admissions process.

I have to admit, though, I really missed undergraduate life, because we spend a lot of time, as I mentioned, working with students and families and their college counselors
and their guidance counselors. So when Lee told me that he was leaving, first I burst out into tears in his office. But then I was thrilled to be able to apply for the job and to go through the application process and to be here now.

So I just wanted to give you a couple of things. First, just to give you some highlights of the class of 2020, our first class, our first-year class that’s here now, and then talk a little bit just about priorities and some of the challenges that we see coming up this year and then see if you have any questions as well.

So 2020, last year we had a record number of applications, just about 20,223 applications; the first year that I was here, we had about 15,000 applications, so we have definitely gone up in the past several years. We also saw a record low selectivity last year, just 14.3 percent of the applicant pool being admitted, and we also saw a record high yield at just about 46 percent of the class. So our first-year students, about 1,338 students in Arts, Sciences and Engineering, and an additional 53 BFA students from the School of the Museum of Fine Arts at Tufts. So we’re very proud of that.

As we look towards 2016, 2017, obviously the SMFA is a huge priority for us. It’s been something that we’ve been really working on this past summer. We are fortunate to have four new colleagues from the SMFA admissions staff who are being fully integrated into our Medford-based admissions staff. We’ve actually done a lot of work to think about how we recruit together. The SMFA staff has done a lot of work. All of them have art backgrounds, and so they have done a lot of work in portfolio review days across the country and around the world, but they’ve also been visiting schools, high schools, with some of our current admissions staff here in Bendetson.

So we are seeing a number of students who are very interested, a number of prospective applicants who are very interested with this closer relationship with the SMFA. I think that we’ll see more students who are interested in combined degree programs, because we see a lot of students who say I have an interest in philosophy, but I also have a real interest in studio art, and I’m so excited about this idea that I can do both of those at Tufts now.

So a lot of our traditional feeder high schools that we see a number of applications from, we’re seeing different students at this point, and we expect that we’ll see a different type of applicant pool. So we’re looking forward to working with the SMFA admissions staff as we do that.

A second piece is our visitor experience. You might have seen a few visitors over the past several weeks. Summertime is probably the time that we have our largest following of visitors. We can have up to 1,000 people visiting each day during the summertime. A couple of things that we want to make sure: One is that our visitors can actually find us.
One of the things that we’re working on is on Boston Avenue, you can see the parking signs and that visitors have a good experience as they’re arriving on campus. But then our second piece that we’re really working on is to make sure that we’re providing the correct message both for our information sessions and our tour guiding as well.

So I know that I talked with several departments about some concerns that you might have about information that is going out, and I definitely want to hear more from people if that is a concern. As we’re really starting to continue to hone that message, it’s important to us to hear from departments as well.

And finally, is just maintenance of the excellence that we’ve seen in the past several years. Each year, we see an increased number of applications, but I hope that you’re also seeing that you have wonderful students in your classrooms. And we continue to have students who are very interested in Tufts that we see in our evening programs and also as we see them out in their own high schools and as they’re visiting here, but we want to be able to maintain that excellence and also continue our gains in diversity in all forms. This class of 2020 is probably the most diverse that we’ve seen in terms of race and ethnicity, some of the socioeconomic indicators as well.

Lastly, in terms of challenges, I think that that last piece, maintaining that academic excellence, as we have a number of variables as we move into 2016, 2017; anytime there’s a shift in leadership, you will see changes in an admissions office. Right now, we are thankfully fully staffed with amazing staff, and about a third of the admissions counselors are Tufts alums. So they very much have the message down, and they’re thrilled to be here. Most of them are recent alums as well.

There’s a new SAT. I don’t know if anyone knows about that. But the SAT has changed. Now it’s on a 1600 scale as opposed to 2400, and it’s actually moving more towards being like the ACT, in that it is measured in what a student knows as opposed to being the aptitude test that the SAT has been in the past. I’m hoping that this means that it will be fair to students across the board as we move forward, but at this point, there have only been a couple of applications. But it’s something that all colleges across the board right now are dealing with this year, as there’s a combination of old SAT scores and new SAT scores. As we concord them, that is one of the variables that we look at this year.

And of course, the addition of the SMFA, the BFA applications, and also combined degree applications. As we look at that, we will know starting next week, November 1st, which is our first deadline for early decision – I can’t believe it’s already here – we’ll start to see what that pool is starting to look like. And then as we move into our ED2 and our regular decision, as well, we’ll be able to see more of what’s happening there.

I think the biggest things that are on the horizon for us, as I mentioned, our first
deadline is next Tuesday. We also have our QuestBridge applications that have come in, QuestBridge being a diversity recruitment program that we’ve worked with and recruited students from through the match program. The past three years have been very successful. So those applications have already arrived, and we will start rating by the end of this week.

And then we also have our diversity recruitment overnight for arts and sciences, that we have about 240 students who will be arriving from across the country tomorrow for our program overnight to learn more about the academic and the social atmosphere here at Tufts. So we thank any of you who are teaching classes for that, and just so you know, there will be a whole lot more people on campus.

But again, I’m pleased to be here. I’m thrilled to be in this new role and to be working with all of you and with the incredible staff in Bendetson, and I’m happy to answer any questions that you might have.

PROF. MANJAPRA: Thanks very much. My name is Kris Manjapra, I’m interim director for the Consortium for Studies of Race, Colonialism, and Diaspora, and I’m also in the history department. First of all, very excited that you have come on and looking forward to working with you. I understand from your background that one of the emphases is diversity, and I appreciated the mention of both the race and class as well as socioeconomic. So maybe you could give us a little more detail about some of the programs that you’re planning or what you would see as a marker of success. Is there a benchmark that you have in mind, and what kind of change do you think Tufts requires?

DEAN RICHARDSON: Sure. So I think that last year, there were a number of changes. And again, I was in the graduate office last year, but my colleagues in the undergraduate office made some changes that I think will help us to move forward in terms of diversity. One is that we have – we used to have just one diversity overnight program that would bring students from arts and sciences and engineering to campus, and we usually had about 260 students who attended. We realized that we were receiving more and more applications for that program, and we were having to turn more and more students away, even students who could be very viable in our pool, but we just didn’t have the resources to be able to do that. So we have actually changed it, so we had our engineering voices program last week, which had about 100 students attend. And so we’re able to give about 240 slots to the arts and sciences. And we provide transportation to students who come to this program.

We find that in order to increase diversity, whether it be socioeconomic diversity or racial diversity, we do need to get students here to campus so that they can actually experience it. It’s not enough for us to talk to students in their high schools, but we do have to get them here. And so that’s one way that we’ve done that.
We’ve also increased the participation of our current students in thinking about some of these programs. We do have a Diversity Council that includes a number of current students. They did apply for that and were interviewed by our staff, and so there are a number of students who are part of that. They are also basically voices ambassadors, and they speak with the students who come to visit.

In terms of yield, we do reach out to students who are our highest need students who are admitted and offer to bring them here to Jumbo Days, again, with the idea that you need to come to campus and be able to experience it in order to decide whether or not this is the place for you. And we also do a lot of outreach in terms of phone calling to our first generation students who might not have been to campus and might not know about Tufts. Our current students call them in April to be able to talk to them about their experiences here as well.

I am hoping – our goal is to try and at least maintain, as I mentioned, sort of a record number, a record year that we had in terms of diversity for next year. And again, with the variables that we have, I think those are the pieces that we have to look at.

MS. DUBMAN: The SMFA has a question. They just sent it to me. “What are the admission goals for the SMFA?”

DEAN RICHARDSON: In terms of numbers exactly, is that what they’re looking for? So as we’re thinking about the numbers for this year, as the plans were being made for making this the program that it is supposed to be, our goal is to really maintain from last year. We had about, as I mentioned, 53 students who came in for the BFA and we had 18 students who came in for the combined degree, and then next year, that will scale up even more, but there’s still some discussion to be had about what those numbers will look like for the following year.

PROF. SHARPE: Christina Sharpe in English. You’ve talked about the record numbers. Could you say what those numbers are for this year?

DEAN RICHARDSON: Sure. Well, this year, the incoming class is about 30 percent domestic students of color.

PROF. SHARPE: Can you disaggregate?

DEAN RICHARDSON: Sure. I believe that about 5 percent of the students identify as African-American, about 12 percent identify as Asian, and then we have about 7 percent who identify as Hispanic. And of course with the federal reporting, if you identify as Hispanic, that is the only thing you are identified in. And then we have a number of
students who identify as two or more races.

PROF. SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut in political science. You mentioned the SAT and how that’s changing. I was wondering if Tufts has had any discussions about making decisions on standardized testing as optional, as many schools are starting to consider, if not actually do.

DEAN RICHARDSON: So the challenge for us when it comes to making test optional is the size of our pool and the fact that we receive applications from over 2,000 high schools across the world. All high schools are very different in terms of the things that they teach, the curriculum that’s available. So the idea of standardized testing does give us some sort of a benchmark to be able to compare students across these 2,000 high schools.

Having said that, though, we do read applications within context. So we are taking into consideration as we look at a student’s testing the background of their family, the demographics of the community, the average test scores of that particular high school, thinking about if a student possibly have had access to test prep, those types of things. So we’re not applying the same sort of, “Everyone must have a 760 in math,” but it is a way for us to see how a student is doing in comparison to other students across the pool. So it’s not something that I would expect that we would be test-optional anytime soon.

MS. DUBMAN: The SMFA has another question.

DEAN GLASER: Okay, last question. Thank you, Jillian.

MS. DUBMAN: Why are we not looking to grow – we used to have capacity for 124 freshmen, and what are the goals for graduate admissions at the SMFA?

DEAN RICHARDSON: So I don’t have the graduate admissions goals. Do you want to answer that question?

DEAN BAUER: Sure. The graduate program usually has between 50 and 60 students coming in for each MFA class. It’s a two-year program. And so every year, there are somewhere between 100 and 120 students. And that program has maintained its admissions goals over time. So that’s not something that we’re worried about.

But the undergraduate program, we exceeded our goals for this year. That’s in part due to the excellent work on the part of the SMFA admissions staff who are very good and very dedicated, and again, are really integrated with our group now. But it’s also due, I think, just to the fact that this is an exciting new venture, and the assurance that Tufts University will stay involved has been good.
And there already has been, as many of you in this room know firsthand, a lot of collaborations going on between people in other areas of arts and sciences and the SMFA. The word about that is getting out. That's all the positive stuff.

On the negative side, it’s a huge enterprise to overhaul the smfa.edu website. We’ll eventually transfer over to Tufts, but we are right now in the process of starting the overhaul of that website by finding event or we can do something really good with it. That’s a huge way to reach out.

And we just don’t know – we’ve been now emphasizing recruitment in admissions in places that it was hard for the SMFA to recruit before. We have a much larger team of people. But as I said, we are well above the goals that we set for this year.

When we mapped out the economic ramifications of acquiring the SMFA, we had a certain set of goals for admissions every year. We’re well above it this year, and we expect it to rise next year. We’re actually, I think, above where we thought we’d be for this next coming year. So we’ll see. And this gives us a benchmark year for the combined admissions average. Does anybody want further information about that before I sit down? Thanks.

DEAN GLASER: I’ll just add that we would love to have a very robust undergraduate population at the SMFA, and we’re happy to see it moving in the right direction. But the financial liability of the whole enterprise is dependent upon the number of students that we get. And we’re also looking forward to seeing the quality of the students continue to improve, and that will have benefits for our colleagues at SMFA as well as those of us here.

Discussion: Tenure clocks for lateral hires
DEAN GLASER: The final item on the agenda is a conversation that I would like to take the temperature of the faculty on. Last week, we had a vote on a couple of tenure and promotion policy issues. I think there was not any conversation about those policies before the conversation that took place last week, and the proposals were defeated.

The deans have been talking about a particular policy that has been in place as long as I’ve been here at Tufts, and it is a policy that we think is worth talking about and seeing if everybody’s still on board with. It does make sense every once in a while to revisit what our policies are and make sure that they make sense at the moment.

The policy is this, and this is in the Chapter 4 of the tenure and promotion chapter of the faculty handbook, but it is a summary of the policy on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and
Retirement of the Board of Trustees of Tufts University.

The lines that I would like to ask you to comment on are the following. “The School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering do not usually reduce the probationary period for a faculty member who has been employed in other institutions of higher education. Tenure-track faculty members, however, may request consideration for tenure before completing six years of full-time service at Tufts in a tenure-track position.”

And I think as we see every tenure case that comes through, we see tenure cases from people who have been out in an academic teaching position for up to 10 or 12 years for those people who have come from other institutions, and we’ve seen people who came here right out of graduate school or right out of a post doc and have had 6 years of service before their tenure decision.

The possibility of bringing fantastic people here who have been at other institutions is one that we obviously want to continue. I’m looking over at Debbie Schildkraut, who served I don’t know how many years at Oberlin, four years at Oberlin, before coming to Tufts. She was a known quantity to us when we hired her. Actually, she was a known quantity because she was an undergraduate here as well a long time ago.

And we’ve been very successful at hiring what I would call “senior junior faculty.” But this policy does mean that at tenure time, we’re comparing apples and oranges at the moment of truth, and I would like to hear what people’s opinions are on that. So I’d like to open a discussion of this policy as we think about what we might want to recommend. Perhaps it’s fine, but perhaps it’s something you would like to revisit.

PROF. SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. Do you have any information on what people actually do when they have that choice, people who have come here as senior juniors? Do most of them tend to come up early anyway? I’m just wondering how much we actually see people who have several years and then have six years.

DEAN GLASER: Most people do decide to come up early, but it’s all over the place, truthfully. It’s all over the place.

PROF. TALIAFERRO: Jeff Taliaferro, political science. Jim, is one option under consideration having some kind of graduated scale for lateral hires at junior levels? Say if they’ve done six years as full-time or tenure-stream faculty position at another institution, their probationary period here would be only three years, or if they’ve done eight years at another institution, their probationary period would be two years? Is that on the table?
DEAN GLASER: I think that’s one potential idea. One would be that just the dean and the chair as they’re negotiating with a candidate would negotiate that with the tenure clock as well, and having standards or thresholds associated with different periods of time at other institutions would be one way to guide that so that it’s consistent.

PROF. TOBIN: Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. I guess I’m trying to understand whether in your experience, candidates feel this is somehow a bad thing. It seems like giving them the maximum flexibility is only to the candidate’s advantage. We do have a statement in the T&P policy that productivity is always viewed in relation to time, so that’s sort of part of T&P’s job, is to take that into account. So I guess I’m not sure I can identify the problem to which we’re discussing a potential solution.

DEAN GLASER: I don’t think it’s a problem for the people who have maximum flexibility. It seems to me more of an issue for the people who have come here directly out of graduate school or someone who’s going to take a year or two to get themselves moving. I’m just observing that this conversation comes up in the Tenure and Promotion Committee as they’re trying to assess this. But it does lead to differences in the cases that come up.

PROF. TOBIN: Sure, but I guess then (inaudible) for people who have six years of post docs also. It seems to me this is part of what T&P does. And people could be coming from very different institutions with very different teaching loads. It just seems to me we should have maximum flexibility (inaudible) identifying the problem. Seems like (inaudible) to me.

PROF. MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. I would just say that I think what has happened now is that we’ve got the bar high enough so that one is very, very hesitant to hire someone who just got a Ph.D., if there’s a real question of whether you can get to where you’re expected to be, and this of course comes from a comparison with people who either have taught elsewhere or who have come, as Roger says, with post docs. So I’m not really suggesting a change. You have to allow obviously for teaching. It does (inaudible). But I do think we should consider that in many departments, there could be a real hesitation to choosing someone who got the Ph.D. in the last year or even one year out, because it does really have an impact on the (inaudible).

MS. DUBMAN: We have a question from the SMFA. “The SMFA faculty have been hired through extensive national searches and underwent a review system of 1/3/5-year reviews. What are your plans to integrate the SMFA faculty into a tenure system?”

DEAN GLASER: Well, right now, the SMFA faculty are professors of the practice with multi-year contracts, and I think that our view was that it would be – given all the things that would be required to integrate the faculty in the school into Tufts, that that was too
ambitious for now.

In order for the SMFA faculty to be integrated into the tenure system, I think it will require some conversation and perhaps some policy study to assure that we’ve established the right standards for people who have artistic intellectual product, as opposed to intellectual product that we’re mostly used to evaluating. And to my mind, that actually belongs to all of us, not just to the deans.

So I would just counsel a little bit of patience at the SMFA, because it is not something that we are prepared to do at this moment in time, but it is something that will be on the agenda soon and as part of the integration, the continued integration of the school.

DEAN BAUER: So I would just add to that that one of the things that my staff are doing right now is doing a study of schools, peer schools and other schools that have tenure-stream appointments for artists – and by the way, the majority of our peer institutions do, and virtually every institution that is an aspirational peer does – so that we can prepare this for the stakeholders in the universities so that people can see what – I didn’t think I would ever use this phrase ever – “best practices” among universities. And I’m hoping that the data that we can produce will be something that people can chew on and will see that Tufts wants to be where the action is. That’s my understanding. I hope others will see from this data that that’s a good place to be.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, I’ll just say Russian program. I’m going back to the language for lateral hires who come up for tenure. I would caution against putting the contract between the deans and the candidate, any mention of when that tenure year might be, because of course the T&P Committee might decide to table that if the person comes up, etcetera.

I would think that maybe some language T&P might consider about normally, that the candidate would have up to whatever number of years, but they would come up when he or she and the chair decide is an opportune time. There’s so many variables, and I think T&P Committee does take into account that someone has just been out four or five years, six years.

But then to argue the other side, they have to produce – the standard in many of our fields is the book, another second project, etcetera, and that might become almost possible for the new hires. But I don’t see a way to quantify how many years you’ve had elsewhere into something that can be counted here before they come up for tenure.

PROF. ALLEN: Hi, Jennifer Allen from community health. My impression from recent conversations is that given the financial considerations that we’re going to be looking at more of these junior senior hires. And if that’s correct, given that our salaries are not as
competitive as some other institutions, I would suggest again that level of flexibility. We want to think about what’s going to bring those sort of senior junior people here, and I would imagine that that flexibility would be part of the appeal.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you. Shelly?

PROF. KRIMSKY: Having served on T&P for a few terms, we’ve seen some very unusual cases. And in my recollection, there have been several cases in which people have gotten teaching awards at their institution, and when they came to Tufts, they tanked. So it’s not clear why or how or what the cultural differences are. But if somebody were coming up after three years, that means two years of work at Tufts, and sometimes they even have teaching loads that are reduced, it may not be – it’s just a point of question that they haven’t really – we haven’t seen enough of their teaching at Tufts to immediately decide on tenure.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you.

PROF. DHINGRA: Am I to understand that (inaudible) or support of flexibility for the candidates, that makes sense. But thinking about it from the other person’s point of view, the person who comes straight out of grad school, here for five years, and then has to look for tenure, I think that kind of person is very aware of the discrepancy in time that he or she is having compared to others.

And I don’t know, but I’ve been on T&P, and if members of the committee are (inaudible) – Jim said it’s apples and oranges, if you’re really able to adjudicate between apples and oranges when you’re making decisions of this magnitude. I think members who come to us (inaudible) hopefully we can still get those – I don’t think we should write those off for obvious reasons. Because they’re very aware, I believe, of discrepancies in time, and yet the standards are supposed to be the same.

DEAN GLASER: It may not be apples and oranges. It may be Granny Smiths and MacIntoshes. But there is some difference, and we see it at the moment of the tenure discussion. First of all, I think other universities don’t do it this way, and Pawan, you’ve been at another institution, and I don’t know what the policies are at other places.

But before we have any conversation with T&P, I just wanted to get a sense, and I’m starting to get a sense of where people are in this and whether the sentiment of the faculty was this is an issue or not an issue. And if it’s not an issue, then we’ve got plenty of other things to do. But I did want to have this conversation at the beginning, as opposed to the end, like we did last week, of a policy decision.

PROF. CELICHOWSKA: Renata Celichowska, drama and dance. I know you’re all
going to be honest, but just as we look at the SMFA and what constitutes a published work, I know that music and drama and dance and film and media studies would love to also have those published productions, compositions, choreographies, plays be treated that way. So we’re going to be rooting for that. Thank you.

DEAN BAUER: So just to be absolutely clear, this would be – when I said artists, I didn’t just mean visual artists. I meant artists across the curriculum. I’m fairly certain that the people at the university who would have to be making the big decisions about this, including Jim, would understand that this was something that would apply across the arts if we were to make a change.

DEAN GLASER: And I totally agree with that. The one thing I would add – and Nancy made reference to it – the people who have to make this decision, it would need to come from the faculty, but it would also then go out to the Provost, and the Provost’s office – I see Kevin here – would have to be on board with this as well. I don’t know what the trustees would have to do, but I’m sure we would have to do that. It is on the agenda. I don’t know what the outcome will be, but it is certainly on the agenda. Any final words on this?

I wonder if I could just have a straw vote on this issue, and the issue is, is this something we should investigate further, that would be a yes. Is this something that was interesting to talk about for ten minutes and we should just drop, and that would be a no.

PROF. LOCKE: And that includes abstaining?

DEAN GLASER: And abstain, I would guess that abstain will be interpreted as a no.

PROF. LOCKE: Actually, I don’t understand what the issue is, so I’m going to abstain.

DEAN GLASER: Okay, I won’t interpret your abstention. Those of you who think that this is further conversation, please raise your hand. Five. Those of you who think that this is much ado about nothing. Okay. And abstentions. Okay, thank you very much for your temperature. Have a good day, everybody, and thank you for coming.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned
Respectfully Submitted,

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