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DEAN GLASER: Welcome. This is, I believe – Jillian, is this the last A&S meeting of the semester?

MS. DUBMAN: Yes.

DEAN GLASER: I wish you all a happy and productive end of the semester. I have a few announcements before we get going. First announcement is unfortunately a sad one. You may have seen in the newspaper today that one of our colleagues in sociology, Katy Vecitis, passed away a couple days ago. Katy was a part-time lecturer in the department but had been a presence in the department for a number of years. My own daughter took two of her courses and said she was the funniest professor she had in her four years at Tufts. She’s an inspirational teacher, a lovely person, and I’m sorry to announce her passing in the minutes of the Arts & Sciences faculty meeting.

Also, this past weekend we lost Marie Costanza who is a long-time employee of the university. She worked in the back, so most people would not have known her or seen her. But Marie was a very admirable person. I got to know her quite well in my seven years in Dowling Hall. She was kind of a tough person but when she scratched the surface she was actually kind of a softie. She always talked about what she was reading and about her daughter and about how much she loved Tufts. So I’d like to ask us just to have a moment of silence for these two important people to us, if we could. Thank you.

(Moment of Silence)

DEAN GLASER: Thank you. I understand that this scarf was left at the last AS&E meeting. We know it’s not somebody in E, so it’s probably one of us. If somebody is missing their scarf we have it here. Now, I’d like to ask Anne Moore to make an announcement.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

2017 Summer Scholars Program

Anne Moore, Program Specialist, Scholar Development

MS. MOORE: My name is Anne Moore. I’m a specialist in scholar & development. I’m here today to announce that applications are open for the Summer Scholars Program. This is an independent research program for undergrads. It’s for rising juniors and seniors to be this coming summer. Each student applies with a faculty mentor and each faculty mentor can only apply with one student. So it’s a single student-faculty member pair.
The student gets $3,500 over the course of the summer and if they receive financial aid from Tufts there is an opportunity for free room and board. So independent research is an incredible opportunity for students. Certainly, I think for many of us probably a really formative experience as an undergrad. It certainly was for me. The Summer Scholars is a great way for students to think about whether grad school would work for them, think about future directions for their career in lots of different ways. Most importantly, I think it’s a way for them to feel really in charge of their own education, like they’re kind of driving the bus. So you can access the – oh, I should also say, not only is there $3,500 for the student, they get a $1,000 research budget and it’s available to them until they graduate. And you also get $1,000 in your research budget. Any full-time faculty member is welcome to apply. So you don’t have to be tenure-track. Lecturers are welcome. SMFA applicants are welcome. So that’s everything that I can think of. The deadline for applying is March 3rd. You can access the applications through our website, which is www.go.tufts.edu/summerscholars. I’ll be hanging around afterward if you have any questions. We really encourage faculty to approach students who are historically under-represented in their discipline. I think even the process of applying is transformative for students. It, again, helps them understand their own thinking. It helps them chart their sort of future career of their intellectual development here. So that’s it. Thanks.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Anne. From one Anne to another: Anne Mahoney.

Curriculum Open Review Meeting, December 5th, 12-1:15 PM, Alumnae Lounge
Anne Mahoney, Chair, EPC

PROF. MAHONEY: I’m Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics and Chair of EPC. I want to announce the second in the series of open meetings to begin reviewing the undergraduate arts & sciences curriculum. It will take place this coming Monday, the 5th, at noon, from 12 until 1:15 PM in Alumnae Lounge. Pizza will be served. We had the first meeting this past Monday, had a lively group of about 50 people, students and faculty, talking about what the curriculum is as students see it.

Jumping off point for this coming Monday is what the curriculum is as we the faculty see it. Over the course of the next couple of years we need a plan to figure out what the curriculum is, what it might be, what it should be, what we want it to be, and what a Tufts education consists of. Then eventually translate that into policies, requirements, and all that sort of thing. For further information catch me after the meeting or email me.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Anne. From the Romance Languages Department, an announcement from Vincent Pollina.
Inaugural Lecture: José Antonio Mazzotti, King Felipe VI of Spain Professor of Spanish Culture and Civilization

Vincent Pollina, Associate Professor, Romance Languages

PROF. POLLINA: In September Dean Glaser announced the appointment of José Antonio Mazzotti, who we recruited from Harvard about eleven years ago, to be the King Felipe VI of Spain Professor of Spanish Culture and Civilization. The chair originally born “prince” but the name was changed in his succession to the Spanish throne a year and a half ago. Next Tuesday, December 6th, at 6:00 p.m. in Alumnae Lounge, José Antonio will present the inaugural lecture of the retitled professorship. His topic is *The Inca Garcilaso and the Benefits of Migration*. It’s intentionally tongue in cheek. Illegitimate son of a conquistador and of a member of the Incan nobility, Garcilaso emigrated to Spain at the age of twenty-two, and his chronicle of the conquest of Peru is the first major literary work written in Spanish by a native of the Americas. On the table next to the door, Jillian has kindly placed a poster. Please take one. We cordially invite you to join us next Tuesday for the illustrated lecture followed by a hot buffet and most importantly an open wine bar.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Vincent. I have two additional announcements. I’m about to call on somebody who doesn’t know I’m about to call on them. I saw Joe Litvak walk into the room. Every once in a while something pretty extraordinary happens to one of our faculty, and Joe came to me last night with a piece of news which I think is pretty amazing, and I just wonder, Joe, if you might announce it to everybody? It’s just something to celebrate.

PROF. LITVAK: I would be happy to announce it. It is absolutely worth celebrating. My colleague, Christina Sharpe, who I believe may be in this room – yes, there she is – has just been recognized by the newspaper *The Guardian* in its year-end list of best books of 2016. Christina’s book, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*, published by Duke University Press was recognized by *The Guardian* on Monday. The book is a phenomenal book, and I encourage you all to read it. It was published three weeks ago, and it has already sold out its first printing. That happens all the time. So let me just ask you to join me in congratulating Christina.

(Applause)

DEAN GLASER: Pretty fantastic. Congratulations, Christina. The federal government has done a little whiplash on us and the last announcement has to do with the Fair Labor Standards Act or FLSA. The FLSA underwent a different enforcement (inaudible) and they required people who made under $47,000 to receive overtime. We do have, as most universities in the country do have, staff who make less than $47,000 a year. These are people who have jobs like resident assistant in the dormitories or as some of our admission officers who go out on the road and are in that entry-level position but they
do spend a fair amount of time traveling, post docs. We are required to pay them overtime according to this new interpretation of the FLSA.

Now, very recently, a court in Texas put a hold on that new requirement. If you Google FLSA you’ll see that a number of universities said that hold is in place. HR has put an announcement out that we are not putting a hold on it, that we will, in fact, honor that. We are way down the road in doing it.

(Applause)

We’re going through our budgets, and we think it’s the right thing to do. So I’m very happy to announce that to you. Are there any other announcements? So now we’ll shift to new business, and I’ll ask my colleagues Lynne Pepall, Vida Johnson, as well as Sarah Sobieraj.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion and Vote on Makeup of A&S Representation on the University-Wide Senate

Vida Johnson and Lynne Pepall, Elected members, Faculty Governance Working Group, and Sarah Sobieraj, Chair, Committee on Committees

PROF. PEPALL: So just to bring you up to date. I think you all know that the trustees voted to approve the bylaws that we discussed here for the formation of a university-wide senate. So the next step in this, I think really kind of historic moment for us, is to come to you to decide how we want to conduct our elections in order to elect seven representatives from the School of Arts & Sciences.

So just to sort of narrow down the scope of that, a finding that we have before us today, we met with Committee on Committees, who kindly agreed to assist us in creating the ballots for this election. So the first thing we thought we would do is to adopt their convention that for every open slot there would be two nominations. And for this first round of elections, we’re doing staggered terms and everyone will be on a three-year term after that. So you can see on the memo that we wrote that we actually have an interesting configuration of terms. We need to elect two representatives, each for a one-year term, two representatives for a two-year term, and then three representatives for a three-year term. Then as the years move on we’ll cycle through electing people with three-year terms. So that’s our composition that we have before us for the School of Arts & Sciences. Now we want to decide if we want to, you know, we know who votes in these elections, all the voting members of arts & sciences, which are all full-time lecturers, tenure stream faculty, and professors of the practice. But we wanted to sort of think about who should be representing us on the senate. So we thought about
the representation of tenure stream or tenured and want to talk about that and other considerations.

The one issue that I would say that we sort of embraced as a committee is that the senate is there to think of issues that confront the university. It’s a university-wide senate so it’s representing the school but not necessarily a particular distribution or particular part of the faculty. You’re really there, I think, because of your interest in the university and community, the university community that we belong to and how to make that a stronger community. So we didn’t want to start putting on too many restrictions that may make sense for a lot of committees that we have in arts & sciences, and it’s clear on tenure and promotion why you want to have scholars from different disciplines, to have their expertise represented. It’s less clear that there may be – we want to hear from you about that. Then there are other issues such as representation, and we can leave that to Committee on Committees or we can discuss how you want that incorporated. So that’s sort of the charge we have today. But the two options that we’ve presented, we’re just trying to get some idea what makes sense in terms of tenure stream. Since this group is going to be working with the administration, whether or not people in – assistant professors who are coming up for tenure, whether we want to put them in the situation being on the senate I think is something worth talking about as well. So Vida, I don’t know if you want to add anything to that?

PROF. JOHNSON: You said it all. Is this the first election essentially an A&S body? Because normally, and we’ve asked the Committee on Committees, which is an AS&E committee, to help us. We are not a committee of any sorts. We were the two representatives on the creation of senate committee. But it’s the Committee on Committees that has kindly agreed to run the election.

MS. DUBMAN: Just so you know, we actually ran an A&S election to elect the two of you to that committee. But we also did for the strategic planning faculty members who were represented on that.

PROF. JOHNSON: I stand corrected. Good thing Jillian is here. Sarah, do you have anything?

PROF. SOBIERAJ: Just to add that I think the other key thing, especially here today, whether there should be a minimum amount of time someone has been at Tufts in order to serve. So there are some committees where we take this into account where there’s a minimum of five years, like Executive Committee and Committee on Committees. So I think that’s another key question we’d like to know.

PROF. JOHNSON: Really, the most important one is whether the election should be for all tenure-stream members or whether it should be for tenured only. Also, please note
that it’s no fewer than five of professorial rank, which leaves open two spots in the election of full-time lecturers also nomination and election. Do you have any thoughts about that? This was a suggestion from Committee on Committees. I think that it’s hard to balance. I think everyone wants to be inclusive. At the same time I think it would behoove us to elect people who we know have a broader view, who have the experience in their own in arts & sciences to be able to participate well in larger university-wide issues.

PROF. PEPALL: My graduate program representation was an issue there. I think it’s interesting to note that all schools except for engineering are graduate-only. So all the issues they’re confronting are issues that are quite relevant to graduate students who are members of the university. So that was just something we have some graduate only and we have many programs with graduate students that deal with similar issues, so it may be useful to have their concerns or if similar issues are being faced in other programs. So that was one thought.

Again, these are just suggestions that came from us about what kind of representation makes sense.

DEAN GLASER: I’d like to use the opportunity to pull the microphone to offer my opinion and to venture off a couple of these. My first opinion has to do with full-time lecturers. For the past year and a half I’ve been representing the school in negotiations with the full-time union. I think it’s given me so much appreciation for what our colleagues do and how they contribute. I don’t think that the functioning of the arts & sciences committee system would work as well without the contributions of some of our colleagues who are full-time lecturers. It seems to me that there should be a guaranteed spot. In my own opinion, at least, there should be a guaranteed spot for at least one full-time lecturer in our representation.

Likewise, we have professors of the practice who are full-time who are full members of our faculty. We just acquired a lot of them at the SMFA. I do believe strongly that there should be some connection of the university senate to the SMFA. Their ability to stay in touch with things, I think, is limited by geography. We do our very best with these meetings. But there should be some sense of how the SMFA is going to be recognized.

PROF. PEPALL: When we drafted the bylaws and came up with this special algorithm, and Jim you know how special these algorithms are, for the number of senators that would be in arts & sciences it was based on the size of our faculty not including the SMFA because that deal didn’t close even though it was in the air. So I think we felt as a committee, it was a lot of work to get to this number, and part of the challenge was we didn’t want the university to have such a large senate that scheduling meetings and getting together is just going to be impossible, but if too small, then how do you get all
the schools represented with arts & sciences being such a big school and how to get that point? We struggled a lot. So when we finally worked out what we thought was sort of perfect then we realized our faculty just grew, we thought well that would be one of the orders of business for the senate to deal with is how best to think about integrating the school.

I’m mindful, and I think anybody on Committee on Committees is mindful about putting too many restrictions on staffing. It can be really hard, you know. I think we’ve had it sort of implicit that we want to recognize our community and its diversity. But sometimes when we actually have to get each slot it can really make it challenging. So I would just bear that in mind as we think of all the issues that we want to have sort of maybe written in as a function of the committee or the goals of the committee and we want to see represented but not necessarily. Again, we’d like to hear from you on that.

PROF. SOBIERAJ: How about thoughts on tenure-stream versus tenured?

PROF. MARROW: I’m Helen Marrow in sociology. Ideally, I would like to also see their representation on this committee, but I do worry about how we might do that and also provide some space for them to be able to contribute ideas and make decisions in a way that we know and can ensure wouldn’t hurt them when they do potentially come up for tenure or for extension of their job contracts. I know people in other universities who are tenure-stream before tenure and who are on faculty senates and who don’t feel like they can say anything. So I think in practice it doesn’t work out very well unless we have a way to do it but also write in some safe guards.

PROF. PEPALL: Some university senates that we looked at when we were doing our homework actually are explicit not to have assistant professors serve and then others guarantee that their voice is going to be heard in some way and actually reserve ones. So I’ve seen a variation of it. I just don’t know what safeguards – how you’d do that though. I think that sorts of tricky, but on the other hand you want – they’re the future of the institution in many ways so you want to have them represented. We struggled with this one. We want your feedback.

PROF. MARROW: I’ll give you one example. I’m thinking of a friend of mine who is a biologist at UMass Lowell and is on the faculty senate right now. Just last year (inaudible) don’t speak because we don’t know where it’s going to go. (Inaudible). So I think even if the safeguards are hard to come up with you may (inaudible).

PROF. JOHNSON: That may also suggest you shouldn’t have them, right?

PROF. WINN: (inaudible) anyone who is elected. It’s not just being elected to give their opinions, but rather to canvas everyone who isn’t represented. I would hope that if we
make a decision not to include assistant professors (inaudible) as suggested, then I would hope that those who are elected to represent this body would make a special effort to make sure and to talk with assistant professors and to make sure that their concerns are heard.

PROF. PEPALL: Absolutely. I agree with that completely. They’re there to represent the whole community.

PROF. JOHNSON: But again, we have to remember that they’re there to represent the community in some way, but we’re not there to lobby for our own community’s issues, rather maybe to provide information, et cetera, which will help make decisions, the administration or the senate to make recommendations for the benefit of the whole university. And this is a new kind of experiment for us. So everyone has to – I think the senate will only function once you have a well-informed body of experienced faculty who are able both to bring in the issues that concern their faculty, but also can think more broadly about where the university is going and maybe what should be done and make some kinds of recommendation to the upper levels and to the provost, for example, who has not until now really had a body of faculty across the whole university to consult with.

PROF. SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. Can you remind us what the expected time commitment is because my concern is that assistant professors will be asked to be on the ballot and will feel like they can’t say no and then they’ll get elected to something that goes against our general norm of trying to prevent assistant professors from having too many service commitments that get in the way of their ability to establish their research profile in time for tenure?

PROF. PEPALL: My recollection, I should have read the bylaws, was that the senate meets, I believe, four times a semester and the burden of the workload is really on the Executive Committee of that senate, which meets more regularly with the administration. But there is an expectation that the senators also attend some of the arts & sciences meetings, which a lot of the assistant professors do not. So I don’t know. I’m thinking, “Okay, the moment they hit tenure let’s hit them with a senate nomination.”

PROF. CELICHOWSKA: Renata Celichowska, drama and dance. I hear what you’re saying, Jim, about full-time lecturers and also I hear about assistant professors. I think when it comes to committees the time pressure, I know a lot of my colleagues who are full-time lecturers as I am, we do also feel a time pressure, and we do also feel a little bit more exposed in public forums about saying what’s on our mind. So I think as discussions go on as far as proportional committee serving it’s uneasy in some instances for full-time lecturers to be given the opportunity on committees, whereas assistant professors are sometimes protected from having to serve in that way. So I don’t know
what the solution is. I just wanted to voice what some discussions have been with full-time lecturers. We might want to survey both of those populations and see if they even think it’s a good idea. I don’t know if that’s open.

PROF. MAHONEY: Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics. I think, first of all, if we say that we can’t trust a senate to be a safe place for faculty and tenured faculty, that, “Oh, my goodness, if somebody speaks out you could be punished for it,” then we’ve already lost the battle. So let’s assume that’s not happening. Let’s assume that everyone’s acting in good faith and let’s assume that we basically all know what we’re doing. On the other hand, the idea of having a minimum length of time, for instance, if I remember correctly, to serve on the Executive Committee you need to have been here for five years, or to have some experience requirement, for example, that one should have held a position on major committees, such as Peter and Paul, EPC, Curricula, that would hopefully bring people into the senate who have the larger view, who can see the bigger picture. And we can even offer the discretion for faculty members and their chairs to decide whether running for a seat on the senate is suitable for a particular assistant professor or a particular lecturer. I know that there are some lecturers who will be willing, if nominated, to serve on the senate. I’m sure there are others who won’t. But I like the idea of, as Jim said, at least a short-term earmarking one space for full-time lecturers and possibly even earmarking one space for assistant professors, although that’s more problematic since they haven’t done as much service since they are appropriately being sheltered from it, maybe they haven’t the experience yet to do this.

PROF. PEPALL: It is certainly our intention that when we hold these elections that anybody running for election will have a briefing of what service they’ve done at the university, what committees they’ve served on, and why they are running for this position. I think we do this in tenure & promotion. And I think that goes a long way in having people know what the experience is. Again, I would encourage this faculty not get too restrictive on “you have to have served on this” – I mean, I’m nervous about that as we try and elect seven people. But I absolutely agree that we want to encourage people with experience and know what experience they bring to the senate when they run for election.

But to move this along, we might want to take a few, you know, votes on whether or not we want to have a minimum representation, one full-time lecturer, whether we want to go for tenure stream, which includes assistant professors, or tenured, which does not. That would help us I think in setting up the election.

PROF. ZEHL ROMERO: I have a sense that this is a new experiment with Tufts. So I wonder how flexible it is. I think my sense is we should be as open and as inclusive at this point and then see how it works. We also don’t know how much this committee will sort of determine; it’s advisory for the moment (inaudible) when the senate decides
what’s going on. So my sense is it should be flexible and we should reconsider.

PROF. PEPALL: Absolutely. The school can decide how it wants to elect its senators. That’s completely up to this faculty. So whatever we decide today is not something that can be changed.

PROF. JOHNSON: One thing also to note that is different in this election for those that are into math may create a problem is that we’re electing two representatives for a one-year term, two representatives for a two-year term, and three representatives for a three-year term. Now if you add other restrictions on that it becomes a problem. (Inaudible) at this point we need the flexibility by saying, “If you have five in professorial rank and we could leave it open and then see who we elect, then that would be space for lecturers everywhere to be recruited.” And I think just to clarify for Jim, I think what Lynne was saying was that, I think one of the first orders of business, will be to increase the number, the A&S numbers, and at that point it may behoove us to elect maybe next year a member from the School of the Museum of Fine Arts. That also gives the faculty in that school a little time to get up to speed with what Arts & Sciences in general is doing because there are lots of changes in their lives. I think it doesn’t preclude our coming back in a year saying, “You know, this didn’t work and maybe we should in our next election be thinking about either tightening or broadening or whatever.” I think time is of the essence because I think the provost would like to get us up and running maybe in the latter half, not us, but to get the senate up and running in the latter half of this semester.

PROF. PEPALL: Winter semester.

PROF. SOBIERAJ: I was just going to say that that openness would also prevent the situation that you’re describing, whenever the Committee on Committees needs a lecturer because we marked this spot and then have to go around and say, “Please, we really need someone,” and people maybe don’t want to do it, but it would maybe create the openness for them to run. I will say that also if we add in that five-year minimum that would also go a long way to alleviate the concerns about assistant professors’ research profiles and maybe their space and feeling comfortable to speak. So maybe that combination of the openness of going with professorial rank and the five-year minimum would be a good thing.

DEAN GLASER: First of all, I want to make one point about the full-time lecturers, which is that they constitute about a quarter of full-time faculty. It’s not a tiny part of the faculty. It’s a substantial part. So having one seat allocated to them I think is very worthwhile to do, in my own personal opinion.

What I propose that we do right now is to take a couple of straw votes so that you get a
sense from the faculty. Then we ask the Committee on Committees to go back and bring a little piece of legislation to us that we can vote on. Does that seem to be –

PROF. PEPALL: I just want to caution that when we put a minimum time that can make it difficult with the SMFA because they will not be a part of – and there are times when people come to the university laterally. So just pay attention to, you know, a lot of experience you may want to get involved. So I think we want to be mindful that experience is important but...

DEAN GLASER: Well, I think those are questions for the Committee on Committees, and I would encourage the committee to invite the two of you to discuss the issue because some of things need to be hashed out. If we could just do two quick straw votes.

PROF. PEPALL: On the option one and two and we’ll include the –

PROF. JOHNSON: At this point let’s see whether it’s tenured or –

PROF. PEPALL: But do we want to then include the provision with a minimum of one lecturer or we’ll just leave that?

DEAN GLASER: I think what will happen is they’ll be a little piece of legislation that will be drafted and we can vote on that, we can amend it at the next meeting.

PROF. PEPALL: So we’re only voting on these two?

DEAN GLASER: These are straw votes.

PROF. PEPALL: So right now we want to take a straw poll, your feelings on option one, which is no fewer than five of professorial rank, which means any tenure stream faculty, so no fewer than five. As opposed to option two, which would restrict the five tenure-stream to being tenured. Those are the two differences between the options.

PROF. DEVOTO: If we want to be formal about this, to take a straw vote requires suspension of the rules on one point. To suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote, so that’s what you need right now.

PROF. PEPALL: All those in favor of suspending the rules?

ALL: Aye.

PROF. PEPALL: So we’ve suspended the rules.
PROF. DEVOTO: Now you can take a straw vote. Then if you want to take another one—

PROF. PEPALL: So we’re going to take a straw vote on the two options. Any clarifications on what we’re voting? All those faculty who would prefer option one, which is open to any tenure stream? All those in favor of option two, which restricts to tenured only? Thank you very much. Abstentions?

PROF. JOHNSON: How about asking, can we ask in general whether we should put further requirements or not because it allows for, you know, lecturers, it allows for SMFA, et cetera, and see what we get this first round. Do we want a straw vote saying, “Yes, put more limitations now,” or just leave it at this and see what we get, knowing we can change it? I’m just worried if we get some large body—

DEAN GLASER: Okay, so let’s do that.

PROF. PEPALL: Well, I’m very interested in knowing the issues of full-time lecturer, whether we want to reserve a spot or not because there seems to be—

PROF. ZEHL ROMERO: I just wanted to ask what did we decide about lecturers? The members of the voting faculty in one way or another they should be included.

PROF. PEPALL: Right. Well, right now implicitly by going with one you have two lecturers serving on the senate because we’re electing seven senators and no fewer than five are tenure stream. So this allows the representation. But it’s also possible that at the end of the day the election will happen and you’ll have all seven tenure-stream faculty because you will elect these people and just because a lecturer — unless it’s running on a specific slot there’s no guarantee.

PROF. ZEHL ROMERO: But we can be clear (inaudible) that when you say tenure-stream lecturers can be there.

PROF. SOBIERAJ: No fewer than five tenure-stream.

PROF. ZEHL ROMERO: But could it be somehow spelled out that lecturers can—

PROF. PEPALL: It’s implied. So that allows, but it doesn’t guarantee the representation. So that’s I think the issue.

PROF. KRIMSKY: Shelly Krimsky. Lynne and Vida, could you just make clear one thing. Is this faculty senate going to be voting on things? Are those votes going to be open? Will we know who votes on what? Will it be secret? Could you clarify whether or
not there will be minutes and votes taken?

PROF. PEPALL: Oh, there will be minutes and votes taken, but I presume if the senate wants to have a secret ballot then they would – I’m just going to ask Kevin. But they have things that they will be voting on.

VICE PROVOST DUNN: My recollection is that the meetings will be open unless the senators decide to go for a closed meeting and that votes will also be open unless they call for a closed ballot.

PROF. PEPALL: Right. But only the senators will be voting.

VICE PROVOST DUNN: So the default setting is open in both cases.

PROF. JOHNSON: And presumably, whoever is a senator will be reporting on a regular basis issues of interest on what the senate has considered to the faculty, to this faculty as well. The idea is not to have some cabal not connected to the rest of us. We have learned that the more open you are, the more buy-in you get from everyone, the more power you have to influence the upper levels of the administration.

PROF. PEPALL: So should we just do the straw vote whether we want to guarantee a minimum of one slot of representation – there will be a guarantee. Could I just have a show of hands for whether or not this faculty would like to have that guaranteed minimum of lecturer representation?

DEAN GLASER: I think we have a sense of the faculty. So we will reserve time at the next faculty meeting to vote on –

PROF. PEPALL: To vote on how we’re conducting the election.

DEAN GLASER: — the piece of legislation on how we’ll conduct the elections and then we will proceed and have those elections. Thank you very much.

Open Discussion: Implications of the Election for Tufts

DEAN GLASER: You will note on your agenda that we’ve devoted some time to talk about the implications of the elections for Tufts. By that, it was not intended to talk about the election of the faculty senate, but the U.S. elections, the presidential election, the congressional elections. As a political scientist, I thought I would try to seed a conversation. I’m very happy to see Debbie, Ioannis, and Jeff T., and some other political scientists here. I’m not sure I’ll be able to answer every question because there is so much that’s unknown about what is to come.
Joe and I met yesterday with the university lobbyists and had a very interesting and
vigorous conversation about what is to come, what they’re expecting is going to come,
how it could affect Tufts, and how it could affect education more generally. So I’ve been
receiving periodic reports on what to expect, and I thought I might summarize a couple
of things that are out there, just some points about things that are out there.

I hope to see a conversation. When I first put out the email that we would have this
conversation before the faculty and at a staff town meeting it was right after the election
and, of course, things were very raw at that moment. And I must admit that, I’ll admit, I
try not to admit my personal preferences to my students, but I didn’t eat for about four
days after the election. I did have a physical reaction to the outcome, and I do think that
a lot of us did, and we needed a therapy session. That is indeed how the town meeting
went. I don’t think we quite need that now, maybe we do, and if we do I welcome you to
have it. But I thought maybe we could spend some time talking about the implications of
this election for Tufts.

One of the implications, one of the big ones that has received a lot of attention, had to
do with our documented and undocumented immigrant students. Mary Pat McMahon is
here and I’m going to ask her when I’m done with this conversation to brief you on what
the university has done so far with our students who we care very much about. What
President Monaco has said to me and to others in his public statements is that protecting
these students is critical. It’s part of our values. He wants to think about all the ways we
can do this and do it in a way that keeps these students safe. There are things he’s
concerned about doing that would actually expose these students and he does not want
to do that. But I think he’s been very clear that in our substantive decisions we want to
support these important members of our community.

We’ve been asked by students to allow chants right outside Ballou Hall to declare Tufts
a sanctuary campus, and it’s not quite clear exactly what that is, if that’s anything more
than a symbolic gesture. I think it’s unlikely that this or very many other universities
will take that actual step, but I do think that the kinds of actions that the university
intends to take will be taken with the intent of protecting our students. This is something
that the president has talked about with our trustees, with other administrators, with
other university presidents, and I look forward to hearing what Mary Pat has to add to
that.

University lobbyists said to us yesterday that they really don’t know what’s about to
come. President-elect Trump is a very unpredictable individual, and he’s very vague in
many of the things that he promised, but there are things that are clear to them. They
said that some – they do see the system as it works in all of its slowness and
inefficiencies as Debbie and I teach in the Introductory to American Politics course, and
that there are a lot of impediments to implementing many things through Congress. Not only does he face a senate which has 48 democrats, and that is enough to block legislation, but there are a lot of members of his own party who they believe, they anticipate, will be hard for him to bring aboard.

What their concerns are are in executive orders, things that he might be able to do through executive order and foreign policy. For the next two years they think those are the places of greatest concern to us. However, there are things that republicans in Congress agree with him and there are some things that I will just put out there as potential implications.

The first of these has to do with government sponsored research. President-elect Trump has been very clear that while the fiscal environment will be constrained, he does view investment in academic research and space exploration as critical roles that the federal government can play. And he has made some major challenge areas that could be areas of focus for his administration such as cyber security, defense research, clean water, energy independence, and feeding the world with special emphasis on agriculture and the role of American agriculture in leading that goal.

He has indicated that space policy in particular is of great interest and has an advisor, former congressman Robert Walker from Pennsylvania, who is talking about a focus on hypersonic technology. I don’t have any idea what that is. But it is likely that space is more likely to receive attention from the federal government funds than earth.

Past republican administrations have specifically emphasized basic research, but have also deprioritized applied science, applied research, environmental science, and the social and behavioral sciences. And it's likely that that will be an outcome of this election as well.

Those of us in political science know this very well because every year for the past fifteen years the Republican Congress has zeroed out the infinitesimal portion of the NSF budget that is dedicated to political science research. I don't know why they haven’t picked on sociology, economics, and anthropology, but they pick on political science every year. The political science part of the NSF budget is about seven to ten million dollars and the NSF budget is a seven billion dollar budget. So it’s less than point two percent. But it gets their attention every time. And it’s not just Trump allies. It’s actually Jeff Flake, Senator Flake from Arizona, who’s actually been a Trump opponent within the Republican Party who is out to get political science. So we know this battle every year and the American Political Science Association defends ourselves every year, keeping a little morsel of money that comes in our direction to fund actually very important research. The national election studies, which are conducted every two years, are the major ones about how we know about how people are thinking about
politics and how they’re behaving politically and it’s been ongoing since 1952 so it allows for lots of other times and studies, receives a big portion of the political science dollars. But the fact is that we political scientists occupy a place in the inner circle of hell in the minds of many (inaudible) legislators and they go after us every year. Perhaps because they view us as having a political bias, and we’re studying them, and they can’t imagine that we really understand them.

There are proposals that require different kinds of, or let me put it this way, As we put proposals together as we pursue federal funds, the Lewis Burke lobbyists who represent us in Washington suggest that there will be ways of strategizing, of talking about our research, that will be more effective than others. They said, for example, we should be talking about weather research, not climate research. This was true during the Bush administration. They say it may call for some pragmatism and that it’s not unprincipled to be pragmatic in our approaches.

They believe that NIH dollars will not be too much at risk. There are champions of NIH in Congress. However, there is some potential for some health areas over others to receive greater attention and that could dry up money. I’m looking at Jen Allen there in the back because I do think that there is some concern that community health dollars may be at risk in the upcoming budget cycles regarding NIH. That, of course, is a concern to our friends down at the Boston campus as well.

One of the things I’m going to say at this point, and I have some other points to make, is that these folks, Lewis Burke, are liaisons for us. So if you are a newer faculty member embarking on your research agenda it is possible to go down with somebody to represent you and meet program office’s at NSF. They’re happy to arrange visits to the people who constitute the bureaucracies that allocate federal funds. So I encourage any of you who have this interest and I encourage chairs, particularly in the science departments and community health, that if you want to send faculty down to Washington to have these conversations that it could be fruitful, and we’d be happy to help. The school would be happy to help with that. We have a mechanism for meeting people who are program officers and making decisions about how dollars are going to be allocated.

The national endowment for the humanities, we asked about that, and the lobbyists said, “Oh, it’s peanuts, it’s so small, nobody’s paying any attention to it. Obama didn’t pay any attention to it. Trump won’t pay any attention to it. So you don’t need to worry about that.” I don’t know whether that’s a good message or a bad message, but it doesn’t appear – they don’t anticipate that this is going to be as vulnerable of some other particular areas within NSF and NIH.

We talked a little bit about science more generally and they said – well, I would note that President Obama quoted our colleague Andy Kemp’s research on climate change. I
don’t think that’s going to happen again. But many academic leaders are concerned that the president will not have a science advisor and a large number have advised and written a petition to the president to have a science advisor. The lobbyists said we’re not sure that’s a good idea because you don’t know who the science advisor would be and you could have a science advisor who’s a skeptic and who knows. But I actually don’t think that’s right. I think that would be a good thing, and I think that’s something we should probably keep our eye on as we try and anticipate what is to come.

With regard to non-profits and fundraising there are implications to the election in this area. Trump has proposed tax reforms that will reduce incentives for charitable giving in order to get marginal tax rates lower they would raise the standard deduction and cap itemized deductions and this would take away tax benefits and profit giving.

Non-profits in general are likely to suffer as a result of these kinds of changes. One thing (inaudible) has tried to study anticipate what his plan would do to individual giving and anticipate that it would erode individual giving by about nine percent or about twenty-six billion dollars. A very, very large sum of money spread out over large non-profit territory.

There’s of course the possibility of more money in their pockets, about people being more charitable. Without the incentive, the tax incentives, I don’t know that that is an argument that resonates, but it’s probably a hypothesis that we’ll be testing. I would just note that we’re close to going into a capital campaign and so this kind of thing is important to us.

Town-gown relations, I think it’s clear that a change in the administration certainly has implications for those of us at universities, our friends in Somerville and Medford and Boston and Grafton are likely to be affected. I was driving in the other day and there was a reference to sanctuary cities, status of Somerville, and how some of those compared to a certain amount of federal funds that they receive, about six million dollars in federal funds, which is I think very principled thing that I would note that Somerville has bills to pay as well, and I promise they will be coming in our direction for more assistance. We do not pay taxes to Somerville, but we pay something called PILOTS, which are in lieu of taxes, “Payments In Lieu Of Taxes.” All of our neighboring towns expect a certain level of support from the university, and as the new administration affects them it could affect our relationships with them. Just note that.

The new president, or soon to be president, has said that he would consider the tax exempt status of large endowments as an incentive to lower student costs, and I appreciate the fact that we want to lower student costs where we can. The problem is that the endowments feed our budgets and they’re there for the long term, not for the short term. The fact of the matter is that last week Dean Qu and I met with some
students and they’re agitating to cap tuition increases and they enthusiastically endorsed our using our endowment to help pay for their needs. As I said to them, I don’t think that’s the moral thing to do. I think it’s prioritizing this year’s students for next year’s or the year after that or ten years from now. I think it would be a mistake to (inaudible). Endowment is a very important part of our budget. The fact is that there are a very small number of institutions that have very large endowments and the administration could be pursuing institutions like us to spin down our endowments in order to reduce student costs.

Regulation, this is likely to be an administration that will be not very friendly to regulation in general. I would note that Title IX and the changes that we made to Title IX are in place. We’re not going to change them as a result of a more lax approach to the application of Title IX. One of the things that I’ve come to know and understand is how bureaucracy does make our lives more complicated. So I did ask the lobbyist if indeed there was any silver lining to the new administration being less bureaucratic and perhaps it might be a little bit. But the fact of the matter is that bureaucracy lives on even as the administrations change and a certain political control of the bureaucracy is actually what really challenges the presidency. So I’m not sure we’re going to experience a great deal of relief here, but I would note that there is one possibility, one possible outcome.

The final thing I wanted to say is – sorry, two more. One has to do with immigration. I do think we have a large number of our faculty and staff who are international. We do have concerns about the ability to get visas for new faculty. We’re working with the Department of Labor and that process is not easy even in the present circumstance. It’s just not clear. We know that there are a lot of faculty who are very nervous about the changes that are to come. We understand that. I don’t know what the answers are. All I can say is we can reassure that the university is doing its very best to support these folks and that we have lobbyists to help us if there’s a more systemic approach that needs to be taken.

Now, the final thing I would say is that I do think there is a boldness on the right that is expressing itself. I’ve been catching flack with my picture and Jiamin Qu’s picture are now on some website attacking us. We are considered to be “educators” but only in quotes because of a letter that we wrote to an organization in California asking them not to put posters on our campus that name individual people that call them terrorists with a political perspective and for basically vandalizing our campus, in my opinion. The way that it was done, it’s not like they posted something on a bulletin board. It was glued on in a way that’s very hard to remove. We wrote them and asked them not to do that again, and now I’m very famous and get phone calls for that. In any case, I expect more of this and it will have some bearing, not just on the administration, but on faculty who have political points of view. As a dean, I care deeply that we live in an open environment and we can express ourselves with lots of different points of view. I think that’s going to
be more challenging in the upcoming years.

So I’m going to stop right there. Otherwise, I could go on a while. And see if you would like to add any comments.

PROF. MANJAPRA: Kris Manjapra from the history department and from CSRD. I just wanted to first of all thank you, Jim, for leadership and the update you just provided us. I also want to, however, request that we pause, because that’s not therapy, but it is a very important recognition that the terrain is changing and the SPLC has documented more than 850 documented acts of hate crimes of harassment, not against everyone in the university, but against certain kinds of bodies, against racialized bodies, against women. And the way that this administration has come to be has been on the back of gender violence, has been on the back of extreme and overt racialized violence, which has been very differentiated. I think we need to recognize that as not just feeling and not just talking about therapy, but that needs to be part, I would request, of one of the conversations that this faculty has. So many of us have chatted about this and teach on these questions, and we really do feel that it’s an important moment where our faculty will be making decisions about how we want to frame this moment and the moments going forward, and those decisions we make now are very, very important for things of what we can talk about, what we can imagine, as well as how we can change the conversation so it’s not just about the minimal requests. What do we need to do to protect ourselves? But we really do need to start making maximum requests about what kind of society we imagine, what kind of university we will be, what ways we are not going to allow our imagination to be impoverished at a time where impoverishment is becoming a kind of normalcy. So we really need to ask, you know, and add to the discussion with these kinds of questions.

(Applause)

DEAN GLASER: Mary Pat?

MS. DUBMAN: While she’s walking up there, there was a question from the SMFA. Eulogio asked are we in the same position as the sciences in terms of federal support at risk?

DEAN GLASER: I’m not a complete expert. I sort of know everything I know from the conversation I had, the deep conversation I had yesterday, but my understanding is that the priorities within the science divisions are likely to change, but the amount of federal dollars that are flowing to the arts and humanities is so small that it’s unlikely to attract much attention.

Mary Pat, I’m wondering if you might say a few words, both about in response to Kris’s
comment because your office, I believe, has collected some information about the kinds of things going on across the school as we think about some of the important questions that the election raises as well as (inaudible).

**Update on Support for Undocumented Students**

Mary Pat McMahon, Dean of Student Affairs and Rob Mack, Associate Dean for Student Success and Advising

DEAN MCMAHON: I just want to say thank you to Kris for so brilliantly expressing that. Our office has been working with RCD and other faculty to think about ways that the community can gather and reflect on the much broader questions, the fundamental questions that Kris raises.

So on December 10th and 11th there will be a two-day forum that is in progress right now, under development, providing the campus an opportunity on Saturday and Sunday to reflect on just these questions. Please watch your email for further information on how we will provide that opportunity for our A&S students, our E students and growing members of our community as well. Thank you. So that’s my sort of thought on that part.

I do want to switch. So in April of 2015 people here may remember that Lee Coffin, after working closely with United for Immigrant Justice, the student organization and group, announced that Tufts would be a leader in supporting undocumented students’ ability to apply and be financially packaged without regard to their citizenship status. So we have been working since that time before this election outcome to better understand what that means in real time for our prospective students, for their families, for our students who are enrolled right now. We need to think about study abroad experiences, work study, when students can’t have work study because they can’t be paid legally. How we can think about ways to support students’ financial needs. A lot of different people from different departments, faculty, have worked on a working group all last year to come up with recommendations, continuous training, and support. We’ve had some very good faculty trainings, student/leader trainings, staff trainings, help people understand particular circumstances of our undocumented students but also students with family members and the broader kind of campus to be informed and supported. That’s just the background prior to the election.

Rob Mack, who is in the back, has been designated as our point person to support what is right now almost two dozen undocumented students who are currently enrolled. We do not currently have plans to change. I don’t want to speak for Karen Richardson, but we don’t have plans to change our enrollment, our admissions policies going forward. We are really collectively, many faculty in this room have been a part of this, are collectively trying to anticipate, kind of, what may happen and be prepared in ways that
we can support our current students and residents next January and thereafter.

Now, if you want to say a little bit about the other pieces that we do that would be so helpful.

DEAN MACK: So just to add, in our process what we decided would be the approach to take for the group of students that matriculated this past year is over the summer we reached out to those students, welcomed them to Tufts, started to engage with them as outreach, who they were, what their needs might be. We spent a lot of time doing that through Skype, email, and phone conversations. Giving most of the students an opportunity to think about what it meant for them to give to the community while they were here and we wanted to approach that. Also being really thoughtful about what it means for them to be the ones who took ownership of their status and how they wanted to navigate that while they were at Tufts.

So we started that conversation just thinking about their peer group, the dozen students who were coming in with an undocumented status, to ask, “Are you comfortable with sharing your status with other students in your peer group, the other eleven of you?” We started that conversation over the summer. So we let them figure out what they wanted to do in that process. And what most of them decided to do was they wanted to keep their status very private. They were comfortable doing that with each other and eleven of them elected to have me navigate that with them. What we’ve done is bring that group together. So we do meet weekly. We started with an orientation program with them.

They’ve had an opportunity to start communicating with each other as well as some of the sophomore students who share that status, as well. We think that’s been really effective for them where they have a space where they have other students that they can connect with because in their words, “It’s really difficult to be in a place where no one, other than those eleven students, will ever really understand what they’re going through.” So that’s been really effective.

I think I want to also share just a couple quick stories that have come up recently just to give you sort of an insight as to who these students are. So the day after the election we all met together as a group. It was a Wednesday. They were obviously in a very hurtful place, they were very upset, very emotional. So we spent some time processing, talking about their fears, about their anxieties, what it means for them, their family, their community back home. In that conversation, I thought, “Well, we should take a few minutes to talk about what it means to be a student right now because it’s a Wednesday and they’re in a very different and challenged place.”

So we talked about academics. We talked about how some of them had exams the next day or that week, papers. I said, “You know, I feel really comfortable taking some time to connect with your faculty, reaching out, advocating for you, you need some space,
you need some time, what does this mean for you, and how can I be helpful in this role.” 
As a group, as we talked about it, they did respond like, “No, we feel very powerless and we don’t want to have our education impacted by this.” So they really didn’t want to take the steps of not going to an exam or not going to class. They didn’t want to infringe on their educational opportunity here, and I thought that was really powerful. It really showed me a lot about who that group of students is.

Another quick story just to share is, what Mary Pat referenced, they do a lot of work advocating for immigration and social justice for immigration. They were vigorous in their list of demands that recently came out asking for Tufts to be a sanctuary school. They also were a part of the request to have a walkout last Wednesday, which had a lot of support on campus and a really great turnout. The students, the first-year students, mostly did not attend that rally, did not attend that walkout. They asked to come together separately while that walkout was happening. They didn’t feel safe. They didn’t want to be a part of that. It was a public display. They were worried about negative attention being drawn, the media. So we met separately so they could have space together while that was happening. I just think it’s important to share just so you can kind of hear what’s happening with the students and their experience. Just to let you know that we are working really closely with them, providing them with as much support and as much opportunities as we can.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So something else that we learned in the last couple days moving forward is that legal counsel, university legal counsel, has guaranteed private legal counsel, one-on-one, paid by the university for all undocumented students, and we really appreciate that. I think that is a great gesture, but also a really concrete thing that the university is doing. I also haven’t spoken with Karen, but my understanding from speaking with our legal counsel is that there is no intent to change any policy around admission of undocumented students.

MS. ARDIZZONI: Susan Ardizzoni, I’m the director of undergraduate admissions. Just to let you know that we do have four undocumented students who are already a part of the class of 2021 through the QuestBridge program. So we are moving ahead as we’ve always done, and we’ll continue to monitor the applicant pool going forward up to the deadline of January 1st.

DEAN GLASER: There’s much more to talk about and we will thankfully have some opportunity on December 10th and 11th. I know that this other program is being devised now. Have a good day everybody and a good end of the semester.

MEETING ADJOURNED
Respectfully Submitted,

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