AS&E Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, December 14, 2016

Schedule and Location

Wednesday, December 14, 2016
Coolidge Room, Ballou Hall
Light lunch, coffee, and water served at 11:30 AM

*PLEASE NOTE THIS MEETING WILL OFFER VIDEOCONFERENCE CAPABILITIES FOR OUR SMFA COLLEAGUES

Agenda

Announcements

May 9, 2016 incident that caused finals to be cancelled and re-scheduled
Kevin Maguire, Executive Director, Public Safety;
Geoff Bartlett, Deputy Director/Director, Emergency Management; and
Leon Romprey, Deputy Director, Police Operations

Equity, Access for Student Equality (EASE) Survey
Linda Daniels, Psy.D., Chair, EASE Group; Staff Psychologist, Health Services; and Liaison to Associate Provost

EPC plans for Bulletin Changes (as a result of transition to SHUs)
Anne Mahoney, Chair of EPC

Old Business

Vote on Proposed Changes to Statement 11, limiting departmental participation in promotion-only cases to full professors.
Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair, T&P Committee
Vote will be taken by secret ballot at the meeting

Discussion and Vote on Revised EPC Proposal re: Make-up Days
Anne Mahoney, Chair, EPC

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for Grievance Panel
Jeff Zabel, Chair, Grievance Panel

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for T&P Committee, limiting departmental participation in promotion-only cases to full professors.
Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair, T&P Committee
Vote will be taken by secret ballot at the meeting, only if the corresponding changes to Statement 11 are adopted

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for T&P Committee, limiting membership of the committee to full professors
Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair, T&P Committee
Vote will be taken by secret ballot at the meeting

For Reference

Attachments*

- Agenda
- Minutes from AS&E Faculty Meeting on November 14, 2016 (T&P Discussion begins on pg. 8)
- Revised Version of Statement 11, Version 20a
- Proposed Bulletin Language for AY18-19
- EPC Revised Proposal re: Make-up Days
- Grievance Panel Defining the Ombudsperson Role

*Please print all attachments and bring them with you to the meeting; a limited number of hard copies will be available at the meeting.

Listings of future faculty meetings as well as the agenda and attachments for this meeting are online at http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/meetings/.
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 Briefings

Announcements

May 9, 2016 incident that caused finals to be cancelled and re-scheduled

The Department of Public and Environmental Safety will appear at the December 14, 2016 meeting of the faculty to discuss response to the May 9, 2016 incidents that resulted in the cancellation of finals for most of the day. The nature of the event necessitated participation by federal, state and local law enforcement. We’ll speak briefly about the initial emergency response, communications challenges and a formal post incident review currently underway. We welcome feedback regarding what worked well and what needs improvement. Please come with comments, recommendations for improvement and lessons learned from your perspective.

Equity, Access and Student Equality (EASE) Survey

The EASE working group was formed June 2016 in response to a key recommendation put forth in February 2016 by the AS&E Diversity Council when asked to prioritize items in the December 2013 “Report of the Council on Diversity.” The Council expressed primary concern around the need to provide and ensure sustained access and equity for all Tufts students, particularly around issues of socioeconomic access. EASE will specifically address both immediate (short-term) and multi-year (long-term) steps to level the access and equity playing field for all Tufts students. Faculty members are encouraged to participate in the upcoming Departmental Resources/Supports Survey.

EPC plans for Bulletin Changes (as a result of transition to SHUs)

EPC has completed revisions to the Bulletin to express policies in terms of semester hours rather than Tufts Credits. The AS&E Faculty will be asked to approve these revisions at its February meeting.

Old Business

Vote on Proposed Changes to Statement 11

Speaker: Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair T&P

Summary: Discuss proposed changes to Statement #11. These proposed changes will be voted on by secret ballot at the AS&E Faculty Meeting on December 14, 2016.

For Faculty Discussion:

The School of Engineering took the following vote in spring 2015:

Do you support having only full Professors deliberate on cases of promotion to full Professor?

Yes (only full Professors deliberate on promotion cases): 33 votes (58%)

No (both full Professors and Assoc. Professors deliberate): 24 votes (42%)

In light of this vote by the faculty of the School of Engineering, the members of the T&P Committee would like to open a discussion by the full faculty of AS&E about the participation of associate professors in promotion-only cases.
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**Key Issues:**

**Pro:**

1. Faculty already at the rank of professor are better able to judge the criteria for promotion compared to faculty who may have just earned tenure.
2. Eliminates potential conflict of interest: full professors do not have to worry about retaliation or consequences when reviewing a case. A tenured Associate Professor who is close to being considered for promotion, may not be in a position to provide an unbiased opinion on a departmental colleague who will soon be an evaluator for his/her own case for promotion. Associate professors could feel pressure to vote in a certain way by their senior colleagues and/or feel intimidated about expressing their views on the case. Having no associate professors removes this kind of collegial pressure.
3. Given 2 the department vote recorded may not be in fact an accurate reflection of the views of the faculty
4. If there should not be any distinction between Associate and Full Professors, then why we not abolishing the rank of Associate Professor?

**Con:**

1. Faculty are considered “full members” of the department upon the awarding of tenure. This change would disenfranchise a significant portion of the faculty
2. Recently minted associate professors are among our best scholar/teachers, and have much to contribute to promotion discussions. The opinions of experienced Associate Professors can be very valuable and they would be lost in promotion cases.
3. Being tenured they have a strong interest in the direction of the department.
4. Presents challenges to implementation in small departments with only a handful of full professors.

**Action required:** Vote for a change of wording in Statement #11, marked in red and blue, to restrict participation in deliberations for tenure and/or promotion to a specific rank limited to members of the department whose rank equals or exceeds that rank. Faculty members who meet this criterion are designated as “eligible” in the draft of Statement 11. *This vote will take place by secret ballot, as voted on by the AS&E Faculty.*

**For Additional Information:** The modifications to Statement 11, needed in order to implement the restriction that allows only tenured faculty at the rank of professor to participate in promotion-only cases to the rank of full professor, are marked in red in the attached document (Statement 11, 20a). Also attached is the proposal that the School of Engineering distributed in Spring 2015 re: only full professors participating in promotion cases.

**Discussion and Vote on Revised EPC Proposal re: Make-up Days**

**Speaker:** Anne Mahoney, chair of EPC

**Summary:** EPC proposes to specify which days should be used, if the deans decide it is appropriate to make up a class day after an unplanned campus closure.

**Key Issues:** We propose to use holidays as we have done in the past, and to start the spring semester one day earlier, allowing a "bonus day" that can be used as a make-up day or taken as a day of no classes if no make-up day is required.
**Action required:** AS&E faculty members vote on the proposal

**Further information:** Please see the attached proposal for more details about the proposal.

**Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for Grievance Panel**

**Speaker:** Jeff Zabel, Chair, Grievance Panel

**Summary:** We are proposing 3 bylaw changes for the Grievance Panel:

1. Remove the position of secretary as an officer of the Grievance Panel
2. Extend the term of elected members from 3 to 5 years.
3. Extend the term of the Ombudsperson to three years and extend eligibility to Grievance Panel members in their second year

**Proposed Bylaw Changes (in bold):**

A Grievance Panel (“the panel”), consisting of nine members of the faculty of professorial rank, elected for **five three-year** terms, including at least one member from the School of Engineering. No more than one member of a single department may be a member of this panel at any one time and no member of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion may be a member of the Grievance Panel.

The officers of the panel shall be a chair, a secretary, and an ombudsperson. **The chair will be** chosen annually by the panel from its own members. **The ombudsperson will hold this position for three years and will be chosen by the panel from its own members. Panel members with one or two years experience are eligible to be chosen for the ombudsperson position.** The chair and the ombudsperson must be designated by the end of each academic year for the following year, and their names should be sent at that time to the Secretary of the Faculty to avoid a hiatus in the panel's functioning. Members of the panel shall be assembled by the chair upon the request of a grievant, or upon the request of a majority of the members of the committee, or whenever, in the judgment of the chair, a meeting is desirable.

**Key Issues:** The ombudsperson position is very weak and we would like to strengthen it. Rationale for the 3 changes noted in the Summary above:

1. This position is obsolete
2. Grievances have been rare in recent years and there is little institutional memory. Longer terms should not be unduly burdensome, since the committee rarely has any business; this would allow members to gain some useful experience over a longer term, and is a necessary context for the third proposed change to the Bylaws.
3. Recent Ombudspersons have become painfully aware of the fact that they are untrained and relatively inadequate for a position of considerable importance and sensitivity. We would like to see the Ombudsperson serve for a longer period so that he/she gains competence from experience. We also recommend that the ombudsperson receive some professional training (if the university will pay for this, which then becomes another argument for a longer term).

**Action Required:** AS&E faculty members vote on the proposal

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for T&P Committee, limiting departmental participation in promotion-only cases to full professors.
Speaker: Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair T&P

Summary: Discuss and vote on proposed changes to Statement #11. These proposed changes will be voted on by secret ballot at the AS&E Faculty Meeting on December 14, 2016.

For Faculty Discussion:
The School of Engineering took the following vote in spring 2015:

Do you support having only full Professors deliberate on cases of promotion to full Professor?
Yes (only full Professors deliberate on promotion cases): 33 votes (58%)
No (both full Professors and Assoc. Professors deliberate): 24 votes (42%)

In light of this vote by the faculty of the School of Engineering, the members of the T&P Committee opened a discussion by the full faculty of AS&E about the participation of associate professors in promotion-only cases on November 19, 2016.

Key Issues:
Pro:
1. Faculty already at the rank of professor are better able to judge the criteria for promotion compared to faculty who may have just earned tenure.
2. Eliminates potential conflict of interest: full professors do not have to worry about retaliation or consequences when reviewing a case. A tenured Associate Professor who is close to being considered for promotion, may not be in a position to provide an unbiased opinion on a departmental colleague who will soon be an evaluator for his/her own case for promotion. Associate professors could feel pressure to vote in a certain way by their senior colleagues and/or feel intimidated about expressing their views on the case. Having no associate professors removes this kind of collegial pressure.
3. Given 2 the department vote recorded may not be in fact an accurate reflection of the views of the faculty
4. If there should not be any distinction between Associate and Full Professors, then why we not abolishing the rank of Associate Professor?

Con:
1. Faculty are considered "full members" of the department upon the awarding of tenure. This change would disenfranchise a significant portion of the faculty
2. Recently minted associate professors are among our best scholar/teachers, and have much to contribute to promotion discussions. The opinions of experienced Associate Professors can be very valuable and they would be lost in promotion cases.
3. Being tenured they have a strong interest in the direction of the department.
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4. Presents challenges to implementation in small departments with only a handful of full professors.

**Action required:** Vote for a change of wording in Statement #11, marked in red and blue, to restrict participation in deliberations for tenure and/or promotion to a specific rank limited to members of the department whose rank equals or exceeds that rank. Faculty members who meet this criterion are designated as “eligible” in the draft of Statement 11. *This vote will take place by secret ballot, as voted on by the AS&E faculty on November 19, 2016.*

**For Additional Information:** The modifications to Statement 11, needed in order to implement the restriction that allows only tenured faculty at the rank of professor to participate in promotion-only cases to the rank of full professor, are marked in red in the attached document (Statement 11, 20a). Also attached is the proposal that the School of Engineering distributed in Spring 2015 re: only full professors participating in promotion cases.

**Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for T&P Committee, limiting membership of the committee to full professors**

*Speaker:* Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair T&P

**Proposed Change #1 Summary:** Proposal to require only full professors to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Change of Bylaws of AS&E (marked in blue)

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

**Key Issues:** The proposal would simply codify the existing practice, as every efforts have been made to elect only full professors as members of the T&P Committee. This requires a change of AS&E Bylaws.

**Action required:** Vote by secret ballot for a change of the AS&E Bylaws at the AS&E faculty on December 14, 2016.

**Proposed Change #2 Summary:** If the proposal to require only full professors to participate in promotion cases to the rank of full professor is approved by the faculty of AS&E, the AS&E Bylaws need to be modified to reflect the result of the vote.

Change of AS&E Bylaws (excerpt below; proposed changes marked in bold and blue) to reflect changes of policy allowing only full professors to deliberate at promotion cases to the rank of professor.

The committee shall elect its own chair and vice chair. In the event that an individual being considered is a member of the same department as the chair of the committee, the vice chair shall serve as chair.
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This committee shall review the qualifications of all individuals who are proposed for consideration for a tenured position or who are proposed for promotion above the rank of assistant professor, or who request such consideration. It is the intent of these procedures that participation in deliberations for tenure and/or promotion to a specific rank be limited to members of the department whose rank equals or exceeds that rank. In the text that follows, faculty members who meet this criterion are designated as “eligible”. It shall requisition and consider all evidence that has a bearing on the individual under consideration. This shall include a departmental statement, and a privately submitted evaluation and recommendation to the Chair of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion from each tenured eligible member of the candidate's department(s); nontenured members of the department who were not eligible to participate in the discussion and vote are invited to submit evaluations and recommendations but are not required to do so. After review of the confidential letters by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, the committee will forward these letters along with the rest of the candidate's dossier to the administration, unless the case is tabled. Confidential letters will be kept secure by the Secretary of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering for three years from the date of official action by the Board of Trustees on the candidate's application, at which time the letters will be destroyed, unless the administration has been legally enjoined from doing so.

The departmental statement shall reflect the full range of opinion of department members who vote on the application, record the numerical vote, and be signed by all voting-eligible members. When department members cannot agree on a single statement, a signed minority statement shall be submitted. The statement(s), including a list of members who voted, shall be made available to the candidate who has the option to submit a timely written response to the department statement. When pertinent, the views of colleagues, both tenured and nontenured, in other departments, and of individuals from outside the university shall be obtained. The committee may ask any of the above persons, or the candidate, to appear in person. Each department will maintain records of student opinion of faculty members, from which information about a candidate will be made available to the committee when appropriate.

For each candidate under consideration for tenure, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall create an external subcommittee. Each External Subcommittee shall consist of: (a) two members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, one of whom shall serve as chair; (b) two members of the department(s) concerned, elected by the tenured-eligible member(s) of the department; and (c) one member, hereafter referred to as the outside expert, selected by the tenured members of the department(s) concerned. This outside expert should be from the same discipline as the candidate, or a related field.

**Key Issues:** A change of Bylaws required if the proposal to require only full professors to participate in promotion cases to the rank of full Professor is approved by the faculty of AS&E.

**Action required:** Vote by secret ballot for a change of AS&E Bylaws at the AS&E faculty on December 14, 2016.