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PROF. TOBIN: This is the last AS&E meeting of the semester. Take a seat. I want to remind everyone just again, when we have the discussion, please do wait for a microphone, and then please do identify yourself by name and department or other affiliation for all of us, but also especially for our colleagues at the SMFA.

So we have three announcements that we’re going to begin with. The first announcement relates to an incident that happened last spring regarding the fire and the cancellation of classes. So Kevin Maguire and Geoff Bartlett and Leon Romprey from TUPD.

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

MR. MAGUIRE: Good afternoon, everyone. For those of you who don’t know me, my name is Kevin Maguire. I’m the director of public safety here at Tufts. With me today are my colleagues, Geoff Bartlett, the director of emergency management, and Leon Romprey, who is the director of police operations.

So we know we have limited time, and we’d like use the vast majority of the time for questions, comments, critical or otherwise. Let us know how from your perspective this incident unfolded and how it was handled.

We’re here to talk about the May 9, 2016 incident of an early morning car fire adjacent to the Health Center and some bomb threats that targeted various facilities on our campus. TUPD responded to the car fire, evacuated the facilities, requested mutual aid from our public safety partners, and swept the facilities for devices. And as you know, as a result of all of that, finals were cancelled for about five and a half hours that afternoon and resumed later on that evening.

We since commissioned an independent review to evaluate what worked well and what didn’t, and we have some preliminary information back that we can share with you. We have solid emergency response and management plans in place, and the law enforcement response was prompt and efficient. Our colleagues used trained K-9s to search the facilities, clearing them rapidly, and communication, with a big C, is an area that needs work on. So we know that.

So throughout this incident, our first priority was public safety. No one was injured. We recovered quickly and attempted to establish finals at the end. We felt the bomb threats were unconfirmed, but needed to be fully vetted. So with that, we welcome your comments, suggestions, etcetera. Know that there’s a continuing investigation, and so some of the questions you may ask, we may have to defer to another time.

And with that, I’d open it up for comments, questions, and concerns.
PROF. ROBINSON: Pearl Robinson, political science. Maybe I’m the only person here who doesn’t know this, but did you find out who did it?

MR. MAGUIRE: We have a person of interest. Do we have enough to proceed with criminal charges? Not yet, but we’re working on that diligently.

PROF. RIFE: Jason Rife from chemical engineering. My sense is the public safety response was very rapid and effective, and I don’t know if on the – this is a different side, so it’s not going to be so much a question for you as maybe a comment. The trickiest part was the response on the academic side, and so I just leave this as an open question perhaps: do we have an improved system on the academic side to know how to respond to this type of event that happens in the future?

MR. MAGUIRE: That’s a good question. I know that we’re working on that through our group that’s evaluating the response to the incident now.

MR. BARTLETT: So as we conducted a post-incident review, we broke it up into five focus areas, and one of the areas that we’re looking at is recovery and academic continuity. So we met with a number of folks who are responsible for aspects like room scheduling and enabling final exams to happen. We’re trying to capture the things that were done that enabled the rescheduling of final exams, look at some of the assumptions the way final exams are scheduled, and then see what we can make recommendations to do so that we can link our emergency plans with the ability to either sustain or somehow resume very important and very hard to reschedule academic exercises.

PROVOST HARRIS: David Harris, provost. So Jason, I wanted to follow up, just to be clear on what you mean about the academic response. I think it was – I’ll just say that the challenge was, “Do we proceed or not?,” and I think on the academic side, when I was talking to Jim and Jianmin about it, and with Tony, obviously, and I’m still confident we made the right decision to put a hold on finals, because there was so much uncertainty.

And my position was if someone tells you that there might be a bomb in five buildings, and there’s already a car that’s on fire, why don’t we trust them that it could be in the sixth building. So I think we decided to put a hold on that. And then there were lots of challenges, obviously, to reschedule.

PROF. RIFE: To clarify, my concern was not if exams should be canceled. That was fully appropriate, and I consider that part of the public safety. It was about the rescheduling. I think one of the items on today’s agenda is talking about snow days, right, and rescheduling for snow days. But it seems like this is a similar kind of issue, but with more challenge when it comes to a final exam, as opposed to a class day. So that’s really the core of my question.
PROVOST HARRIS: Thanks for clarifying.

MR. MAGUIRE: Anyone else? Thank you.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, and thank you I think for a very professional and effective handling of a difficult situation.

**Equity, Access for Student Equality (EASE) Survey**

PROF. TOBIN: The next item has to do with the EASE survey and project. As we know, not all of our students come from the same socioeconomic backgrounds, and this is a briefing on the beginnings, I believe, of an effort to assess and address some of those issues.

DR. DANIELS: Thank you. So I’m here to represent as a chair of a working group that was established back in June. The working group is called Equity, Access and Student Equality Group, better known as the EASE group, in keeping with Tufts’ fondness for acronyms.

So the EASE group was formed in response to key recommendations made by the Diversity Council based on the diversity report that was submitted in December of 2013. And one of the things that became clear in listening to the Diversity Council report was that we have a percentage of students who are struggling enormously. So one of the issues that was clear was that some of these students – and I’m talking about approximately 20% of our AS&E students – are struggling with things such as food insecurity, lack of money to buy basic living supplies, and such.

So I began to work with a number of students, faculty members, administrators across AS&E, and we formed a working group to look at what Tufts can do to level the playing field for these students. So our first concern was to really look at what are the needs of these students in the aggregate. We do know that there are students at Tufts who are homeless. We know that there are students at Tufts who go to bed hungry. We know that there are students at Tufts who are working 30 hours a week, plus trying to maintain their academic performance, and also sending money home to their families.

So we have a cohort of students who are silently suffering. And so the work of the EASE group is to begin to try to think about how we can level the playing field for these students. So the first step is to really map the extent of the problem. And with that, we have developed a student survey that we have just launched last week, in fact, that will ask students to tell us as much as they can about what the hidden costs are of their education and what the needs and resources are that they are lacking.
The second part is to actually look at what are the resources here on campus. There are many that we don’t know about, and there are many that don’t exist. So our goal is to see what that looks like. So that will involve having the academic departments as well as other divisions let us know what are the resources that are available, and how we can get those resources to students as quickly as possible.

And then the third step is to really try to centralize all that information so that students know where to go and know how to access these resources. We will indeed find that there are resources that are not present here at Tufts that may be helpful to these students, and we’ll cross that bridge when we get to it. I’m looking at Tony. And hopefully, we will be able to do a better job at helping these students succeed here at Tufts. So the goal of our group is to really help these students as best as we can.

So the next step in our process is to send out a departmental and division level survey asking each department, each division, to provide us with information with respect to what the resources are in your individual departments, what the supports are that you may have for students who are of low SES, and what you can possibly do to help improve the lives of these students while they’re here at Tufts. Questions, comments, suggestions?

PROF. GOLDSTEIN: Gary Goldstein, physics and astronomy. I’m surprised at one-fifth of the students being in troublesome situations. How do we know that?

DR. DANIELS: Well, we looked at the financial aid situation, and what we found was that there are PELL students, which will be students who would meet those criteria for low SES, and that number is about 590 students. But there’s always those students who sort of fall between the cracks. So with financial aid’s help we identified students whose family contribution was $7,000 or less, and that captured another 200-plus students. And those students, of course, also meet the criteria for low SES. And I was quite surprised at the number as well.

PROF. ROBINSON: Pearl Robinson, political science. It seemed to me that many of these students would be identified at admission, and that that would be the ideal time to anticipate their needs and have something in place so that on day one, they would have more of a level playing field, though it will never be level.

DR. DANIELS: Exactly, yes.

PROF. ROBINSON: And then it seems that you have students who will fall through the cracks because their family circumstances change after they get here.

DR. DANIELS: Absolutely.
PROF. ROBINSON: But what are we talking about? Are we talking about meal tickets, or we’re talking about – just sort of give some idea of what you’re –

DR. DANIELS: Okay, so some of the things that we’re talking about is food insecurity, which is a big one. What happens is that we know that the first two years, students are required to stay on campus, and they’re required to have a full meal plan in their first year. However, in the second year, a student can call the bursar’s office and say, “I want a limited meal plan,” and then will be reimbursed for the difference. And many of those students use that check to buy books. And therefore, by mid-semester, they have run out of meal tickets, meal swipes. So that’s one thing.

The other thing is that we have student health insurance. However, when a student goes to Health Services, they will get a diagnosis, they will get a prescription for medication, and they will be told to go to CVS in Porter Square and pick up their prescription. Students with low SES can’t afford the $15-dollar co-payment, so they don’t pick up the medication.

The other thing is transportation as well. Students often don’t have enough money for some things that are required by their classes to go off-campus for different events. There are students who come to Tufts who are from different countries or from different states. They come here and don’t have proper clothing. So warm clothing, coats, or other things. There are students who cannot pay for laundry every week. And there are students who can’t – they have to balance, “Do I buy this book, or do I buy toiletries?”

So these are some of the things that we have found to be a problem. And then, of course, there are those unexpected emergencies as well that come up.

PROF. DHINGRA: Pawan Dhingra, sociology, and American Studies. Will you after you finish the survey with the students be able to share what departments and programs, if not individual students’ names, but percentages of students who are in our departments and programs who are at risk?

DR. DANIELS: Absolutely, yes. We’ll be doing a significant data analysis on that, and we are intending to share that with as many people as we can.

PROF. DHINGRA: And just to follow up – this is to Jim Glaser – maybe at a chairs and directors meetings in the future, brainstorm together ways of supporting students like this in department budgets?

DEAN GLASER: Yes. It seems to me that it would be a good exercise, and the chairs meeting would be a good place to do it. I do want to say that Linda and I have had several conversations, and it’s not like this is a new – it’s not like we’ve discovered it all of a sudden, and it didn’t exist before. Of course, we’ve had students with very
significant financial needs on campus for a while, and we have put into place some things over the years as we’ve become aware of them, and so it’s not that we’re starting from zero. We have done some things.

And let me just say that John Barker and Laura Wood put in place this year, with the help of an arts and sciences donor, a program where all of the textbooks, which are very expensive, are on reserve. Now, we’ve never put textbooks on reserve because the publishing companies put a new edition out every year, and it’s not very cost-effective for the library to purchase the new edition every year. That’s a strategy that the publishers do to make sure that they can circumvent these book marketplaces. But we’re now doing that.

Laura is not here, I don’t think, because I think there’s a family emergency, but the last I saw, there were something like 3,500, 3,800 separate checkouts of the books that are available there. We spent I think $15,000 just to make sure that they were available for students. Actually, Alicia, do you know any of this? Anyway, it’s just one example. It’s something that we’re doing to address the issue. Do you want to say something?

**MS. MEANEY:** Sure. Dorothy Meaney, Tisch Library. We are putting this program, a pilot program that has been fairly successful for the fall semester, and we’re putting it into place for the spring semester. We’ve looked at the high enrollment intro courses. We’ve worked with Dean Rob Mack to identify which of those courses have the highest enrollment, and we’re analyzing not just the usage of these textbooks, but really how far they reach.

It’s not only first-year students that enroll in those courses. And so we’ll do our own data analysis and figure out the most effective way to move forward. Having said that, as the dean understands, it’s not really a sustainable program for the whole university, but it is a step in the right direction.

**PROF. FULTON:** There’s a question from the SMFA. The question is: how was the survey distributed, to all students, undergrad, or grad? These two populations are somewhat different.

**DR. DANIELS:** We have not looked at the SMFA at this point, because we just started the project, but we will be – that’s our next step, is to look at that particular population specifically.

**PROF. FULTON:** What about graduate students? Did the survey –

**DR. DANIELS:** That’s next year’s objective.

**MS. REILLY:** I’m Patty Reilly, director of financial aid, and I did want to respond to
the question about as students are admitted, we should be able to identify them then. And you’re absolutely right, and that’s when we do identify them. That’s when they get their – you know, we meet 100% of their need. We also do a lot of outreach before the students arrive, the summer before they arrive.

We call each one of those families, we talk with them about what their needs are, and we make sure they understand what their commitments are going to be. So we are doing a lot of outreach early on and trying to work very hard with the EASE group to make sure we get the students here, and then help them deal with unanticipated expenses once they arrive.

DR. DANIELS: And I want to thank Patty for being very helpful in getting the survey out and helping us with that.

PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: Sharan Schwartzberg, occupational therapy. My program’s a graduate-only program, and we have been requested through the accreditation committee of occupational therapy educational programs to provide data, such as the number of students and graduates who are from low-income families. So that’s been at the request of the US Department of Education. And so the Office of Institutional Research has been helping me to gather information on exit surveys, but currently, Tufts does not ask information about low-income –

MS. DANIELS: Graduate students.

PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: — families for graduate students. So I think that’s a great resource, the Office of Institutional Research, to help with the exit surveys to include such data on a regular basis. That’s just a suggestion.

DR. DANIELS: I agree wholeheartedly. David wanted to say something.

PROVOST HARRIS: David Harris, provost. I just wanted to bring it back and remind that part of the reason we started this was really about – Tufts, I’m very proud to say, is a university that meets 100% of demonstrated need. And so the question always at this and other institutions where I’ve been is, “What’s need?” And so part of what we’re doing here is trying to understand what are some of the other costs that show up, and do an assessment periodically, and then make the tough decision of what’s on the need side, what isn’t on the need side. And that’s part of why the start is with undergrads.

DR. DANIELS: Exactly.

PROVOST HARRIS: Because we don’t have that same policy with our grad populations. And so just to make sure the context was –
DR. DANIELS: Absolutely. Thank you for that.

PROF. PINDERHUGHES: Ellen Pinderhughes, child study and human development. I’m also on the EASE task force. I’ve been on the undergraduate working group for the president’s diversity task force as well. And I just want to kind of build out a little bit some of what Linda has shared.

One of the things that I do recall being really striking and the committee was very concerned about was the inability of students to access not just the basic issues and the basic needs that Linda’s talked about, but also experiences that are otherwise transforming for students of privilege: study abroad, campus-wide activities, internships. So these are all the kinds of activities that the working group identified as barriers for students, and that EASE, in addition to the very specific examples that she gave, are going to be really important for us to identify and really be able to figure out ways to address.

The other point I want to make is that one of the compelling reasons that led me to join the taskforce was a point that Linda made, and that is that while in the past Tufts has made some identification of resources for some students, the way they’ve accessed it has outed them as a low-income, low-resource student. And so one of the goals is to be able to figure out a system where students can access these supports without having to identify themselves.

And so the question about whether we’ll be sharing information with departments I think we’ll have to carefully as a committee think about what the best way is to share that information that honors students’ privacy, but also helps address their need.

DR. DANIELS: Absolutely, yes. Good point. Thank you, Helen.

PROF. MONTEZ: Noe Montez, drama and dance. So I’m glad to hear about the textbook reserve program. I’m curious if you can speak to other actions that we can take specifically in our classrooms as we plan for the spring semester in order to create a more equitable playing space.

DR. DANIELS: Well, I think one of the things is to really think through some of the requirements that you ask of students in terms of purchasing things, like particular software packages or things of that nature, whether there’s some way that you can sort of do some kind of tier pricing or scale back on some of the things that you are – or there are some ways in which you can provide some of that stuff free to certain students who may need it.

I think one of the major things is just awareness. I think a lot of people – somebody said they were shocked at the numbers. And I’ve met with many people across the campus
since my arrival, and I would say 90% of the people are shocked by the fact that this is actually the case. We all know that there are students here who are of low income, but to put it at 20% of our students meeting that criteria is shocking for a lot of us.

So part of the reason why I wanted to come here is just to sort of educate you and let you know that they are there. And that student who may be sleeping or not showing up for class may have just worked 40 hours a week. And so just to have a certain level of awareness of what may be going on. I think the assumption is that since a student is here, they at least meet the academic criteria, and that’s all we think about. And so I just want to open up your minds to other issues that the students may be struggling with that you may not have been conscious of.

PROF. TOBIN: So I think that’s a great place to end this stage of our conversation. We’re certainly going to be returning to this, and presumably once you have more data from the survey –

MS. DANIELS: And I will be sending out a departmental survey as well, so I encourage you to please complete that. Thank you, and if you need to reach me, I’m at linda.daniels@tufts.edu. Thank you very much.

DEAN GLASER: One quick response to Noe’s question. Dowling Hall has Rob Mack on staff, and if you identify a student or if a student identifies themselves to you as struggling with these issues, I would give Rob a call and make sure he knows. He’s connected to all the resources. He knows where the different pots of money might be. Patty Reilly’s office is right down the hall from him. He’s a good point person for you to know and to use. Thank you.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, and thank you, Linda. So the last announcement has to do with the ongoing saga of the SHUs, and Anne Mahoney will tell us the latest.

EPC plans for Bulletin Changes (as a result of transition to SHUs)
PROF. MAHONEY: This is actually just an announcement. There will be plenty of time to discuss this. I want to discuss this. It’s an endlessly fascinating topic. But we’ll do that in February.

You all received with the announcement for this meeting a copy of the revisions to The Bulletin to go into effect for academic year ‘18-’19, not this coming year, the point at which we begin accounting in semester hours, rather than in Tufts credits. We will discuss this, and with luck, vote on it at our February meeting. These are changes to Bulletin language, so this faculty has to vote on them.

I also want to take a moment to acknowledge all the people who made this happen.
Everyone who’s been on EPC this year or last year, will you stand up and take a bow. Thank you all. It’s a good group to work with. It’s fascinating stuff. If people are looking for committee assignments, this is definitely where the action is.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, Anne. This is an endless and extremely important task, and we really do appreciate all your work on it.

So we’re turning now yet again to the topic of Tenure and Promotion policies. As decided at our last meeting, we held over the discussion and vote about the proposal to limit voting in departments on promotions to professor to people who are already holding the rank of professor. So we’ll reopen the discussion on that, and we will then have a vote on that by secret ballot. So let me to turn it over to Krzysztof to lead this discussion.

**Vote on Proposed Changes to Statement 11, limiting departmental participation in promotion-only cases to full professors.**

PROF. SLIWA: I don’t have much more to say than we will have a continuation of the discussion. Maybe one thing. The overarching principle for T&P is that we are trying to implement a fair process. Fair means the same for all the departments which are governed by T&P, and this includes two schools: the School of Engineering and the School of Arts and Sciences. And as far as I can imagine, there’s no way to implement completely an ideal system. It will never exist. The system that we have is fair, in the sense that we apply the same criteria and the same process to everybody.

Now, as you know, there was a vote by the School of Engineering. They wanted to restrict the participation for the promotion cases to only full professors, and as such, we have to bring it to the decision for the full faculty. The list of pros and cons haven’t changed. It’s the same. To me, the most important one is that not restricting it creates a possible conflict of interest. In my mind, it’s an extremely strong argument to make a change.

The argument against – and there’s a whole bunch there on Page 3 or 4 – the most important one that it will exclude some part of faculty, although temporarily, and we don’t have a real discussion – I mean, most of the discussion points that were raised the last two times were clearly from one side. So last time, as you perhaps remember, we’re supposed to take an electronic vote in between the two meetings, but the faculty voted to change the rules. I hope that the reason was to bring more discussion. So here it is.

DEAN QU: It’s hard to speak behind your back. Jianmin Qu, mechanical engineering. I want to speak, say a few words as a faculty member, not as the dean so that my boss who is sitting there will not reprimand me afterwards for saying something I should not. I think you can also relax a little bit, because I’m not going to argue for or against the
motion on the floor. I’m going to say something else that’s only tangentially related to the motion on the floor.

Let me take it back a little bit so you can put what I’m going to say in the proper context. On setting up the agenda for the last faculty meeting, the Executive Committee decided that we’re going to take an electronic vote for this Statement 11 change, because the Executive Committee believes that this is a very important vote. Therefore, we want to have broader participation, and electronic votes tend to draw much more participation based on our own data. Did I summarize that correctly, Roger? Good.

But at the last faculty meeting, as many of you know, the faculty would reverse that decision. We said, “No, we don’t want to do the electronic vote. We want to do the in-person vote at this meeting,” and that’s why we’re doing it now. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the last faculty meeting because of an unavoidable conflict. So last night, in preparation for this meeting, I read through the meeting transcript very carefully.

As I was reading it, it became very clear to me that I have missed some very passionate discussions on this particular issue. But what really drew my attention most is the reason that we want to make the change from electronic to in-person, which is the people who are not coming to this faculty meeting do not benefit from hearing both sides of the argument. Therefore, they are not well informed. And we don’t want people who are not informed to vote, so let’s change this to in-person meeting so that they will not be able to vote unless they are here to be informed, to be educated.

On the surface, that seems to be a very sensible, logical, and well-constructed argument. However, with the memory of the presidential election still was fresh in my mind, I was reading it, and I asked myself the following question: would I be in favor of a law that says those, and only those, who have attended political speeches from both sides of the aisle, maybe those who have watched all the presidential debates, and maybe only those who have read or studied the platform of each parties carefully are allowed to vote? In other words, only those who are well-informed have the right to vote. I think should there be such a law, the outcome of this election might have been different. It might have been more towards my own liking. But I will never vote for such a law because it goes against the fundamental core of our democracy. One vote – one person, one vote. Remember, the right to vote is undeniable, regardless of whether that vote is informed or misinformed.

In other words, I’m going to defend the person’s right to vote even if I know that person’s vote is completely misinformed.

Now, let’s get back to the transcript of the last faculty meeting. It is very clear that – let
me put it this way. As much as I think it is important that everyone should make every effort to attend this meeting, as much as I think it’s important that we hear arguments from both sides, and as much as I think it’s important one should be well-informed before you vote, I will be the first one in line to defend those who have decided not to be informed to defend their right to be non-educated and even to defend their right to be ignored. I would never take their voting right away. I would never even attempt any effort to prevent them from voting.

Hold on, let me finish.

PROF. RAMSEY: Is this even in order? The decision has already been made.

DEAN QU: Thank you. So if you think about what we did at the last faculty meeting, what we did was in effect taking the right to vote from those who are not or who have decided not to be educated or not to be informed at this meeting today. I think that is a very bad and dangerous precedent. I know you’d argue that in-person voting does not mean taking the right away or the voting right away from those who are not here today. And we have been in-person voting for all these years. After all, our democracy is based on participatory actions. You’ve got to be here in order to vote, to speak, to be heard. And I agree with you all that.

The point at stake is not about which way to vote. I’m not here to debate the marriage between electronic and in-person voting. The point is the very reason for which we made that change. We made the change with a clear intention to prevent certain people from voting.

PROF. TOBIN: I think everyone understands your point, and it is about a vote that was taken at the last meeting. And we do have a vote to take at this meeting. So can we wind this up very quickly so we can move on?

DEAN QU: Thank you. I will do that. So what I’d like to plead to you is to think about this very carefully. Think about if this is okay, to change the rules of voting in order to prevent certain people or certain ideas to be heard, and if this is the tradition or the culture that we want to establish in this faculty, or more bluntly, is this the kind of democracy that we want to practice in this faculty?

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, Jianmin. I’m sure people want to respond to Jianmin’s comments, but I would also like to bring this to a quick conclusion so that we can debate the actual motion at hand.

PROF. COWEN: I actually want to debate the actual motion. Is that okay?

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you.
PROF. COWEN: Maybe I’ll circle back at the end to something that Jianmin said. I want to invoke a colleague who’s about to retire. This is Harry Bernheim in biology. Harry Bernheim is about to retire at the rank of associate professor at Tufts. I have recently found out that in addition to having been a past chair of biology, that Harry Bernheim personally writes every single medical school recommendation for a Tufts undergraduate who is applying pre-med. He has deans and committees that help him with this, but basically Harry Bernheim writes these letters.

And in fact, one of the things that made him most worried about retiring was he didn’t think necessarily any other faculty member would be able or willing to step into his shoes and take over this very important job that has led to Tufts having one of the highest successes in the country, is my understanding, of undergraduates being accepted to medical school.

So I’m a full professor so voting in favor of this motion is not going to disenfranchise me in any way. I’ve talked to Harry recently about saying I might be willing to take over this job. Now, if I take over this job, it’s going to be a huge hit on my research. And I kind of feel that a lot of the people who have sat at associate professor rank at Tufts over the years, tenured associate professor, have been doing a certain kind of heavy lifting to make this university run that has permitted us to hire in a whole new set of people whose research is much starrier and stronger, and somehow that the progress that Tufts has made that a lot of it has been built on the backs of people who have selflessly devoted their lives to this institution.

And to me, it seems a little bit mean-spirited to disenfranchise them. And I find this business of making this required to be an in-person vote to be somewhat symbolic and that these are also the only people who have the time, who take the time to come and show up to these faculty meetings to make sure we don’t make egregious mistakes. It’s not like I have time to come to most of these faculty meetings. I make it to maybe one a year because I’m also trying to do research. I’m a good multi-tasker, but there’s a limit to what a single person can do.

And I personally would like to not – to me, a vote in favor of only letting full professors make these decisions feels profoundly ungrateful to a set of people who have really sacrificed a lot of time and effort for our students and for Tufts.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you.

PROF. AMMONS: Liz Ammons in the English department. I hope I’m not repeating something that was said. I just was able to come to the meeting now. I’m in favor of all tenured faculty voting for promotion of associates to professor. I think it introduces more hierarchy among the faculty that is deleterious to harmony in a department to sort
of reinforce the division between associate and full professor. It’s very hard to earn tenure. Once you earn tenure, it is a community of equals, and some hold the rank of associate, and some hold the rank of full professor.

PROF. TOBIN: So in the interest of time, as we continue this discussion, we’d like to start distributing the ballots. So all full-time faculty, whether tenure, tenure track, or full-time lecturers are eligible to vote. So just so we know who should get a ballot, if people in those categories could raise their hands. I don’t know if you want to talk. Stand up, I guess, or something so we can tell the difference between people who are just raising their hands and people who have comments. So the way this is going to work – I don’t see anyone standing and wishing to talk. Sorry, go ahead.

PROF. FANTINI: Sergio Fantini from biomedical engineering. First of all, I apologize for not being here the last faculty meeting. I had a conflict, so I really couldn’t be here. I just want to say that what I mentioned two faculty meetings ago was really all of the input that was there, in the sense that there was no extensive discussion in the School of Engineering. There was just this proposal discussed on the basis of the pros and cons, and this is what it’s about here.

The other thing that I did not mention is that in no way this vote was intended to be a decision for the School of Engineering. It was just intended to express the opinion of the majority of the School of Engineering so that that topic could be brought up here. I have to say since the first time at Tufts, I really enjoyed being a member of the Arts and Sciences and Engineering faculty. When I was associate dean for graduate education in engineering, I was fighting to keep the schools, the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering as close as possible together, working with Lynne, who is somewhere here.

So from this point of view – and this is my opinion – is that whatever the vote would be here will apply to all the faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering. And this is my opinion. The other thing which I can say again is my opinion is that to me, the one reason, the one strong reason in favor of this is conflict of interest, which is a key topic. No scientific researcher, scientific reviewer would be allowed to vote at the panel for grand reviews if there is a perceived, even just a perceived, conflict of interest.

The issue that Lenore mentioned is a valid one. I have to say that we have looked at all of the universities as part of the committee appointed by Linda back then. We could not find one university where the associate professors vote for promotion to full. Of course, we may have missed one. So if any of you are aware of a university where associate professors vote for promotion to full, please speak up. But we could not find one.

We could find three universities, and they are (inaudible) University, Northeastern, and University of Oregon. These three universities, even though the rule is still that
associate professors do not vote for promotion to full, in these three places, the
departments can petition for an exception. And of course, Lenore’s case would be one
that would fall clearly under this exception. This is something I did mention two
meetings ago, but somehow it didn’t make it into the changes to Statement 11.

I just wanted to mention this, because even though I’m the first one to say what others
do is what others do, and we are Tufts, the fact that every single university adopts this,
to me, should tell us something, and the something is really to conflict of interest. That,
to me, is the major point.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you.

PROF. SOMMERS: Sam Sommers, psychology department. I respect the idea and the
concern about conflict of interest. I don’t know that I have heard a spate and litany of
concerns along those lines from here at Tufts. It seems to me there are procedural ways
to deal with that. Secret ballots at the department level. We heard last time about
associate professors maybe being uncomfortable making a decision, and they can
certainly abstain and not vote. It seems that there are plenty of procedural safeguards in
place to prevent those kinds of conflicts of interest, and we were particularly concerned
about them. It’s also not a zero sum game, such that one individual’s promotion to full
comes at the expense of or facilitates somebody else’s.

So I do think that while on the face of it, conflict of interest is always something that
we are concerned about, if anything, we’ve often heard at faculty meetings here about
initiatives to get more people promoted from associate to full. There hardly seems to be
a spate of spurious or ill-advised votes to promote people to full on this campus, so I
don’t think that that’s something that at least strikes me as a primary concern that would
convince me to take away what is maybe an unusual ability or privilege that associate
professors have on this campus. But nonetheless, it’s one that’s been there that our
colleagues have always had, and that, to me, is, I guess, the sort of abiding motivation
in how I’ll vote here.

PROF. PINDERHUGHES: Ellen Pinderhughes, child study and human development. I
have to say that when I came here 14 years ago, I came from one of those schools that
didn’t have associates voting, and I was shocked. But today, I will be voting no against
this because I have for the past 14 years come to understand what I think is a
particularly unique strength about Tufts, having been at two other institutions, and that
is the respect that cuts across rank, and I think – I’m not going to say anymore, because
Sam, you also said a lot of what I wanted to say. So I just wanted to point out that as
someone who originally came into the system didn’t understand why, I’m voting to keep
it.

PROF. TOBIN: If you’re starting to fill these out, I just want to remind you to be
careful about what the votes mean. It says very clearly, but I know not everyone reads carefully. If you’re voting yes, you are voting to change the policy and make it so that full professors only can vote on these decisions. If you’re voting no, you’re voting to retain the existing policy that all tenured faculty vote on these decisions. And if you’re abstaining, of course, you’re declining to take a position. So just to be clear about what yes and no mean on these, and make sure you’re voting for what you want to vote for.

PROF. HOPWOOD: Jeff Hopwood, electrical and computer engineering and a member of T&P. Just two items. One is I’ve only been a member of T&P since May, and I’ve already seen, without divulging too much, two cases that are sort of uncomfortable because of what we’re talking about, which I believe create some conflict of interest and some tension.

The second thing I’d like to point out is about our voting method. I did receive two ballots, and this is the blank one, which I did not fill out. So I would encourage you to think about electronic balloting as the way to go.

PROF. GOLDSTEIN: Hi, Gary Goldstein, physics and astronomy. I missed the last meeting, unfortunately. Something I recall from years back is that Tufts has very few full professors compared to its peer institutions. I don’t know if that’s still true, but there used to be a long process that prevented people from even coming up for promotion. Is that still true, I will ask?

But secondly, if we’re talking about conflict of interest because there is some kind of quota on the number of full professors there can be in a department, we should know about that. If there is no quota, then I don’t see what the conflict of interest would be.

PROF. SCHULTZ: Mary Schultz from chemistry. I just want to suggest a different kind of a conflict, not so much a conflict of interest, but the conflict that the associate professor gets put in in a department where some people want someone promoted, and some people don’t want someone promoted, and then you get retaliated against. That’s the conflict that I worry a lot.

PROF. TOBIN: So are we ready to proceed with a vote? If you have not already done so, please mark your ballots, and then I guess raise them up over your head so that Jillian can collect them. So what is going to happen now is that Jillian and Fulton and maybe other people are going to count these ballots while we proceed with a couple of other items of business. And then we have two additional items, one directly and one perhaps peripherally related to this topic. Depending on the outcome of this vote, we may not need to do one of them.

If you’re not already doing so at the SMFA, if you could please tally the ballots and send them to us on the computer so that we can include your votes in the tally. So while
the vote counting is going on, I’m going to call again on Anne Mahoney to bring us yet another exciting and important proposal from the EPC.

Discussion and Vote on Revised EPC Proposal re: Make-up Days
PROF. MAHONEY: Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics, Program of Science, Technology, and Society, and chair of EPC. This is the proposal for how to handle make-up days. We had discussed this earlier in the semester. It was sent back to EPC. We have answered the questions and clarified a couple of things, and the proposal is back before you in substantially the same form.

Two clarifications should probably be noted. It was asked why we needed to add a make-up day to the spring semester. I checked this with Jillian, who went to the calendar setting committee, university counsel, and any number of other administrators, and the response came back swiftly and decisively: don’t shorten the semester; it’s too short as it is. So we are not using the 66th day of the spring semester as a potential make-up day. We are adding a bonus day because we’re really fond of being accredited, and we want to keep it.

The other ambiguity – and thanks to the Executive Committee for pointing this out – is the list of days here is not so much in preference order. It’s simply in approximately chronological order, except that we put the bonus day first because it’s the new and exciting idea. When a make-up day is chosen, it will be the one closest in time to the lost day. It will be up to the deans to decide whether a make-up day is required.

We are not proposing that every time we miss a day of classes, we immediately make things up. We’re thinking about special cases, like two years ago, when we lost three out of four Mondays at the beginning of the semester. Naturally, we wanted to make up a Monday. One could imagine that, for example, if we had a snowstorm of long duration and lost an entire calendar year, perhaps we might wish to make something up, or perhaps we might say fine, we’re just a week behind, and we won’t make it up.

EPC proposes that we, the faculty, delegate that decision to the deans and let them worry about whether to call a make-up day. This proposal only has to do with what happens if they do. While the ballots are being counted, we have a couple of minutes for discussion, so questions, comments, fire away.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. I’m good with any system that you use, as long as we find out immediately what’s going to happen. So I can’t stress enough that it’s really helpful, particularly for laboratory courses, things that require a lot of preparation before the students show up, that we know exactly what the plan will be as soon as possible. That’s my plea. Thank you.
PROF. MAHONEY: Duly noted. If there are no other comments, then let us proceed to a vote. In the back.

PROF. SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. Sorry if this was already clarified, but is there a stipulation in here about what faculty are or not allowed to do on these make-up days, especially in light of our earlier discussion about students with jobs and things where they may have other commitments on those days?

PROF. MAHONEY: Yes. In particular, we’re following the same policy that we put together two years ago and saying you really shouldn’t schedule an exam on a make-up day. Moreover, we as faculty have the option to use or not use that make-up day. I remember two years ago, I used it for one class, and not for another class. But you shouldn’t schedule an exam, because if we’re making up a Tuesday, but we happen to be doing it on a calendar Wednesday, and some student is working on Wednesday and can’t come in, just because we declared that Wednesday has become Tuesday, and the student’s other life doesn’t know that, it would be kind of not fair to be having an exam that day. So that’s in here.

PROF. SOBIERAJ: I’m Sarah Sobieraj from sociology. I just wanted to mention that seeing reading day on the list seems like it would cause an uproar. Again, understanding faculty have discretion, but even just students’ perception that they could, that’s something that I think is problematic.

PROF. MAHONEY: It is, but on the other hand, we used a reading day two years ago, and one could imagine if campus closures come relatively late in the semester, snow is not the only reason that we might have to cancel classes. If the events of finals from last year had happened two weeks earlier – or we were all here in 2013, and we remember the manhunt after the marathon when the entire area was locked down, and we cancelled classes – in an instance like that, if we’ve already gone past all the other scheduled make-up days, and if we decide for whatever reason that a make-up day is appropriate, reading period would be the last shot for doing that. Again, we don’t want to eat up the entire reading period. And if there were to be make-up days scheduled during reading period, at least one reading day would have to be left.

Look, we don’t want to have to do this at all. Scheduling make-up classes is a nuisance. Missing classes in the first place is a nuisance. We’d rather not have to do it. The only reason I’m here is that two years ago, when it snowed way too much, and we lost way too many Mondays, we had to cobble a policy together at the last minute. What we want to do is have a policy in place so that if we have another dreadful winter, like two years ago, we don’t have to be scrambling at the last minute to figure out, “Well, what do we do now?” We have a decision, and Murphy’s Law being what it is, this pretty much guarantees that we’ll never miss classes ever again.
Let us proceed to a vote. All in favor of establishing this as the procedure for determining what day to use if a make-up day is to be scheduled, all in favor? All opposed? Any wishing to be recorded as abstaining? I make that 67 for, 2 against, and no abstentions. The motion carries.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, Anne. I can announce the vote on the proposal to modify Statement 11. The votes were 25 yes, in favor of changing the policy, 70 no, to retain the same policy, and 2 abstentions. So the motion to change Statement 11 fails. The current policy will be retained.

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for Grievance Panel

PROF. TOBIN: I call on Jeff Zabel to bring back to us the bylaw change proposal for the Grievance Panel.

PROF. ZABEL: I just want to thank all of you for coming out here to vote in person on the proposed bylaw changes for the Grievance Panel. I know that’s the main reason you’re here today.

Repeating from last time, currently, the bylaws of the faculty of Arts and Sciences and Engineering state the following: “A faculty ombudsperson chosen annually by the Grievance Panel from among its members in their third year shall have the power to hear faculty grievances informally and confidentially.”

Given that the Grievance Panel members serve three-year terms, this implies that under normal circumstances, the ombudsperson serves only one year. Recent ombudspersons have become painfully aware of the fact that they are untrained and relatively inadequate for a position of such considerable importance and sensitivity.

Hence, 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 receives some professional training, and we are going to discuss this matter with the deans if these bylaws are passed.

The Grievance Panel has been discussing alternative ways of defining the ombudsperson position at Tufts. The committee has expressed unanimous support for extending the term for the Grievance Panel members to five years, extending the term of the ombudsperson to three years, and extending the eligibility to serve as ombudsperson to Grievance Panel members beginning in their second year.

These changes would allow the person filling the ombudsperson position to gain important experience and so to provide better support for faculty who wish to discuss their issues or problems. Almost all current members of the Grievance Panel have said
that they would extend their tenure from three to five years. The current ombudsperson, Mary Schultz, is willing to extend her tenure to three years.

So these are the proposed changes to the bylaws. First, remove the position of secretary as an office of the Grievance Panel because it’s obsolete. The second is to extend the term of elected members of the Grievance Panel from three to five years. And the third is to extend the term of the ombudsperson to three years and extend eligibility to Grievance Panel members starting in their second year.

Any comments or questions at 1:13?

PROF. GOLDSTEIN: Just a question. How often has the Grievance Panel met in recent years to actually look at a grievance?

PROF. ZABEL: Well, first of all, the ombudsperson serves a different purpose. They are to potentially reconcile issues. Those do not come to the Grievance Panel. So we only get cases where a faculty actually submits a formal grievance. That has happened once in nine years. Part of the reason may be because of the fact that the ombudsperson is a weak position, as is defined now, and also because I dare you to go out there and find out information about the existence of the ombudsperson at Tufts. It’s not very easy to do. And we would like to publicize this more and make this more readily accessible to faculty so they can find out more about this position and hopefully use it when they need it.

PROF. TOBIN: So I think we should proceed with a vote on this, since this is a bylaw change. This requires a two-thirds majority. So all those in favor of the proposed changes to the bylaws regarding the Grievance Panel, please raise your hands.

PROF. ZABEL: Do I really have to count?

PROF. TOBIN: Yes.

MS. DUBMAN: I got 77.

PROF. ZABEL: I got 77.

PROF. TOBIN: All those opposed to this change, and those who wish to be recorded as abstaining. I believe the motion passes. The bylaw has been changed.

So since the changes the Statement 11 failed, we will not vote on the associated bylaw change, which would change the bylaws to do the same thing the Statement 11 changes would have done, and that would have required a two-thirds vote, which seems unlikely.
The last thing on the agenda is the other proposed bylaw change, which would limit membership of the T&P Committee to people at the rank of professor. My feeling is that it’s probably a little late in the day to begin the discussion and vote on that. It’s an important topic, which I think is related, but also partially independent of the other proposals. So I would suggest that we defer that until the next AS&E meeting.

So I wish everybody a successful end of the term. Happy holidays and we look forward to seeing you all back here in February.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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