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## MEETING ADJOURNED
ANNOUNCEMENTS

PROF COUCH: Please take a seat; we are going to convene. The chair recognizes Jianmin Qu, Dean of the School of Engineering.

Introduction of Deborah T. Kochevar, Provost ad interim
Jianmin Qu, Dean of the School of Engineering

DEAN QU: Good afternoon. So, this is supposed to be the honor the president has to introduce the provost, but in Chinese we have a saying, [sentence in Chinese]. It really translates to, “When the tiger is not in the mountain, the monkey becomes the king.”

(laughter)

It’s a great honor to introduce Debbie, the interim provost. Debbie is currently the Henry and Lois Foster Professor and Dean of the Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine at Tufts. She received her B.A. in English and biology from Rice University, a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree from Texas A&M University, and a Ph.D. in cellular and molecular biology from the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center. After completing an NIH Health Research Service Award Fellowship, she joined the Texas A&M faculty and remained there until 2006 when she joined Tufts as dean. She was a Congressional Science Fellow to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, she is an active leader in professional societies, and she is president of the American College of Veterinary Clinical Pharmacology, active in the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), having chaired its Council on Education and the Educational Commission for Foreign Veterinary Graduates. She is an accomplished researcher who has published in peer-reviewed journals. She is a great teacher and mentor and has won several teaching awards. Please welcome Debbie to her first AS&E faculty meeting.

PROF COUCH: Thank you. The chair next recognizes Dana Fleming, Assistant General Counsel.

Responding to Government Officials
Dana Fleming, Assistant General Counsel

MS FLEMING: Hi everyone. Thank you to Dean Qu for inviting me to speak today on a topic that is near and dear to my heart: information requests from government officials. The university regularly gets requests, but over the last year, our office has received an increasing number of inquiries on how to respond to them. Often, they are new or haven’t fielded requests yet, but others are aware of changes in immigration laws and the implications about what they are sharing. It’s a good idea to provide a quick overview of guidance and give out our contact information so you can come and talk to the lawyers in the counsel’s office.

It couldn’t be more straightforward. If someone comes and asks for information, ask them to wait and give us a call. I will say, “Okay great, where are you? Be there in two minutes,” if you’re on the Medford campus, or “Okay great, where are you? Put the agent on the phone,” if you are not nearby. If for some reason it takes five minutes to connect, tell them, “Thank you for waiting.” Ask them to wait in a public space – a hallway or lobby – because there are different
rules about where they can access on campus. Lest you think this is a great deal of preparation for an event that may not happen, this happens quite a bit. I got my last call about this on Tuesday. Most requests are entirely routine and mundane – employment, visa, or education verification.

What I’m trying to underscore with this slide, we are not aware of any immigration enforcement on any campus across the country, but many schools have made clear their protocols of what to do when an official comes to campus. We’ve done this presentation for groups across campus and we are working on card stock so people who work at the front desk can have the information at hand.

A couple of other things to note, it’s not unusual for them to flash a badge or paperwork. Some people are intimidated by that, but it’s par for the course. Say, “Someone will be right here to help you,” and generally speaking, they understand you have a process to follow. By and large, they are polite. Know that we are here to help and we don’t want people to feel pressured about looking at paperwork and having to decide on the spot what information they are releasing. Another thing to underscore is routing calls and we will be cooperating but will be doing it in a responsible way so we understand what information we are being asked to release before we release it. You have our numbers and hopefully no one will have to use it, but just in case. Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

PROF COUCH: Let’s thank our speaker. The chair recognizes Jianmin Qu, Dean of the School of Engineering.

**Proposed Bylaws Change: Faculty Research Awards Committee (FRAC)**

**Jianmin Qu, Dean of the School of Engineering, and Members of the Executive Committee**

DEAN QU: A little bit of background on this particular topic. The faculty of AS&E has a joint committee called FRAC. The committee issues awards of various sizes. The budget is $215k. The provost’s office provided $75k to this fund out of a gift agreement and this year, that gift ended. The provost’s office will not provide the $75k any longer. Jim Glaser and I talked about this and we decided to use the limited resources to support the schools’ priorities, and the two schools have somewhat different prior and different needs. After some discussion, we decided to split the sum 80-20 and move that money into each individual school so they can decide how they use the money to support faculty research. The Executive Committee seems okay with that and we will move forward with that process. What we need to do is change the bylaws in order to go ahead because in the bylaws it lists the committee under AS&E, so we have to removed FRAC from the bylaws. The motion I would like to propose is to remove FRAC from the AS&E bylaws.

PROF COUCH: The assumption is that FRAC will be reconstituted in the A&S bylaws and as an A&S-only committee and that engineering will decide how to use the funds on its side. A bylaws change requires a vote, so this will be voted on at the next meeting in the fall, and the second thing is to remove one thing and reconstitute it in another.
PROF TOBIN: To the best of my knowledge and belief, there are no A&S bylaws.

PROF PEPALL: Just LA&J and GSAS.

PROF TOBIN: Where will this reconstituted committee reside?

MS SULLIVAN: I believe it was hoped the LA&J bylaws could cover this as a committee.

PROF PEPALL: The three grad-only departments are not part of LA&J so that is a problem.

PROF LOVE: What’s the budget of A&S and E? What fraction?

DEAN QU: Of the $140k, it was an 80-20 split, so $28k to engineering and the rest to A&S.

PROF LOVE: I worry about the time and effort of faculty applying to this because this is a tiny bit of money, and to split the committee into two with the same number people of applying. Can I suggest we find more money and keep it how it is?

DEAN QU: Engineering thought this made more sense based on how the current awards are being granted. In the engineering school, most of the faculty have a sponsored research grant, therefore spending time for a couple of thousand dollars is not attractive for the reason you described. We are thinking how to affectively use the $28k. We are contemplating a few things. One is to focus more money toward helping faculty wo are interested in large center-like grant and use it to alleviate the administrative burdens of writing grants. Another option is to use this to sharpen junior faculty proposal writing skills rather than for research; we would have senior faculty critique their proposals. Instead of sprinkling a couple thousand to a couple people.

DEAN BRIZUELA: The A&S contribution to FRAC, however it’s reconstituted –A&S will be increasing its contribution to the fund, so the A&S portion would remain flat.

PROF CRONIN-GOLOMB: I’m on FRAC so I know a little about what’s going on. This would eliminate the summer research fellowships and senior leaves administered by FRAC and that is the most important thing to take note of, and the Distinguished Scholar Award, which rotates between different divisions in the schools, and currently when it comes time for engineering to be eligible, that will be handled in FRAC. Can you respond to these two items?

DEAN QU: For the Distinguished Scholar Award, and I’ve discussed it with Dean Glaser, one approach is easy to take on, and currently we rotate among four school divisions and we could continue that, so for engineering we could select one award every four years and maintain the current process. As far as the senior leave is concerned, we haven’t really talked about that. It’s something we need to think about carefully and whether it makes sense with our priorities. We may or may not continue it. Nothing is finalized for the engineering school yet.

PROF JOHNSON: I have to say that I have pointed out that we are trying to do a money solution, but we are also affecting more – I didn’t know we didn’t have A&S bylaws – there is a great deal of symbolism in breaking up FRAC and not being a committee of AS&E. I’m not sure how to solve that because the engineering dean has asked to remove the funds so it makes their
participation not viable anymore. You could have your Distinguished Scholar Award every year and FRAC doesn’t deal with it. I’ve been on FRAC and T&P and found it extremely enriching and useful to have “the other” – A&S and Engineering – working together. FRAC cannot disappear as a committee and I’m not sure about the transition and it’s a bigger issue structurally than it seemed. We’ve become A&S as a unit in the Senate and we are changing, somehow, our relationships on a different level and I don’t know if I have a solution. And I’m not saying I don’t support the dean’s right to use the funding as he chooses.

PROF ORIANS: I totally sympathize about reallocating the funds. But I am against voting to disband FRAC without having a clear path forward, and I, personally, would vote against it unless I see the replacement. That doesn’t preclude you from how you support FRAC, but I’d like to see the committee in place, and it looks like A&S is committed, but we have to work with the dean’s office about how to move forward.

DEAN QU: This is pointing to one issue that is how independent are the two schools anyway? It’s clear we are not independent because this bears on A&S, and the other sentiment is going to affect the school of engineering.

PROF ORIANS: I’m not prepared to vote to change the bylaws until we have an understanding of the transition.

PROF JOHNSON: I’m wondering if, temporarily, FRAC can create a small subcommittee and work with the dean to dispense that money, but the decision will be – we’ve had subcommittees like for GIA where only three people look at the applications – and they work with the dean to continue it as a step and that doesn’t require a bylaw and FRAC can work with the engineering school’s decision.

PROF COUCH: The constraint is where it will be placed as there is not an A&S bylaw.

PROF EVRIGENIS: I’ll note that there are A&S-only committees and the Committee on Committees was never consulted about this issue and never asked to do anything.

PROF COUCH: I think we have to move forward. Let’s thank Dean Qu.

The chair recognizes Lynne Pepall, chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Tenure and Promotion Discussion: Role of the Outside Expert
Lynne Pepall, Professor, Economics, Chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee 2017-2018

PROF PEPALL: Thank you for coming out and hearing our ideas about how to change a process to make it better. I think our T&P process at Tufts is a real point of pride, and the faculty elected work hard and take the task seriously, and your input is valued. It’s something we should be proud of at Tufts. I’m here to talk about the role of the outside expert and how we can recast this role to improve the process. I’ll go over the current process then some ideas we are playing with.

The outside expert serves only on tenure cases. When preparing the list of external evaluators, the preparator notes two choices for the outside expert and then it’s brought to T&P for approval.
The candidate knows who the outside expert will be but not who wrote letters for case. The outside expert becomes a member of the subcommittee (two members of T&P, two members of the department, and the outside expert). This subcommittee meets during the tenure process, and from 2016 on, we’ve had these meetings via web exchange; they are no longer coming to campus. In their current role, the outside expert comes in late in the process. They receive the application, CV, external evaluator letters, the department statement, narrative on teaching, publications, course evaluation data, and additional letters. Once the subcommittee convenes this meeting, the two members of T&P take the lead and ask questions and the department is there to clarify and answer questions. The outside expert tells us who the letter writers are, so we can put into context who they are. And they are asked to interpret the letters, and I’d like to come back to this because the external evaluators don’t know there is an outside expert reading these letters (they assume they are only viewed internally). The outside expert is also asked some field-specific questions and we try to get the questions out to them before the meeting to understand the field’s scholarship. We also ask whether external funding is required or sufficient. After the meeting the T&P members submit a report on what was said in the meeting. The first draft is sent to the members of the department, and after them, the outside expert reviews and signs off on it. Once the signatures are collected, it then becomes an official part of the tenure dossier.

There is no question that the set of letter writers we get is critical. There is a great value in having an outside expert tell us about the letter writers. It’s true at institutions like Tufts where research groups may be small and our colleagues may not have an overlap in our field or know who the heavy hitters or emerging stars are. This is an important piece of it and their views contribute to the case. But the outside expert comes in late in the case and it’s late to be asking if there is anyone missing. It’s an awkward timing for that question and we don’t find it that helpful. We thought, “Wouldn’t it be great if we could get input and expertise when we review the lists?” Knowing who we should really get and who to make a first- and second-tier priority and we wouldn’t mind having some expertise earlier in the process. It’s also extremely awkward that they are reading letters from their peers in the discipline. When we tell the external evaluators that their letters are read by a subcommittee, they can figure it out if they go to the packet and read who makes up the subcommittee. Disclosing that in the solicitation may affect if and how they write. We are looking at the value added and ask if we are missing an opportunity where the outside expert comes in.

Here are some suggested changes. Again, to be clear, this is not a proposal, and after I go through it, I want to hear your thoughts. We don’t want the candidate to have to submit their package any sooner, but it may be valuable to have the outside expert chosen earlier. Candidates could declare mid-February, and then candidate and the department chooses the outside expert and tells T&P when the external evaluator list is sent. We would work with the outside expert and ask them about the suggested list of external evaluators. We also think that this role for the outside expert could be helpful in promotion cases. We only require five letters and visibility and scholarship is very important for promotion. We wouldn’t have a meeting, but just ask about potential letter writers.

This final slide is the summary of possible proposals. The first is perhaps the most radical, which is to bring the outside expert into the beginning of the process and help put together external evaluator list and prioritize it, and no longer have a subcommittee meeting and the outside expert would no longer be reading the confidential letters.
The second idea is to keep everything as is but contact the outside expert earlier in the process and contribute to the vetting of the list. But given that the outside expert will still be given the role to read the letters, we would want to put that in the solicitation.

The third is to stay the same but notify the evaluators more fully of who sees their letters.

PROF SAJINA: I sit on a lot of review panels and discussions on anonymity come up that suggest the name is stripped off from the document itself, and that can be a solution so the outside expert doesn’t know who wrote which letter.

PROF PEPALL: As it happens, they interpret the letters so that they could say, “This person is usually so grumpy and never writes a good letter. This letter is great and that’s telling.” I’d be less sure of [the outside expert’s] value if they were not able to add that context.

PROF SAJINA: Couldn’t they say, “person A is grumpy” on the external evaluator list?

PROF IOANNIDES: With due respect, I have some issues with these proposals. There is an ethical issue and I’m glad it’s recognized. But one gives a big role to the outside expert. And you are pushing the process earlier and I fought battles to push the deadline later. It seems to be that things start earlier.

PROF PEPALL: We don’t want to increase the role of the outside expert, just calibrate it now.

PROF MIRKIN: I like number three of this proposal. The department in its wisdom selects the outside expert, and the outside expert reviews the external evaluators. I think the wisdom of the department is better than the outside expert. I don’t like the two-step process. We send the names to the T&P committee and now we will do it in two installments and the outside expert will suggest more names and discuss them and get back to you. I think it works quite well now. I agree there is an ethical issue if you don’t say the outside expert will read the letters, and I’ve written letters and I don’t mind who will read it more or less.

PROF PEPALL: It’s the more or less.

PROF HITCHNER: For the record, other institutions don’t have outside experts at all. It seems to me that the role, as it stands, has an extraordinary power and influence which is outsized in the process at Tufts. He’s an evaluator of the evaluators on top of evaluating the faculty, and we have the capacity to deal with this internally. We are attempting to seek perfection in a process that is already functioning well. It raises a more fundamental question and you can think about how it may help more in the sciences, but the humanities can be very subjective.

PROF PEPALL: The current process doesn’t elevate the role but to recalibrate it somewhat.

PRF HITCHNER: Who says they know what is the right list?

PROF PEPALL: We do ask that now in the subcommittee meeting. If the names of the writers are appropriate for the field.
PROF RICE: One of the issues to be addressed is that the proposal is saying that the department might not have the collective wisdom to vet the list, so how in that situation are they able to choose one person who has so much control in the process?

PROF PEPALL: We don’t observe they have trouble choosing an outside expert, but some have trouble coming up with a list of external evaluators. I wouldn’t want to overemphasize the role of the outside expert and ask questions at the right time and it’s odd to ask them to review the stature of the letter writers and the letters. When we say “stature” we are trying to identify the rising stars in the field, which may not be so obvious.

PROF RICE: If the department can’t choose the outside expert, why would they be able to choose the external evaluators?

PROF PEPALL: The process allows for both the department and the candidate to chime in on this. The candidate certainly knows who the right people are in the field.

PROF HAMMER: I’ve been a preparator for someone who is outside my field. I think the procedure could be different depending on the department.

PROF PEPALL: No, no, no.

PROF RICHARDS: I’m not sure, but when I’ve been on T&P and on a subcommittee it’s that the outside expert sees and reads the department statement, and I would, among other changes, make it so that they don’t receive the statement.

PROF PEPALL: I totally agree with you.

PROF RANKIN: I have a question. In how many cases does the outside expert add something to the case? If we got rid of the outside expert, would we lose anything?

PROF PEPALL: In some cases, yes and some, no. It’s useful to hear about the key players in the field to know that we captured this correctly and I think T&P would be loath to get rid of it.

PROF IOANNIDES: In small departments, it’s extremely important.

PROF JOHNSON: I suggest that we make this a forum topic for the fall and continue this discussion.

PROF PEPALL: The faculty’s input would be most helpful and important before we write and bring you a proposal. Thank you.

PROF COUCH: Thank you. The chair recognizes Laurie Baise and Anna Sajina, co-chairs of the Committee on Faculty Work/Life.
Faculty Housing Report
Laurie Baise, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Anna Sajina, Associate Professor, Physics and Astronomy, Co-Chairs, Committee on Faculty Work/Life

PROF SAJINA: Thank you. There are copies of the report at the back. I am just summarizing the key points. We are not a decision-making body; we look at policy and make recommendations. Last year we were approached by faculty concerned about Walnut Hill properties and the faculty being relocated in favor of student villages. We met with members of Walnut Hill and the Campus Planning and Development Committee, and this is the culmination of that. It’s a massive topic. Tufts is located in a high cost of living area and it has a direct impact on hiring and retention. This is also an issue of sustainability, so buildings are green and efficient but if you have to drive an hour to get here, it’s not very green.

The short-term recommendations would cost nothing. There is no faculty housing as a priority. Set aside a number that meets the current demand and that’s its use, faculty housing. The priority goes to transitional faculty, but some should be set aside for long-term use. There is still room for student village development. The second thing is improved communication. The resources are not well-communicated, like a housing website so people know what’s available to them.

The long-term recommendations are more involved issues. Most of our peer institutions offer some form of mortgage subsidy. This can take any number of forms where the upfront cost is reduced or the interest rate. Everyone we talked to said this would be great. Anything that happens would be better than what’s happening now so that it recognizes the high cost of living. The second thing is that commuting is a fact of life and improving the benefits to promote the use of public transportation and to look at where people live. Many live in the Medford-Malden area which is about the only affordable housing that exists. A simple thing like having a shuttle would help. A third option is to actually look into a new housing development in Medford or Malden. The Campus Planning and Development Committee was in favor of a Malden location as it’s also accessible to the downtown campus on the orange line. That’s the executive summary, but I want to open it for questions.

PROF MIRKIN: I think it’s a long overdue thing to do and it’s nearly impossible to recruit junior faculty who have kids and want to live in a good school district around here. I don’t know if this will solve the problem, but it will help. Of the junior faculty we have recruited, none is the breadwinner in the family. Tufts can buy houses and when the faculty leave, they sell it back to Tufts. In the long run, the prices will only go up so it’s a good investment. If we don’t do it, we won’t be able to recruit the best faculty.

PROF EKBLADH: The administration should take a note from you about having a discussion before making a decision. Vacating faculty for the student villages was announced in the Tufts Daily and this discussion is a good start and I would further those points. Stanford is building faculty villages, right?

PROF SAJINA: We looked at about 20 institutions and read who does what. We don’t do nearly as much as our peer institutions.
PROF EKBLADH: I found out last year I was going to be kicked out and was previously told by deans, chairs, and Walnut Hill that we would be able to stay in perpetuity, and we have since gotten a policy that is riddled with exceptions. We need a written policy. Our salaries haven’t risen much between the financial crisis and Tufts’ crisis. The burdens are pushed onto the faculty, particularly on junior faculty. We were trying to hire someone from Rutgers who worked in New Jersey and lived in New York City and she could say it was expensive here. When you can only offer three years of housing, it doesn’t make us competitive.

PROF SAJINA: We don’t offer any form of subsidy for child care either, and we’ve pushed for it, but it’s not going anywhere.

PROF BAISE: One of the single most important things to come out of this report is that Walnut Hill needs to rethink how they consider housing. They think about it as a real estate holding and their housing stock could be used better. It doesn’t all have to be faculty housing, but they need to use the resources better.

PROF SAJINA: That’s one of our recommendations, to spell it out so there is no misunderstanding. From here, this goes to the deans and that’s all we can do. We aren’t a decision-making committee.

PROF JOHNSON: It should go to the provost or the president as it’s a university issue. Send it to the Senate.

PROF TOBIN: I want to make a motion to thank the committee and to encourage this issue go to the administration with the faculty’s support.

PROF COUCH: The motion is made. And seconded. All in favor. Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Let’s thank our speaker.

PROF JOHNSON: The Executive Committee wants to thank our chairs, Alva and Harry, and especially Alva for running these meetings this year.

(applause).

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Erin Sullivan
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering

Minutes taken by Lindsay Riordan
Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering