

**A&S FACULTY MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2018  
COOLIDGE ROOM, BALLOU HALL**

**Table of Contents**

<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Resolution on the Passing of Julie Graham, SMFA.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mags Harries, Professor of the Practice, SMFA .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Brief Update: A&amp;S Bylaws .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Erin Sullivan, Secretary of the Faculty .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>NEW BUSINESS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Research Strategic Plan Update .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Simin Meydani, Vice Provost for Research.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LA&amp;J Curricula Committee Proposals for Discussion and Vote.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>David Proctor, Chair, LA&amp;J Curricula Committee.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Proposal to Create a Race, Colonialism, and Diaspora Department.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Jim Glaser, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Response to Budget Concerns from AS&amp;E Faculty Forum.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Jim Glaser, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, and Chris Helmuth, Executive         Administrative Dean.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>MEETING ADJOURNED .....</b>	<b>10</b>

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

DEAN GLASER: Welcome. There are lots of low-fat cookies up there so help yourself.

We have a full agenda, so we'll start right away. I'll ask Mags Harries to read a resolution on the passing of our colleague, Julie Graham.

### **Resolution on the Passing of Julie Graham, SMFA Mags Harries, Professor of the Practice, SMFA**

PROF HARRIES: Julie had the biggest smile. It disarmed you in a good way. Greeting you, she always wanted to know about how you were doing. This was the same for her colleagues and for her students.

Julie listened, looked, and responded as a person who was interested in you. This gave her students a level of trust in their own voice and not clones of her aesthetic interests as an artist.

Julie Graham worked at the School of the Museum of Fine Arts for 27 years. During that time, she also taught courses at Harvard and other art schools. Her year in the Sorbonne in her junior year and her graduate work in London influenced her to teach summer courses abroad. She ran summer courses from the Museum School in France and Italy. She was interested in establishing a regular summer course in Venice during the Biennale, as this gave students a wide view of art from all over the world.

Despite her friendly manner, she was firm in that she expected a lot from her students. Besides the assignments and the readings, she expected students to fill a sketch book a week. The sketch books had to be filled, with ideas, things they saw, artists that excited them, sketches—a whole training in looking and responding. By challenged her students to regard materials as having meaning, she allowed her students to bridge outside of the rectangular painted surface. She had a very thorough knowledge of contemporary artists and what was going on in the art scene.

She kept in touch with her students long after they left and was available to sit and have coffee and help them through the difficult transitions of maintaining the discipline to be an artist. She understood as a woman who raised and supported her child how tough it can be. She had to support herself as a graphic designer, working in architecture offices while still maintaining a studio for her painting.

Julie was not only a terrific painter but also a photographer. Oftentimes an artist uses a camera as a tool to collect information for her main body of work, but she also used it as an art form, juxtaposing spaces together to form a different kind of space that was full of light. The photographs held the secrets to what really excited her. She loved color, she loved layered surfaces, scavenged juxtapositions, architectural spaces. When she painted, she worked on many pieces at the same time often scavenging from other works or found pieces of painted wood that she would attach to a painting. Each piece of wood would have its own history. She worked the surfaces, sanding, scratching, dripping. They were all about the physical markings. When she hung the work together they would be in conversation with each other.

She taught a course on Material Meaning which helped students to think in terms of abstraction. Her mentors being Antoni Tapies and Richard Tuttle, the surface of a painting was not limited to be a rectangle, it was a base which you could engage inside or out, the canvas not a surface but a material that had many forms.

Her TA Allison Gray described Julie as “my mentor, advocate, and, most importantly, a dear friend.” She kept in contact with her students through her 27 years at the SMFA, and they all describe her in glowing terms. She was always in their court guiding them to find their own voice.

The SMFA will sorely miss this amazing woman. As a colleague, artist, and teacher, she encompassed all that the school does well. The sale of Julie’s work will fund a grant in her honor.

We ask that this resolution be included in the minutes of the faculty of Arts and Sciences and that copies of this resolution be sent to her husband and son.

DEAN GLASER: And now, Erin, with an update on the Arts and Sciences bylaws.

**Brief Update: A&S Bylaws**  
**Erin Sullivan, Secretary of the Faculty**

MS SULLIVAN: Dean Glaser announced a few weeks ago of the creation of the Arts and Sciences bylaws. That project is now underway. We met last week to discuss a draft and the vote happens next month. If you would like to join the effort to draw up the A&S bylaws, you’re more than welcome to. Please let me know if you want to join or if you have any questions.

We don’t have time on today’s agenda for a Faculty Senate update, but I want to direct you to [their website](#).

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Erin. And as for FRAC, I support the proposal, but if the vote fails, the creation of the Arts and Sciences bylaws will continue.

**NEW BUSINESS**

DEAN GLASER: Today we have Simin Meydani here to give an update on the Research Strategic Plan.

**Research Strategic Plan Update**  
**Simin Meydani, Vice Provost for Research**

VICE PROVOST MEYDANI: This is the third time I’m coming to give an update on the strategic plan. I hope you remember some of the background. For those of you who don’t remember, [the website](#) provides the background. Very briefly, we spent a lot of time collecting data from stakeholders. It was presented to the community, faculty and staff. Those were recommendations that were presented to the Executive Committee, and we presented them to the Board of Trustees in May. Very briefly, the recommendations were focused on critical

infrastructure. The priority areas that emerged were Climate, Food, Water & Energy, Comparative Global Humanities, Equitable Society, Living Technology, and One Health.

What we did was that we put together working groups for each of these priority areas. I'm not going to go through them. You can see the range and breadth of the areas represented. I believe the heterogeneity of the research areas is seen. Unfortunately, we were not able to support all 12 proposals, for budgetary reasons. We wanted to provide transformational opportunities for our students, so we selected 8 proposals to move forward in two stages. We decided 4 had potential for immediate success. Phase 1 are listed on the slide: Culture, History, and Translation; Laboratory for Living Devices; Center for Integrated Management of Antimicrobial Resistance; and One Health-y Aging.

Although the proposals were written by groups, the money isn't automatically going to the groups. There will be opportunities for the money to go to a variety of places. Some groups needed more time to get people engaged. In a year we will be able to select 3 of those proposals.

On Monday, October 29<sup>th</sup> there will be a daylong symposium dedicated to these areas so we can introduce them to the larger community and encourage engagement. Please find ways to participate. We would have preferred to have the meeting in Medford for several reasons, but we couldn't find the space, so we are holding this in Boston, but we are helping with transportation there, and providing parking. I encourage you to attend, your group to attend, and engage with the groups. We also have a workshop on how best to collaborate with each other. The second set of recommendations are for critical infrastructure, how well we were doing. I've shown this slide before; the green shows the percentage of faculty who thought the services did not meet their needs adequately. Based on this information, we created three focus groups.

The charge of this focus group, co-chaired by Mitch McVey, was to create three subgroups, Funding, General Infrastructure, and Awareness. The second phase was to work with the larger community. The first recommendation was to work with the community and promote communication. The third was to create a research portal. If you are looking for collaborations, you can figure out who to go to. The fourth changes the infrastructure.

The University has committed a significant amount of funding in the next four years. We have been busy since May. I'm happy to say we are implementing them. The seed funding would start by the end of October. We have a very detailed plan of accountability for this. It may not look like a lot of money, but it's a significant investment from the university. In terms of the research infrastructure, we are putting together a task force and making a list of what we can accomplish. I will return when we have further updates. We will do our job to facilitate the progress.

I want to stop here and encourage you all to participate in the October 29<sup>th</sup> event. I hope to be back here again to report on progress.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Simin.

**LA&J Curricula Committee Proposals for Discussion and Vote**  
**David Proctor, Chair, LA&J Curricula Committee**

DEAN GLASER: Now, we have David Proctor with Curricula Committee business.

PROF PROCTOR: We have several items to get through. You'll see item 1, printed here, is correct, though earlier versions were listed differently.

- Item 1. New Course—Anthropology—ANTH 0140**
- Item 2. New Course—Anthropology—ANTH 0143**
- Item 3. New Course—Art & Art History—FAH 0057/0157**
- Item 4. New Course—Classics—CLS 0079/0179**
- Item 5. New Course—Education—ED 0128**
- Item 6. New Course—Film and Media Studies—FMS 0054**
- Item 7. New Course—Film and Media Studies—FMS 0065**
- Item 8. New Course—International Literary and Cultural Studies—Chinese—CHNS 0185**
- Item 9. New Course—International Literary and Cultural Studies—German—GER 0079**
- Item 10. New Course—Middle Eastern Studies—MES 0191/0192**

I believe independent studies will launch their own tag.

- Item 11. New Course—Music—MUS 0130**
- Item 12. New Course—Music—MUS 0132**
- Item 13. New Course—Religion—REL 0008**
- Item 14. New Course—Religion—REL 0064/0164**
- Item 15. New Course—Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning—UEP 0011**
- Item 16. New Course—SMFA—Visual and Critical Studies—VISC 0026**

Concerns or questions? Is there a motion to approve items 1-16? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Thank you. Also, on Friday, there is an event in Distler at 6:30PM in honor of [inaudible]; I know a lot of you knew him.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you.

**Proposal to Create a Race, Colonialism, and Diaspora Department**  
**Jim Glaser, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences**

DEAN GLASER: We have a tight schedule because we have plans to talk about the budget, but before that I'd like to talk about the proposal to create a Race, Colonialism and Diaspora department. There are many faculty who are here in support of this. It came up organically from the faculty, but we've had a lot of discussions of this proposal. We do endorse this proposal. The Provost does as well. I thought I'd spend a few minutes talking about our approval and the resources needed. I received a written summary of the listening session that was held about this.

We created the Consortium for RCD several years ago. It was an innovative structure at the moment. It's intellectually vibrant. I was occasionally able to attend an RCD event and a lot of faculty from many departments were in attendance at those events. It has been a magnet for

interest. We think it is a logical next step to go to the next level, the ability to hire tenure stream faculty. The loss of faculty in these areas added to that interest.

The idea would be that faculty in this department would have primary appointments in other departments and secondary appointments in RCD. Appointments in History, Religion, etc.

We recognize that we are in a semi-hiring freeze right now, though there is a tenure stream search in psychology as part of the cluster hire that was started last year. There will also be a bridge professorship in education between A&S and Engineering. We recognize we are proposing this in a moment of austerity. The fact is that the consortium already exists. It has a location. It has a great staff support person. We don't actually see those issues at this moment.

At the listening session the issue of service came up, which is a legitimate concern. But we think the people participating in this would have to monitor their service assignments. There should be creative ways of helping. We probably have some economies of scale. I'm coming at this from the perspective of my home department, political science.

There were questions that came up at the listening session about the loss of faculty of color. We had 16 faculty come to us this year with offers from other institutions. We usually have 3 or 4 per year. Of those 16 people, we retained 7, and lost 9. Some of those faculty we lost were faculty of color.

RCD is also interested in diversifying the curriculum. There is a significant effort at peer institutions to retain faculty. It's a lively marketplace. We want to compete, and we see RCD as central to our ability to recruit and retain faculty. This also has implications for graduate students. There is supply and demand.

What will this mean for other departments? We have to balance interests from the Deans Office. We will not continue the freeze next year; we will turn the spigot back on. This is hard to do. People have been patient with us and supportive of our effort to live within our means. I'm grateful to the chairs for understanding and for helping us through it.

But certainly, it means departments are asking, "What does this mean for us?" We do have a fixed pie. The pie has grown in the last dozen years. This may not mean you don't get the line you request in the next cycle. We want everyone to pursue efforts to be the best departments they can be.

PROF MANJAPRA: I won't talk more than a few minutes. We've received support, letters of support. We've had coffee and tea. We are grateful and excited. The RCD already exists. The academic and intellectual trajectory is recognized nationally. By word of mouth attention is positive for Tufts. This program is one that Tufts needs to give the full measure of institutionalization. The faculty group has discussed the importance of the name. It's important that the department starts with "race." It's a deliberate choice, an academic choice. We intend to make it the lead term for the new department. The second and third points for the RCD are: The lead faculty for RCD are overworked right now. Fundamentally because of accounting. We cannot account for the work being done. We want to take their work out of a black box. It also allows us to support and mentor the new generation of faculty at Tufts. Many of whom are

faculty of color. Giving them a home in the department of RCD gives us a place to do that. That makes faculty stay and helps retention. Finally, the RCD of today has to do with where we are today at Tufts and in the world. We are falling behind in making students of color are welcome. There are facts that back that up, it's not just from what I hear. The professoriate should mirror what the Tufts student body should be.

Finally, the curriculum transforms. What are the records? The archives? If we want to stand behind our students, in 2018 in the United States of America, this is the time. We need to shift our view from one of austerity and scarcity that means the gains of one department means loss to another department. We don't view this as an end. We will be asking to be institutionalized. We will be asking for lines. Almost all the faculty will be jointly located. We believe, on our principles, we can see this as a win-win. And not as a zero-sum choice. Any questions? There are many members of the faculty group here today.

PROF MENGESHA: Kris, could you talk about your vision as a department?

PROF MANJAPRA: Lili is one of our new, young colleagues at Tufts. Where we head is a very exciting question. We've been in touch with Paul Joseph in sociology. We want to work more closely with the humanities and sciences. In the second step, we might envision a graduate program. The vision of the RCD is an open one. It should be molded by the young faculty who join.

PROF HAMMER: I'm chair of education, have a secondary appointment in physics and astronomy, and I'm the new director of IRLI. I think it's a wonderful thing what RCD has been doing. The institution tends to separate departments. The department dominated by secondary appointments might change the definition of what a department is.

DEAN GLASER: That's a good point. We don't yet know what that means. There are some things that will come up that will be challenging. A question at the listing session that came up was about tenure cases, and we do have some departments like child study and human development, education, community health that are quite heterogeneous. It might be different for all these domains, and might for RCD as well, but we will participate as we figure it out and help navigate the commitments to multiple departments. We will be there to steer through the challenge.

PROF HAMMER: You could consider keeping the budget lines less strict? Could you split their budget accounting?

DEAN GLASER: That well could be a solution: sharing resources between departments. Small departments struggle with leaves when one person counts for so much. I don't think I can give you an answer right now. We are certainly thinking about it.

PROF KENNY: I like what I heard at the end about graduate programs. Producing faculty for other institutions would be great. We've had 20 years of Provost-ing that break down departments. We are searching for a Provost now. Let's bring in a Provost that does just that.

PROF MANJAPRA: ...and I had a discussion about creating a new form for the scholarship we are looking for. The scholarship is interdisciplinary, which is the content, but we are lacking a container. As someone who values the creative work of interdisciplinary scholarship, we need to remain on the cutting edge. The RCD feels like we can play a role.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Kris.

**Response to Budget Concerns from AS&E Faculty Forum**  
**Jim Glaser, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, and Chris Helmuth, Executive Administrative Dean**

DEAN GLASER: Let's transition to the final item on the agenda. We had a faculty forum on this thanks to Vickie and Harry and the Executive Committee. We were given the executive summary. Of course, the deans weren't at the faculty forum.

Chris Helmuth is the new EAD. In a short period of time, he's had a great impact. He works with a great team, Tony Luongo and Terry Daly. I appreciate their work on the front lines. Chris has brought leadership to the school.

I'm going to talk through a few slides and Chris could help with the difficult ones. This first slide is the basis of our situation. The difference between the revenues and the expenses. FY18 was last year, and we were well below the line. There are ways are mitigating this with funds that aren't part of our revenue. Those things come out of the schools', plural, reserves. We saved up for a rainy day, and it was raining last year.

On the basis of the first three months, we will be in a better situation this year. We have stored away some funds to help. Why do we have the deficit? First of all, tuition increases were constrained. They were expected to be larger. Space expenses have more than doubled since 2012. That includes deferred maintenance. I wish I could tell you we were all in newly renovated buildings and spaces, but that isn't the case.

The SEC debt service added \$5 million. CLIC added \$2 million. These two buildings house many of our departments now. It also increased our research capacity. The AS&E costs for university assessment went from \$31 million to \$62 million. These are dollars that pay for dining services, HR, lawyers, separate from the deferred maintenance.

EAD HELMUTH: The biggest reason is TTS and the integration of technology. You've hopefully seen the benefits of this. AS&E bears a larger portion of central services relative to other schools because our revenue is greater.

DEAN GLASER: The endowment payout. The purpose is to protect the endowment and grow the endowment. It is a short-term medicine for a long-term gain.

The next graph shows that Space and Assessment costs have grown a lot over the last many years. You can see how faculty salaries have grown. There has been a disproportionate growth to financial aid. How much revenue do we give back in financial aid? The change was 3% and it is

a difference of almost \$9 million after just a couple percentage points. It has had implications for the schools, though it's what we do here.

EAD HELMUTH: On the A&S Tuition and Aid graph, you'll see our net revenue is roughly flat. If I superimpose the master's revenue, the health costs are growing faster than the net revenue. It's a huge amount. When we think about our net revenue, we are trying to keep the aid down because it's a drive for revenue. The things we have to do in the short term are painful. It's the same problem we have with cost recovery. We have an overall good trajectory. The faculty member who generated our biggest revenue left between 2016 and 2017. We want people to have funding for their research and their students. 30% of direct costs supports buildings. The black dotted line is how much we get from research. Space is also one of our biggest costs, and it's going up.

DEAN GLASER: Faculty salaries are a portion of the A&S budget, about 44% of our entire budget. In 2018, it's 47%. The faculty salary line has grown. One way we can improve our situation is with fundraising. Nancy Mahler and her team are helping, and it's a relentless activity. It's very exciting and I'm on the road one or two times a month to bring in new dollars. They are distributed in three categories: current use from the annual fund, campaign funds, and bequests. The largest gift last year was a bequest. It was \$5 million. I hope we don't see it for a while because I know this man and he's a few nice fellow. But sometimes people pass on and we get some money from their estates.

We have set goals for ourselves. We are at about 1/3 of the university's goal. We have beat that goal every year. Last year, part of that was from acquiring the SMFA and their endowment. The annual fund: those go right to our bottom line. They go right into our budget, and it's very important to us. Our annual fund this year is \$9.6 million. Giving Tuesday and the end of the calendar year are so helpful.

Of the \$236 million we have raised, this chart shows how it is distributed. About \$73 million has gone to financial aid. \$68 million has gone to professorships. We set a high priority for professorships. It helps us recruit and retain faculty. It's a recognition that the school values you. Some are junior professorships and they return the title once they get tenure.

One of the keys to financial sustainability is added students. Each class is about 100 students larger. That will continue for two years. Two years from now, we will be 400 students larger, but then that will plateau. We hope to constrain the growth of financial aid. We want to keep generating revenue through master's and graduate programs. We are charged for every square foot that we occupy. In the short term we are reducing non-compensation spending. There has been a one year pause in faculty searches.

On the next slide is the change in undergraduate enrollment and you'll see the plateau. We do have plans for another building [the Cumming building] that will house economics, math, and computer science. It will introduce another major cost when we cut the building. The core and shell of the building are paid for by a donor. We are planning for this; we don't want to be caught off guard.

PROF LOVE: So, this is simply an observation, but looking at the graph, at the integral, the very first one, it seems like we were making money. The average of that graph seems to be zero. We made a little money, but we aren't a cash-in-hand business. Why isn't this a problem? Why aren't we smoothing our expenditure?

DEAN GLASER: We didn't pay attention to some of this from decades and decades ago. For those of us who live in buildings like Eaton Hall, the costs associated with renovation and maintenance are very substantial.

EAD HELMUTH: It's really key to note that the capital expenditures for buildings are not in that line. Those are billed in prior years. The Dental School is the only school above zero. Zero isn't good enough in the long term. Zero is the short-term goal. To renovate our facilities, we need to be above.

PROF MIRKIN: What's your projection? Are we going to be under no matter what?

EAD HELMUTH: I think the space costs aren't going down anytime soon. The answer is we have to outgrow it. Teaching more students will help.

DEAN GLASER: I promise we will have more conversations as we go forward. Have a good day everybody.

## **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