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ANNOUNCEMENTS

PROF SULLIVAN: Good afternoon. First is Professor Utz with an event announcement.

2018 Max Tishler Award Lecture: Thursday, October 18
Art Utz, Professor, Chemistry

PROF UTZ: I have a quick announcement. Math is hosting a lecture tomorrow at 4:30 PM. The We identify for the Max Tishler Award Lecture a renowned scientist to talk to a broad audience. Frances Arnold’s work uses tools of evolution and selective pressure, like how bacteria produce molecules with selective traits. Her work is about reading molecules. She just got the Nobel Prize in Chemistry. We are happy to have you attend. If you’re unable to attend in person, we are streaming the presentation on webcast, and there is a handout on way out with the address.

PROF SULLIVAN: We have another good announcement from David Gute and Todd Quinto about the Tufts Community Appeal.

Tufts Community Appeal
David Gute, Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering, and Todd Quinto, Professor, Math

PROF QUINTO: So, David and I are here to encourage you to give a gift to the Community Appeal. It’s super easy: go online or give by check, and there are some fliers at the back of the room. I have a suggestion: pick something important to you or Tufts or the surrounding community. If you give to the neighborhood service fund, Tufts organizes that and all money the goes to the organization. If you appreciate diversity and our wonderful student body, five to financial aid. This year, I’ve gotten to know several first gen students, so I’m giving to that.

PROF GUTE: Being someone who’s been public health all my career, I’m into positive behavior modification. I’ll phrase it in a way that seems to work with working classes and that is a little competition. Arts and Sciences’ and Engineering’s’ participation rates are now counted separately; we are certainly going to exhort and exceed the participation rates from last year and we can make bets on who’s going to win this little derby. Thank you for your attention today.

PROF SULLIVAN: What’s the deadline?

PROF QUINTO: December 31st and we’ll send out other announcements throughout the term.

PROF SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Faculty Forum Executive Summary
Members of the Executive Committee

PROF SULLIVAN: The Executive Committee wants to inform you that the faculty forum was to discuss the budget deficit. Thanks to all faculty who participated and to Erin who took notes and
helped us present the material. The material is available to all faculty and it’s a summary and questions. There are hard copies here and it’s also posted on Secretary of the Faculty’s page under “meetings.” The Executive Committee had a discussion with both deans on Monday that was fruitful and those questions will form the presentation Dean Glaser will make on the deficit and how we will work together, and the Executive Committee wants to enhance the communication between the administration and how faculty can collaborate with the administration through its committee structure without cutting costs or deviating from the academic mission of the institution.

OLD BUSINESS

PROF SULLIVAN: So, onto old business. Dean Qu is here to talk about changes to FRAC.

Recap of Proposed Bylaws Change: Faculty Research Awards Committee (FRAC)
Jianmin Qu, Dean of the School of Engineering, and Members of the Executive Committee

DEAN QU: Thank you. Just a quick reminder that we had a discussion before the summer about this issue. AS&E has had a committee on faculty awards over the years and had a budget of about $215,000 per year and $75,000 was from the provost’s office. The provost’s office was no longer providing those funds and Dean Glaser and I talked about it and based on the budget, we are unable to backfill the provost’s contribution, but the awards are important to us and we wanted to continue with the committee in some way. Because the amount will be smaller, and either the number or amounts of the awards will be smaller, and the needs of the two schools are different, we came to the conclusion that to better serve the schools, we would split up the committee and the schools would decide what to do with their shares of the funds. That was the original thinking, and we brought it up to FRAC, the Executive Committee, and we had a discussion at this faculty meeting. Engineering is developing a draft on how we are doing this. We need to remove the committee from the bylaws of the two schools, we have a process to follow, and this is one of the steps to make the change.

PROF SULLIVAN: We will have more discussion today and vote on this in November. The vote is to remove FRAC from the AS&E bylaws. Dean Glaser already announced that an ad hoc committee for FRAC consisting of A&S faculty will continue award to A&S faculty and, in addition, Dean Glaser is using this opportunity to create A&S bylaws. Jim, do you have any remarks?

DEAN GLASER: Yes. FRAC would then be embedded in the A&S bylaws. We’ve just brought in a gift that is going to help us with FRAC; it’s a one-time gift that will be directed to FRAC and targeting humanities research. It will enhance the budget so that’s very good news.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Just a couple other notes as I sit on FRAC as a non-voting member. The funding for this year is flat for A&S; Jim committed additional funds in spite of the provost’s funding being taken away. FRAC is functioning the same way; there are no changes in the process and policy so far.

PROF LOVE: I don’t think this was very well explained last time. I just don’t think it’s a very good idea. It seems a strange thing to say, since we are in danger of losing our R1 status, that a
program designed to give money for seed projects, which is very, very important and could lead on to other funding that comes later, it would seem to be the right thing to hold onto this institutional structure, to at least have a group of faculty looking at research and generate pressure on the administration to look at all this great work. I encourage my colleagues to vote against this, and the bylaws are in our purview, because not supporting that seed funding is terribly short-sighted and will have money again.

PRESIDENT MONACO: The provost’s contribution was a limited gift for four years.

PROF LOVE: [inaudible]

PRESIDENT MONACO: I’m just stating a fact.

DEAN QU: We are not stopping that activity; it will be done in each school individually instead of together.

PROF LOVE: The bylaws that create this new structure doesn’t exist.

DEAN QU: That’s why we want to change the bylaws so each school can do it itself.

PROF GOLOMB: As a long-time member of FRAC, one thing I noticed is how effective FRAC is at maintaining communication between A&S&E. One of Engineering’s strengths is its close collaboration with Arts and Sciences, and its one way that Engineering can distinguish itself from other schools around the country. I think this change is going to have a negative impact in further increasing the split between Engineering and Arts and Sciences, and I think long run damaging.

PROF GONZALEZ: Would this have been done if there was a not a budget crisis?

DEAN QU: We will still think about it, the change in funding was an opportunity and one reason we talked about it is that the faculty in the two schools have different needs. In the Engineering School, most faculty have their own research funding and awards from the current system are relatively small from an engineering-perspective. It’s not very incentivizing for engineering faculty – the lab costs are way more than $1,000 or $1,500, and there’s not a lot of interest to apply to those awards. Another example is publication costs – many grants have funding for publication costs. To meet the needs of the two groups of faculty, it may be more sensible to do this separately.

DEAN GLASER: In A&S, we don’t wish to control this, and we want FRAC to continue. It will still have representatives from all different disciplines and it will require faculty from the humanities, social sciences, sciences, and artists, and still have pots of money designated for things. It will be no different except that it’s only for A&S faculty and the needs of engineering will be handled by them. This is not just coming from you [Engineering faculty], its coming from the chairs of [Engineering] departments that you can distribute the funds as you see fit.

PROF GOLOMB: FRAC does respond to the needs of engineering faculty. Not everybody has a large, well-funded research program and even small amounts, $1,000 here and there, can make a
big difference to someone who isn’t blessed with a large research portfolio, and it may be a catalyst to build a portfolio in the future.

PROF SWAN: I value having opportunities with my A&S&E colleagues, so will this separation prohibit or reduce our interaction?

PROF SHULTZ: I’ve been on FRAC, and you can disagree, but with A&S, we have sciences that are well-funded, and maybe it’s a tiny thing for a science person, but $1,000 is golden for someone in the humanities. The committee plays off the needs of the disciplines. I say this as a science person, but I learned a lot about art on that committee and a lot about engineering, and to Chris’s point, it’s poor planning separating the two.

PROF QUINTO: There are two issues, how to spend the money and collegiality and how we build campus community. It’s a shame if FRAC is only way we can build campus community.

PROF SULLIVAN: Thank you. We will close the discussion now and take a vote at the next meeting.

DEAN QU: Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

PROF SULLIVAN: It’s a privilege to call on Mary Jane Shultz and Jeff Zabel to talk about changes to the Grievance Panel.

Discussion of Proposed Changes to the Grievance Panel Bylaws and Procedures
Mary Jane Shultz, Professor, Chemistry, and Ombudsperson, Grievance Panel, and Jeff Zabel, Professor, Economics, and Chair, Grievance Panel

PROF ZABEL: Lili, who has been involved, is also here. We came before you a few years ago to extend the committee’s tenure from 3 years to 5 years. The definition of the ombudsperson left little ability to do the job effectively and we are taking steps to improve the position. This partly involves mandatory training and being explicit, at least in Lili’s belief, about the level of confidentiality, making it more comfortable for faculty to come to the ombudsperson with a problem. We’ve got legal and the deans to buy in, so we just need yours, which is the easy part.

PROF SHULTZ: The first thing I’d like to ask is – and I don’t want you to really raise your hands – how many of you didn’t know we had ombudsperson or what they do? We want to bring the role into compliance with the International Ombudsman Association, the IOA, and they have a set of ethical guidelines they operate by: independent (not owned by either party); impartial; informal; and confidential. Only if the person coming forward wants their identity revealed, will anyone know they met with the ombudsperson. It’s a level of comfort for people. In the training, it was revealed that an institution of our size usually has 20 cases per year, but we have two. Either everything is absolutely wonderful, or people are not taking care of problems. I’m a gardener and a little weed is easier to pull. Once we get all this settled that we have an ombudsperson and what that person can do, that’s part of the buy-in, Dean Glaser has agreed that
the committee will make a presentation to new faculty, so they know about this resource if necessary. That gives you the motivation.

PROF ZABEL: We have bylaws and procedure changes. Bylaws. So, the AS&E ombudsperson is chosen to serve a 3-year term from among its members. “The committee consists of nine members of the faculty of professorial rank, elected for five-year terms, including at least one faculty member from the School of Engineering. No more than one representative of a single department may serve as a member of this panel at any one time, and no member of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion may serve concurrently as a member of the Grievance Panel.”

That’s the main change to the bylaws. Let’s move on to the real work because that’s pretty straightforward.

In the spring semester, the AS&E Ombudsperson is chosen to serve a three-year term by the Grievance Panel from among its members and is confirmed annually thereafter. Panel members chosen in their 3rd-5th year of service on the Grievance Panel will agree to extend their tenure on the Grievance Panel to be able to serve the full 3-year term of the Ombudsperson position. If no member of the Grievance Panel agrees to serve as Ombudsperson, the Grievance Panel will recruit an AS&E faculty member who is not on the Panel to serve in this position. This person will be an Ex officio member of the Grievance Panel.

The first paragraph reiterates what I just said. The issue was defining the level of confidentiality, which Lili helped with.

The Ombudsperson shall have the power to review faculty grievances informally and confidentially. The Ombudsperson will practice in accordance with the International Ombudsman Association’s Code of Ethics and Standards of practice which include the core ethics principles of independence, impartiality and neutrality, informality, and confidentiality. The Ombudsperson will need to participate in and complete formal training such as what is offered by the International Ombudsman Association.

Lili said we had it, but we have to make sure we are also OEO reporters. That’s the main change we are talking about.

MS PALACIOS BALDWIN: It’s the ombudsperson who doesn’t have a required obligation to report to OEO.

PROF MANJAPRA: Can you explain the relationship between OEO, the Grievance Panel, Legal and the Ombudsperson? And for a faculty member, we have responsibility to report to OEO, so how do we relate to the ombudsperson if we have responsibility to OEO?

PROF SHULTZ: Yes, all faculty are mandatory reporters; you have to report to OEO or the Vice Provost’s office. As ombudsperson, I’m told, I do not have to report that. In that sense, I’m not a faculty member at that point. My relationship to other bodies is none; I’m independent.
MS PALACIOS BALDWIN: The ombudsperson role is one that would provide an individual with someone to talk out an issue with, like interactions with faculty or a chair; they talk with Mary and consider their options. This person is not prohibited from going to OEO, the union, or personal or Tufts counsel. The ombudsperson is here for talking out options. We have seasoned, smart faculty members to talk about avenues with and here is someone to talk to, or you may want to report to OEO because dah-dah-dah. That’s how those work together.

PROF SHULTZ: If I was just a faculty member and someone says, “So and so says they are being discriminated against,” I have would to tell OEO.

PROF TOBIN: In terms of the term, there needs to be a provision if a person goes on leave or has to take time off because that’s fairly likely to happen. I’m not on the committee doing this, but the Senate is discussing this university issue and how does this fit in with that discussion?

PROF SHULTZ: I’m on the Senate and that discussion is ongoing, and I believe these are complimentary entities and a faculty member can come to the AS&E ombudsperson or to whatever the university creates. Suppose someone in Chemistry comes to us, they would have another avenue to go to, but now they don’t and that’s a concern.

PROF ZABEL: In terms of going on leave, they would have this other person to go to as an option.

PROF VIDA: The issue is coming up on the agenda and the details are being worked out. My sense is that the other schools don’t have a grievance procedure or an ombudsperson, so there is a great need for that. We won’t necessarily change our procedure and theirs is modeled after our procedure. The Executive Committee is acutely aware of the give and take that will go on and make sure the procedures stay in effect and others are developed. We have procedures here that the other schools don’t have.

PROF ZABEL: The Senate position is a compliment not a substitute for what we provide.

PROF SULLIVAN: Thank you for work on this. I want to consider Roger’s comment and make a friendly amendment. Is it possible to have an interim ombudsperson for a term given how much training is required?

PROF SHULTZ: That’s an excellent question and I don’t have the answer. Since this is the inaugural position, we don’t have another person. In a year or two when another person comes in, I’ll still be around, and that’s a possibility, to call on a former ombudsperson to fill in.

PROF ZABEL: We can make that explicit.

PROF TOBIN: I just think it should be addressed.

PROF ZABEL: Yes, for sure. I want to thank Lili; she’s been a real help and we appreciate her efforts. We couldn’t do it without her and I wanted to acknowledge her.
PROF SHULTZ: And thanks to both deans.

PROF SULLIVAN: And thank you for doing this important work. We will be voting on this bylaw change at the November 7th AS&E meeting.

**Update on Code of Conduct from the Committee on Student Life**

**Kevin Kraft, Director of Community Standards, and Mary Pat McMahon, Dean of Student Affairs**

PROF SULLIVAN: I now want to call on Kevin Kraft and Mary Pat McMahon.

PROF RAMSBURG: I just wanted to say a couple of words. About nine months or so ago, Mary Pat asked the Committee on Student Life to look at the student conduct policy and the committee undertook this with bigger and serious thought. That group also comprised students. We came out with policies that reflect the vision and values of the university and we hope you see that. Stuff will come back to the faculty for discussion, but a lot of this is in Mary Pat’s office’s purview.

MR KRAFT: Thanks, Andrew and the Executive Committee; I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you today. I want to give a brief overview of changes and get your feedback and then have a conversation.

I often get asked – and Roger was on the committee and was helpful framing this question – what’s the purpose of the changes? It’s the first comprehensive review in 15 years, and there have been individual changes at various times, but not a systemic review that codifies student behavior. A lot of laws have changed, as well as technology in society. One thing was that it’s against policy to have a mobile device on your person while taking an exam, but now, everyone has one all the time. Another prompt for this was that faculty on a student review report recommended that we create an enhanced culture of policies and create expectations and how we handle that. Our policies lack clarity, and students didn’t know what was expected of them or where the line was. The final thing was prescriptive sanctions: if you have a first violation, like you cheat on homework, then this is what will happen. If you do it algorithmically, you end up with results that don’t feel fair to the people imposing sanctions or the students. We have reasons to make policy change. As Andrew mentioned, some policies are made by deans’ office, so instead we wanted to have a broad community conversation about standards and values. We didn’t want to look at what other schools do, but look at our values and distill them into policies. Mary Pat requested that CSL, which is made of faculty and student representatives, being looking at this in February and they ended in August; they took on a big commitment and made recommendations. They suggested text changes to actual policies and made a second set of recommendations that require discussion by the faculty and a vote later on.

We requested feedback from everyone we could – The Daily, faculty, student groups. What is working? What should change? What’s your feedback? We didn’t want to make changes that didn’t make sense to the community. We had a website where people could submit feedback; we didn’t a lot of feedback from there but what we got was important. It’s worthwhile to know that we did a broad outreach campaign to be representative of the community.
We got the results from that and looked around and from February to August, the committee met for every long meetings, 3½ to 4 hour meetings, to think about this. We noticed that CSL was not representative of the broader AS&E community – there was no one from the SMFA and only one graduate student. We got approval to add an ad-hoc faculty member from the SMFA and an additional graduate student. In August, we had another round of Daily articles and we had a forum to find out what you think. Not a ton of students took us up, but the feedback was substantive. This slide shows the people on the committee and I want to say thanks to them.

We wanted to more clearly define what behavior is prohibited. “Behave responsibly” is good, but not defined. We wanted to define expectations. A lot of the policies you see are shorter. We didn’t want to deal in long, legal-type tombs. It’s clear and concise for the average college student. Just saying “disorderly conduct” opens it up to the eye of the beholder. We wanted to make changes in relation to the values of Tufts. We didn’t want this to be a dry recitation of expectations or frame it in a negative way. Part of coming here is the life experience, getting wiser, and negotiating one’s self and the community. The third thing is how we deal with violations to policy, so we enumerated students’ rights. We moved away from a transactional approach to handling these cases. In the old system, X=$300 fine; that was too transactional and legalistic. All penalties have an educational outcome – what do they need to learn and how do we structure that? They can still be put on status sanctions like academic probation, but we want to say to them that we can help you learn from this and move in a positive direction.

These are the community standards, and this became important. Integrity, community, respect, social justice, and responsibility. We also drew from the mission statement and T10 strategic plan and asked ourselves how this distills to student behavior. What does a student need to do and know? We are framing it in a positive way and not making a list of negative things you can’t do.

What are the individual changes? Amnesty through responsible action. Is someone needs medical attention or someone near you because of alcohol or drug use, if you need help, we will allow you to call for help without getting in trouble. We want the idea that you can get help and not be afraid of the consequences to be known. That used to only apply to alcohol and small amounts of marijuana, but now it’s for alcohol and all drugs. We are guaranteeing in written policy that if you or a friend uses alcohol or drugs, you cannot get in trouble if you need help. And as an incentive, there is an expectation that if someone needs medical attention, you have to call. If someone is in your immediate presence, you have the responsibility to help that student out. The marijuana policy Tufts has to follow is the federal law so that we qualify for financial aid and research money.

One thing we changed was the old protest and demonstration policy because it was really detailed, and what we said was we don’t want to disincentivize students from engaging in activism. All the rules they follow in everyday life also apply to activism, like they still can’t vandalize things. There were a lot of opinions about this. We’ve taken the policy that we are not going to take an opinion about your activism – we won’t take sides on issues. We are focused on behavior, not ideas. If you are holding a large event, 25 or more people, you have to register it like every other large event. It’s not to get approval of the event, just registration, and we help with logistics, like police details or city permits. We received a little criticism about that, and some people think we are trying to squelch activism. Campus life usually requires two weeks’
notice for an event and we agreed to reduce that to one week and even further if something emergent happens, so the day before or even same day. Our intention is to facilitate activism, not squash it. Activism is part of the Tufts’ experience, but there is a limit to how you have to comport yourself in relation to the community.

The hazing policy was updated. The policy on unauthorized recording of others. You can’t do it without consent. Also access to spaces – it’s pumpkin season – so no climbing roofs. We made changes to the resolution process, but I won’t talk in detail about that now, but there is a hearing panel with three faculty members on it. We are doing outreach and the full code of conduct is on the website. There will be other recommendations with AS&E Executive Committee that will come up in the future regarding academic policy and how the AS&E bylaws can support panels. That’s a brief overview of that. Questions or comments?

DEAN McMAHON: Alice also did a lot of work, and Andrew and Jamie and the group met over the summer so we could start the year with these policies in place and we’ve had a couple of test run protest registration – one was for a Kavanaugh protest. We got an application on a Saturday and are still working on responding on the weekends. Thank you, everyone, for attending to this and being part of the conversation.

PROF MANJAPRA: I didn’t understand why not make it day-of in that case? Students are already feeling marginalized [inaudible].

MR KRAFT: Saying same day all the time is a logistical concern, because it’s not enough time to work things out. There was a march from Dewick up the street to Professor’s Row to Ballou in support of the dining workers, and students were walking in the street where cars were coming, so more advanced notice would be good because two of us ending up going out there to direct traffic. We are willing to accept same day as needed. The general point about marginalized students is a good one. Students might think that we will we have TUPD at all events, which may make some students uncomfortable. TUPD are aware of all events and do not currently come to all events, so I think there is some precedent there that they won’t always be around.

DEAN McMAHON: For protests and counter protests, one advantage is that support is available when needed. We are not taking over events and we want to be there to be helpful.

DEAN GLASER: Could you talk about if a group violates the group gathering policy?

MR KRAFT: It depends on what they do, but what I’ve told students in general is if the only failure is that they didn’t register, that’s not a serious violation, and the penalty will be more educationally oriented; we won’t fine or restrict their ability to have events in the future. How did this work out and how could it have worked out better? We want to think about how you can be more effective in your activism.

PROF BERNHEIM: Thank you. Have a great afternoon.

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