ARTS, SCIENCES & ENGINEERING
FACULTY MEETING
COOLIDGE ROOM, BALLOU HALL
WEDNESDAY, October 28, 2015

Announcements

AS&E Diversity Fund Award Recipients ................................................................. 1
   Amahl Bishara, Associate Professor, Anthropology

Launch of the Revised AS&E Faculty Handbook .................................................. 1
   Jillian Dubman, Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering

Marty Guterman, Memorial Concert, November 8th ............................................. 2
   Todd Quinto, Professor, Mathematics

Old Business

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Changes for Faculty Research Awards Committee (FRAC) ........ 2
   Jillian Dubman, Secretary of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences & Engineering

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Change for the Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee .......... 3
   Mark Cronin-Golomb, Professor, Biomedical Engineering, T&P Chair

Update on the School of the Museum of Fine Arts (SMFA) .................................... 8
   Jim Glaser, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences

New Business

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for the Committee on the Library....................... 17
   Laura Wood, Director of Tisch Library

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for the Committee on Committees.................... 17
   Ioannis Evrigenis, Professor and Chair, Classics

Appendices

Briefing Information ................................................................................................. Appendix A

Summary of AS&E Faculty Handbook Revisions .................................................. Appendix B

Proposed Bylaw Change: T&P Committee ............................................................ Appendix C
PROFESSOR TOBIN: First we have announcements. I'll call on Amahl Bishara for an announcement on the Diversity Fund.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
AS&E DIVERSITY FUND AWARD RECIPIENTS
PROFESSOR BISHARA: So a very quick announcement. We have funded five proposals with the Diversity Fund with the September 2015 proposals. First of all, Thomas Abowd of GRALL is organizing a program: “A Speaker Series on Gender and Sexuality in the Contemporary Middle East,” to be held in the late fall and spring semester.

Steph Gauchel, the Director of Women's Center and Pluralism Initiatives has organized "Questions of Faith: Religion, Diasporas, and Colonialism" student luncheon and evening panel with a film screening and discussion of “This May Be the Last Time.” It will be November 9th or 10th with a film on November 16th or 17th. I guess this is also a really good opportunity to when you hear this is relevant for your classes to get back in touch so you can get more details on that.

Noe Montez of drama and dance is organizing a “Discussion and Musical Theatre Workshop” with Joel Perez on February 9th through 11th, 2016.

Nina Gerassi-Navarro of romance languages is organizing a program on “Civil Disobedience Across the Americas: From Selma to Buenos Aires and Beyond” on February 9th also.

Cristina Rosa of drama and dance is organizing “Black Bodies in Motion: Choreographing Resistance Across the Americas.”

So please get in touch with them about how to connect with them. The next Diversity Fund deadline is November 30th. Thanks.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Next announcement is from Jillian about the launching of the new handbook.

LAUNCH OF THE REVISED AS&E FACULTY HANDBOOK
JILLIAN DUBMAN: Hi everyone. A couple of years ago we had launched the revised faculty handbook, in 2013, and we have been working almost every summer since then to try and update the handbook. Last summer was a little busy, so it's taken a little bit longer to get those changes up. But in your attachment to today's meeting is just an update as to what has changed in the handbook - policies and procedures that have been updated.

The major changes that have occurred are in chapter five related to leaves. Arts and Sciences has implemented a few new types of leave policies. Based on the non-academic leave policies, I worked with Margery Davies to update a lot of that information and bring it current with law and policies of the university. So there's a list of those changes. If you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them after the meeting. I will send out an announcement to the faculty after the
meeting so that everybody receives the same information, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Just one more thing, the same day we went live with the handbook last week we went live with the AS&E Faculty Work/Life website. So now if you go to my website, secretary of the faculty website, there is now a tab that says work/life. We worked with Elizabeth Remick and the work/life committee to make that happen. So we're really happy to have that resource for all of you.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Thank you, Jillian. Third announcement is from Todd Quinto.

MARTY GUTERMAN MEMORIAL CONCERT, NOVEMBER 8th
PROFESSOR QUINTO: So this is a short announcement to let people know something about Marty Guterman. He was a beloved member of the math department faculty who passed away in 2004. Every year the Boston Arts Ensemble puts on an annual classic music concert in his honor. I wanted to let you know that this year's concert will be on November 8th at 3:00 p.m. at Saint Paul's Church in Brookline. It's called “South of the Border” because they're doing string quartets as well as a history piece, that apparently if you predict it, you can even get free tickets. The way to find this is not to email me, but go on to bostonartsensemble.org website.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: We have a few pieces of old business. There were two proposed bylaw changes that were presented at the last AS&E meeting, and so we can have additional discussion if needed and vote on those bylaw changes today. Following that, there will be an extended opportunity to hear about and ask questions and discuss the situation of the SMFA.

So the first bylaw changes are relating to FRAC. So Jeff Berry and/or Behrouz Abedian can talk about that.

OLD BUSINESS
VOTE ON PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES FOR FACULTY RESEARCH AWARDS COMMITTEE (FRAC)
PROFESSOR HOPWOOD: I'm completely unprepared to -- maybe Jillian can comment on this. So there's a title change that's causing a bylaw change. I will defer to Jillian to bail me out for the one-thousandth time on exactly what those details are.

JILLIAN DUBMAN: So historically for FRAC we have had an ex-officio member from the office of research administration. There has been a change in structure in the office, and so we are now asking for a bylaw change from the faculty to reflect that change in membership. So it's asking you to recognize the position of the associate vice-provost in the research administration or designee as the official member of the committee to replace the director of research administration. So it's a very minor change.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: Is there any discussion? I think the motion is already there because it's made by the committee. Is there a second? So I think we're ready to vote. All those in favor of
this change say aye.

ALL: Aye.

PROFESSOR TOBIN: All opposed? Abstentions? That decision has been made. The next proposal is for changes in the Tenure and Promotion Committee. This is a little bit more substantive. Mark Cronin-Golomb?

VOTE ON PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE FOR THE TENURE AND PROMOTION (T&P) COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLOMB: So getting right to a vote today on the proposal that was discussed in the last meeting to increase the size of the T&P committee to eight with at least two members from the faculty of the School of Engineering and four members of faculty of the School of Arts & Sciences. The proposal that's also to make reference to the long vacant position of secretary of T&P and to remove the requirement that one-third of the membership will be elected annually. This comes out of the T&P to have more representation of the various fields represented at Tufts and also to make recommendation that came out of the School of Engineering after a subject that was carried out last year. Any further questions or discussion?

PROFESSOR RICHARDS: I have two concerns that maybe you can address. One is a strategic concern, which is simply that in my casual observation the administration has found it easier to disagree with the T&P committee when the vote is not unanimous, and I'm a little worried that a committee of eight will find it more difficult than one of six. So that's a strategic concern that I'd just like to put out there.

The second is a budgetary concern, which as I understand it, the standard course release for being on T&P is two courses. So that if we go to an eight-member as opposed to a six-member we're talking about four courses coming out of the faculty. While I fully understand the need and the workload of the T&P Committee and the need for representation has to be broadened, I am concerned that four courses is equivalent of one FTE, one full-time faculty member.

And we're either going to take those four courses out of the curriculum and not replace them, or we're going to take funds from someplace else, say graduate financial aid or graduate financial aid or budgets or whatever and use the money that way. I've heard no discussion that that is the best use of our resources as opposed to another solution in terms of workload at least of streamlining the process. Many years ago we got rid of the outside expert for motions. I don't know why we couldn't do that or perhaps think about doing that.

I just wonder though about the resource cost. And just to underscore the point a little bit more, I don't think my department is alone. But in my department the average class size is now 36 and half the courses are being taught by adjuncts to probably more than half of the students. I don't think that's what anybody advertises Tufts as the kind of place that they're selling to students and undergraduates in particular. So I am very worried about the resource process, and I wonder if we could address that before we begin to vote on this. I think not thinking about that at all is a serious omission.
PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB: The answer to your first point, I would like to say T&P is a committee of the faculty and we shouldn’t really be in the position of having to strategize with the administration and our job is to make an honest and as full evaluation of each case as possible. So that's my answer to the first point.

The answer to the second point, I anticipate that there are going to be discussions about different ways of compensating faculty for service on T&P. For example, in the School of Engineering there's an agreement that is much more valuable to have support to travel, a research support of the graduate students has partial compensation on T&P. This is really something that we can't discuss in depth right now. It's something for the administration to talk about. However, it is a valid point.

PROFESSOR ZEHL ROMERO: I'm wondering if the deans have any projections if the number will continue to be as high for people coming up to T&P as they have been in the last few years because we did hire new people. Are there any projections from the deans how it's going to continue, if indeed, there will be so many T&P cases in the future as there are in the last ten years?

DEAN GLASER: I think that the likelihood is that the workload of the committee will continue to be at the present level. I don't see a diminishment of the case load. Part of it is because in our office we have been encouraging people to come up for promotion more actively. It's in the interest of the school to have people moving through the ranks more quickly. And part of it is we've expanded the size of our faculty over the past several years. So I think that the likelihood is the case load will continue at this present pace. Jianmin, do you want to say anything?

DEAN QU: Thank you, Jim. From the engineering side I think the situation is very similar. We have expanded tremendously over the last six to ten years and many of the people hired were junior folks, so they'll be coming up for their tenure and promotion process. So I would imagine at least for the next ten-some years the number at the engineering school going up for tenure and promotion would remain at least now maybe a little higher and then gradually sort of tapers off.

In response to the concern about what happens in the future with the number, Jim and I talked about this. This is one of our concerns when we look at the proposal. There is a big drain on our resources, particularly for teaching, we consider at two courses each. But one of the things that we could do is looking at in the future if the number does go down, what we could do is to consider sort of a review state, of course if the number comes out to only be about half of what we have now, we could consider instead of two course releases give only one course release. In other words, making it a flagstone in terms of the work review to accommodate the number of cases each year.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, former member of T&P and German, Russian, Asian. To answer partially, Dan, your department has been very active on T&P and has had many members. I think that had been part of your sort of strategy of being on important committees, which is fine. But the likelihood of these two new members, one has to be an engineer. In our
cases last year a third of our cases were promotion or tenure and promotion were for engineering, but only one-sixth of our committee was from engineering. In other words, the A&S members were carrying a much heavier load in preparing those engineering cases.

So I think this balances the work between engineering and arts and sciences a little more fairly, and the chances of having more than one member from economics are probably, especially if we discuss it, are probably not going to be as high because there are so many other departments. In my department I was replaced at $6,000 a course. So it only costs the university $12,000 because replacing someone in language and literature is obviously a lot less expensive. So faculty, keep that in mind when they vote for people to go on the committee.

PROFESSOR RICHARDS: I guess just a couple of quick points. First of all, it's not having people from departments on the committee or not, it's about the fact that this is going to cost real resources. We've already heard that there is some concern about this among the deans, and I'm concerned about it. It doesn't matter whether the resources come by way or whether the money comes by way of research support or by additional travel money and so forth. It's still dollars. It's going to make it that much harder for anybody in any department that's asking for a position to get it because there's going to be that much less money that's around. I think that's the real concern. Maybe they can replace some people with a net cost of $6,000, but I don't think they're going to be replaced that way. I think that's an important consideration.

I will just say one thing about the strategic voting. I don't know how widely known it is, but often T&P resorts to constructive votes. A constructive vote is not where every person votes completely how they feel, but where they vote in a way that is arranged to show some concern about the case. Even though they might feel more than 50 percent of their heart the case should be a positive if there's been doubts raised about the case they may turn in or submit a five to one, or four to two vote. I think that that is something at least in my experience when I was on the T&P Committee, and I think it's still the practice, and that suggests to me that there's a lot of strategizing going on.

I think it's a little naive to say we shouldn't think about strategic consideration when we think about how the T&P Committee is constructed. So that's my concern. As of right now I've heard no argument that says this is the best use of limited resources. The money that's going to come to support is for undergraduate financial aid or graduate financial aid. I'm not convinced that this is the best way to resolve this problem, the best use of those resources. And there are other options. There are certainly options in terms of shrinking the number of letters we ask for. We ask for normally eight letters still, I think. We do see the outside world, outside experts, and so forth. I think there are a lot of things we could do and I've heard no discussion of those alternatives.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB: Well, there's no real way to know how long this change is going to last. I would like at some point in the near future to have a working group built which would consider the way the tenure and promotion system works here. We have a very unusual system here at Tufts. The system has been in place for longer than I can remember, and I've been here for a while. So I wouldn't treat this as a permanent change, but as part of an ongoing development of the way T&P works.
PROFESSOR ORIANS: Colin Orians, Biology. So I just wanted to follow up on Dan's question. So can you just explain why you're needing one in each school rather than just taking care of the imbalance with engineering? Why aren't you just adding more from engineering? So that gets to the resources question, and I'd like to just hear some explanation why it's an addition of two and not an addition of one.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB: One reason is that we want to preserve the capability of having a split vote. When we first discussed of adding one vote I think there were maybe unintended consequences for having a committee size which is odd. The general balance of the number of faculty in engineering and arts and sciences is looking better represented by the proposed division of members on the committee. It's more like 20 percent, 22 percent from the school of engineering, and the anticipated vote might come to be a little more.

PROFESSOR RICHARDS: Just one clarification. I heard you say that you would like to have a working committee or something examined and the role of T&P, I think I heard you say that. But so what I'm understanding is we make change and then we think about whether it's a good idea or not, or -- so maybe I'm mis-hearing it. But that seems to be in the wrong order. It would be better to have the committee first to think about what the appropriate design should be and what the resource cost would be rather than the other way around. Maybe I'm mis-hearing it.

PROFESSOR GRONIN-GOLUMB: We do have to move with the times. It's going to take a load of work to (inaudible) a change move very slowly. This is a small change and I anticipate in the future they'll be much more consideration needed.

PROFESSOR PINDERHUGHES: I would just like to say I find the concerns expressed by Dan very compelling. I also, with a colleague in my department who's on the committee, I understand the workload and I find those issues very compelling as well. And I think here trying to think about some possible way to address both sets of issues. I doubt that what I'm going to propose is even viable from a bylaw's perspective. But I'm wondering whether there is some way to consider a temporary, a clearly temporary, adjustment to the membership, while at the same time there are a range of options considered. And at a certain point, whether it's a year from now or two years from now, a final decision be made for X number of years. Ellen Pinderhughes, child development.

PROFESSOR MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. Like Vida, I'm a former chair of the committee. I have to say I'm a little puzzled by the argument about resources, given that what we are talking about in arts and sciences is literally two courses out of all the courses. We're talking about one more member from arts and sciences and one more from engineering. Of course, I am in the humanities department and that means the replacement is 6,000, but I personally was not replaced. So it costs my department nothing.

But I think also that the idea that we have to totally revamp right away is really a way of scotching this proposal and leave us without the possibility of functioning more effectively for the next two years and I suspect, as Jim suggested, we really do have a bigger workload for the foreseeable
future. It's both more cases and it's more lateral hires and that means more work in the summer. I really don't see it decreasing, so I do urge people to go ahead with this proposal.

PROFESSOR COUCH: I just want to point out quickly, Alva Couch from computer science, School of Engineering. We have a record number of people right now where all decisions are temporary. This is a faculty governed decision. So if we decide in a couple of years this is not working, we can undo it.

PROFESSOR KELLY: Would you mind explaining how adding more members reduces the workload for each person because I'm assuming that each voting member has to prepare for each case, so I think I missed something.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB: It's not so much an issue of reducing workload and I'm sorry if that has been viewed to be one of the main attractions about this change. It's a matter of getting a tenure and promotion committee which is more representative of a faculty as a whole. We are larger now than we were in 1990, and we should pay attention to that change.

PROFESSOR QUINTO: Todd Quinto from mathematics. I'm on the tenure & promotion committee now and it is enough work that we need two course releases. I think without that it would be impossible for us to work and do the responsible job that we do. However, I think it's a really good idea to consider evaluating how we can do this more efficiently. The problem is as Mark and Professor Manz said is it takes time, and I like the idea of voting this change and also proposing that we get an adhoc committee to discuss how to do tenure and promotion. Since that's a bylaw change it will take at least a year after this year and this could help us getting more members.

PROFESSOR JOHNSON: Vida Johnson again. I wasn't at first in favor of expanding the committee because I was thinking, “Well, if you have more people it takes more time to discuss it.” But to answer the question I think, Mark, it is also the question of sharing the workload, sharing the workload more equitably between arts and sciences and engineering first of all. Then also within the committee, each faculty member gets assigned a case, actually two faculty members are assigned cases. So they are the ones who are charged with reading every student evaluation, reading every email that's a pile like this that is handed out, as well as more in depth reading of the scholarship.

Everyone obviously reads all the letters and some of us can't understand the scholarship so we rely on other committee members to explain that scholarship. Then we used to prepare a presentation to our own committee on those cases. Then we used to prepare a presentation to the deans. There is nothing to concentrate the mind like thinking you're going to be speaking to the decision makers really at a higher level. So it is a lot more work. And let alone the fact that the chair of the committee gets absolutely no recognition whatsoever for chairing the committee. Thousands of emails going across her desk, all kinds of questions from departments. And that chair can't afford to assign himself or herself an overload, somewhat overload, to make up for that because there's so many cases.
Since I was on the committee, the first year there were twelve promotions, eight tenure cases. The second year I know there were twelve tenure cases and certainly an equal number of promotion. The third year there were sixteen tenure cases and those were the ones that have the committees. So in my experience the tenure cases doubled, which meant that the workload of the faculty member -- by the way, we also sit in a three or four hour meeting with the outside expert. We then prepare what really has become almost a transcript, the chair of that subcommittee and the other member prepare those. So that's a huge -- I figured out that it probably took like twenty hours to really prepare a very accurate document that goes by everyone. I felt like even by editing it, like this should be done by someone else but it cannot be because of confidentiality. So that gives you an idea of, in fact, lightening the per faculty member load of preparing the case and being on the subcommittee would be substantial.

PROFESSOR FISHER:  Kathleen Fisher. I'm in the computer science department in the School of Engineering. I think not just a workload issue, but the issue of representation at the School of Engineering is really important right now. We're making decisions about people's tenure and promotion cases. These are life changing decisions for them, and we owe it to them to have people on the committee who are the best qualified to be able to evaluate their research statements. There might be one engineer who is on the committee who can't understand the research portfolio of a particular person and they might be excluded because of conflict of interest. I think we owe it to our School of Engineering faculty members to have more representation even if the cost of the teaching releases that might be more than we'd like to pay, but given the importance of this issue I think we can't actually take that lightly.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB:  Any other comments or questions?

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB:  Then I think we're ready to vote. So Mark, what's the proper procedure?

MARK DEVOTO:  It's an up and down vote.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB:  So a raise of hands. All those in favor? All opposed? I think we have a clear two-thirds majority. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR TOBIN:  Thank you. I'd like to call on Dean Glaser to tell us the current status of the SMFA.

UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL OF THE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS (SMFA)
DEAN GLASER:  I'm going to ask Nancy and Karen Mulder to come up and join me. Let me introduce Karen to you. Karen's been with us for maybe six weeks or something like that and is here with a broader portfolio than the SMFA. However, she stepped into the job just as the SMFA was carrying out and has really taken a leadership role in coordinating our due diligence as to the big decision that has to be made.

I see the look on Pearl's face, and I think, “You know what I'm talking about,” so I think there may be other people in the room that know, although we've talked about it in a couple of faculty
meetings. The SMFA a couple of years ago sought independence from Tufts and Joanne Berger-Sweeney said, “It's your destiny,” and in my opinion was the right response. They went down the road of independence and because of the absence of a relationship with Tufts or the loss of relationships with Tufts their enrollments took a deep dive. The museum is looking at their museum school and saying, “Maybe we don't want to be in the school business.” They approached us as well as several other universities about actually acquiring the School of the Museum of Fine Arts. Over the summer we had a series of conversations and presentations as we indicated that, yes, indeed, we would be interested in exploring the possibility of actually acquiring the school and having it be fully part of Tufts.

We are in the process now of looking at every dimension of this potential acquisition and there are many. It's very complicated and there are lots of things that we don't know and aren't going to know until we are actually into it. However, we are doing the best we can to make a very educated guess. The different components include admissions, finance, advancement, facilities, operations, and academics and curriculum. We have working groups that are engaged in all of those explorations. The SMFA and the museum have said, “Tufts, you are our preferred partner.” We have promised them that our trustees would make sort of a preliminary decision in November, a decision to either encourage or shut off this conversation in November with the goal of a final decision in the middle of December. So we're operating on a very short time frame.

The basic principles that we're bringing to the decision are gelling right now and I thought maybe I would just review them very, very quickly and then let Nancy talk a little bit about the academics and then Nancy, Karen, and I can fill in the questions that you might have.

The first fundamental decision is that the students in the SMFA would be full Tufts students who would be fully subject to Tufts policies and Tufts benefits and, in some cases, some costs. So for instance, our tuition is more expensive than the SMFA tuition then our financial aid is more generous. So hopefully this would apply to these students. The SMFA at present is running a deficit of about two million dollars a year. If everything stayed the same in terms of their enrollment we would be looking at those deficits into the near middle and distant future, and it's not the scenario that we would like to acquire the school. If we do not believe that this cannot be turned around, we will not be doing this. But we are exploring what it would take to re-energize enrollments there, to bring their admissions processes into the 21st century. We are trying to figure out the cost if, indeed, this is viable and if it's a break-even or if it's revenue-generating, and at the moment I think we're feeling somewhat optimistic about that but the final returns are not in. That is something that we will explore.

We are looking at attempting to project whether we could go from about 6 or 8 double-degree students, which we have now, to about 25 double-degree students. So we would maybe triple the amount of double-degrees that we have. We would be looking to have fewer straight bachelor of fine arts students, perhaps 25 a year, and 15 studio arts students who would be getting BA's and be part of arts & sciences’ student body.

The boundaries between the schools would be porous. In other words, a student could start in the School of the Museum of Fine Arts and if they wish to come over to the arts & sciences program or
the engineering program they could apply. There will be some sort of gate keeping as presently
happens. I think Jason, I saw Jason walk in the room somewhere. Jason does do some gate
keeping, so not every arts & sciences student who wants to be an engineer can be an engineer
unless Jason sees their potential to be successful in engineering. We would put something
similar, a process into place whereby students could transfer back and forth but there would be
some gate keeping.

Housing is a key variable here. We want to make sure that we would be able to bring these
students into our community and the idea, I think, at the moment is that they would spend their first
year on this campus and their second year on that campus on Huntington Avenue and then after
that they would be, much like many of our present students, on their own for figuring out their
housing. The concerns of our Student Affairs office is that these students be supervised, and we
don’t want to just sort of set them free on the neighborhoods because, of course, we have
town-gown issues that we’re working towards, and we want to keep our host communities happy.
So the question then becomes, “Do we have the capacity to house these students? What does it take
in terms of the resources to create the beds necessary to house these students?” And that is
something we are presently exploring.

Transportation is a critical factor in whether this will work or not. We have presently some
shuttles that go back and forth. We’ve actually just added wi-fi to the shuttles and hopefully
making their transportation time more productive. We would have to -- I think increase the
number of trips that are made back and forth if we were to do this, but it would be a key part of it
because one of the things that does impede students from really being successful in this program is
how do you navigate between these two places that are forty-five minutes apart.

So those are some of the really basic principles that we're operating from. And I'm going to ask
Nancy to talk a little bit about the academic opportunities that a faculty group has been exploring.

DEAN BAUER: Thanks Jim. I actually want to just first clarify something about Karen that
you didn't say, which is Karen is not in arts & sciences. She's in Patricia Campbell's office, and I
think you’re the director of business operations, is that right? Business development? And she has
been able to coordinate these huge numbers of working groups to help us all share information
which is so valuable because sometimes we can just get stuck thinking about academic stuff
because we don't know something about financial stuff. And you can ask Karen, and she gets it
right away. So that's been a great help to everybody.

I have spoken two or three times before at these meetings about the academic piece, and I'm going
to go in a different direction from the kinds of things I said before based on the assumption some
people have heard it. I welcome to take some questions.

I mean, we're sometimes thinking of things as mundane as schedules, right. Because right now
the SMFA does its own scheduling and we do our scheduling and our core students, especially in
the dual degree, but also in the BFA degree have to kind of catch ken to figure out what they can
take. So there are logistical things like that that we will eventually think about.
As Jim mentioned we're thinking about a possible studio arts major for our own campus. I think we're thinking about that no matter what. We're actually an outlier among our peer schools. We're one of the only ones that has no studio art major for our students. Whether that be a second major or not. Of course it's up to the faculty to do that. But we have the capacity to do that if we made this move.

There would be much, much higher quality digital media and art on this campus. They have fabulous equipment at SMFA which we could move here, part of it, or whatever we wanted to do. There is a lot of interest. I know a scientist who I've been speaking to and others about being able to figure out things like visualization, visual literacy, for students all across our campus. Our digital humanities people would benefit both from the -- supplies we have, people we have, et cetera, I think we'd bring over here without having be able to have our students take classes from down there.

We are thinking of a maker space that includes makers of materials for scientists, social scientists, and artists. We're thinking about space of where that would go. We're thinking about ways of connecting the arts. So SMFA is very, very strong in performance art. This is something really interesting to our dance program, our drama program, our music program, of ways to incorporate their expertise into our school.

The other thing is that art students bring a new perspective to our campus and having more of them on our campus would make in many ways our more visual art space on our campus more intellectually diverse. There are lots of -- I mean, I could literally stand here for an hour, so I'll just throw out a couple more things.

We have some very good master of arts in teaching programs in several of our departments. One of the programs that we have as a master of arts in teaching in art education that we have right now, there's more and more demand for teachers who are able to do more than one kind of art practice at school. There's a huge demand for that now and we can grow a program like that and support it if we have these kinds of resources available to us.

The other thing too is I've been hearing from a number of engineers, in fact, it makes my heart sing, about STEAM initiative, so putting the arts in STEM. I'm also hearing it from artists. In fact, I've met with several engineers about the possibility already, and I think it would be a way to potentially bridge and make further ties between engineering and arts & sciences.

I want to say one other thing. Jim mentioned the town-gown issue, which to me is a hugely important thing. If we're going to have a different population of students on our campus or potentially a few more students on our campus we need to be sensitive to our neighbors. I've been thinking about this a lot. Somerville has an enormously large number of artists relatively speaking, and I think it would be really wonderful to have those artists more involved in our community. And if we have spaces or resources and so forth on campus we can bring them in as visiting artists, or guest artists, or lecturers, just people coming into classes.

We can also -- the other thing I'm thinking about is Medford has a very strong arts council that's
run now by somebody who was formerly at Tufts who can't understand why Tufts isn't taking advantage of grants that they give out. Medford is really serious, both mayoral candidates for the upcoming election, are very, very serious about increasing the amount of public art in Medford, beautifying Medford, not just at the level of planting more trees, but really making it into an art city. I think there could be some very interesting collaborations between an arts program on our campus and the city of Medford. In addition to which we already have a very, very strong program with Medford and also to some extent with Somerville in their schools and have students on our campus who might be interested in arts education, being able to go into those schools is another thing. I will stop now. Everybody who knows me, knows I can talk for an hour. But I can really talk for a lot more time about the stuff we've been doing.

DEAN GLASER: Any questions?

PROFESSOR COUCH: Alva Couch, School of Engineering. I have one concern. I understand a little bit about the culture there, and I believe that you're actually when you raise the tuition and change the tuition that you're going to completely the change the clientele that go to this school. So you're actually not going to get the same people at all. Therefore, I consider it to be an exceedingly high risk. We've all heard the term “starving artist,” and the current pricing there is based upon the market rates for starving artists, which is to say the biggest price based upon the return.

I am very much concerned that we are then going to have a completely different population attending this school. Not a bad thing, but a risk factor.

DEAN GLASER: Actually, Karen, you might want to comment on this. I think that while our tuition is greater, our other fees are lower. Is that correct?

MS. MULDER: That's right. Net is actually really not that different. If you look at the total student charges picture there's not too much difference. It's just more of it comes in to tuition at Tufts than it does there, and then housing. Housing is much more expensive there than our current house rate. Students fees are also more expensive there than they would be at Tufts. So overall, the total student charges are not terribly different between the two.

DEAN QU: My understanding is they'll be spending most of their time over there so how can that reduce the housing cost for them?

MS. MULDER: So right now the BA/BFA student population is the biggest, the dual degree population is the biggest growth area for the SMFA at Tufts and the vision that we're presenting. So, you know, they're spending a lot of their time here. They're also spending a lot of their time there. But the housing policies are the same. So it's still two years worth of time being spent in Medford and then they can move downtown to Boston if they're spending most of their time taking elective courses at the Museum of Fine Arts. So we just think because a lot of their elective courses and their major courses will actually be happening in the Huntington Ave. location many of them may choose to actually shift their residence location from here to there over the course of their career.
DEAN BAUER: Let me just add there will also be a build up of art studios, not consistent with the model so that we're not spending more money or putting more resources to this consistent with (inaudible) are coming up with. We would have more arts opportunities on our campus as well so it would be very -- depending on what the students are interested in.

PROFESSOR TALIAFERRO: Jeff Taliaferro, political science. A comment and a question. From our previous conversations, Nancy, it was my understanding in my conversations also with Lee Coffin in the undergraduate admissions and financial aid committee, it's my understanding that if this acquisition were to go through all students applying to the SMFA at Tufts would be evaluated holistically as our current undergraduates are. In other words, they would have to submit standardized test scores, transcripts, application essays, the whole works. As opposed to the current situation with the standalone program at the SMFA where they just submit a portfolio for evaluation.

But my question is have you given any thought as to what the eventual size of the undergraduate population at SMFA will be if we were to acquire it?

DEAN GLASER: We have. I think we are looking at sort of a minimum number that would make it viable, in fact, make it even a little bit better than viable. And that is twenty-five double degrees, twenty-five BFA's, and fifteen additional students here. That's, I think, attainable. Our colleague, Lee Coffin, particularly is confident about the first of that group. The second group is attainable, but the question is at what cost. Will those students be, you know, of the caliber that we're used to? And we want to support that pool of students to see if we can build that pool of students so that we would have high quality students and high quality artists as well.

We hope that there's actually some revenue potentially beyond that. For instance, right now some of Northeastern students take courses at the SMFA. There's a lot of colleges and universities in that area and is there some potential to meet some demand there that are not our students but will bring some revenue into the school.

Transfer students, another area where I'm told by our colleagues at the SMFA that there's a strong pool of students, maybe not a strong pool, but a pool that didn't die the way all their other admission pools died. Could we enhance the student body of that group as well. But I think at a minimum we're thinking about sixty to sixty-five students a year.

PROFESSOR PINCHERHUGHES: Ellen Pinderhughes, child development. I have two questions. As you talked about the principles you talked about some of the concerns and Nancy talked a lot about some of the benefits. I'd like to hear a little bit more about what some of the other concerns are as you're considering this idea. Then the other question has to do with town-gown relations and thinking about it in Boston. So this is the only campus right now where we think about town-gown relations regarding undergrads. That becomes another key piece to think about in Boston.

DEAN GLASER: On the latter question we're probably looking at a small number of students
there. They are already part of that community. To be honest with you, I don't really know what all the town-gown issues that they presently face there are. I'm sure that there are some. I know that for instance the mayor is part of the museum board and there must be some conversation that takes place there. But I'm not sure that the acquisition would do anything to the present situation. We would need to learn what the present situation is, but I haven't heard anything that is problematic.

Challenges. I mean the number one, there's sort of three big ones, and maybe Nancy and Karen may have something to add. One of them is, is this financially viable because we are making a leap of faith. Lee Coffin and the admissions team, highly professional, very strategic, large organization penetrating the United States and the globe can do better than the three-person operation which has been a revolving door and doesn't have a whole lot of support. But it's an open question. It's a question whether that will happen. The demand for an art degree may be the reason, the decrease in the demand for an arts degree may be the reason for a decline in their enrollments as opposed to the detachment from Tufts. The timing does not suggest that, but this is an issue.

Is this a financially viable operation even if it is fully staffed -- is fully filled with students? That's another concern. And of course, we would have to make decisions, sometimes difficult decisions about what to do as opposed to what not to do there and potentially here.

Facilities is a concern. Right now our arts facilities are sub-par and that's being generous. Ann Gardulski has an up close and personal view of the arts facilities. You know, we've been moving along with that for many years, but I think our sense is that we need an upgrade, and we need resources to do that. So that is a concern.

The metrics of the students. We've worked very hard to build our metrics so we're a really powerful school in terms of the kinds of people who we attract. That's been very good for us in many, many ways. A lot of pride is built from our alumni, and of course it's wonderful to teach such fantastic students. So those are some of the concerns. I do think that there's a lot of upside though and things that can help us with our curriculum and your programming, with our reputation, and of course the connection with the museum, a premier cultural institution in the city of Boston and in the United States. That relationship I think, personally, could be really, really big and important to us. So I think there's a real upside.

PROFESSOR VOGEL: Rich Vogel from civil environmental engineering. You know, at first -- Nancy, this is really a wonderful expose of the importance of the arts in arts, sciences, and engineering across disciplines. It's really amazing how many people and disciplines it could touch. You know, I could imagine if a business school came to Tufts and of course they were teaching courses that economics department already teaches and it would be a natural fit. By some standards it would be a very complex decision for the economics department to take them in. Here the natural, simple engineer that I am, the department of art or history seems like the natural residence for this program since it is art after all and it is a master of arts and so forth. So the question I have is how has the committee dealt with the -- it seems to be the ultimate residence, the home, for this is really the paramount. And the question is really how has the committee been
DEAN BAUER: Yes, that's a good question. It's not something that's only in the early wake of our academic committee. Jim's on the academic committee. I lead the academic committee and we have three people from art and art history including at least one who's here right now. I know Malcolm is here. And then we have representation from every other department that we could think of that had somebody that had a real stake and there's a very wide variety of perspectives.

I think the question of where this unit would sit is still up for grabs. The way we have it -- by the way, at its peak, SMFA had I think 100 BFA students per year for a total of 400. In addition to which they had 50 MFA students curricular. And that's a two-year program. So what they would have every year is about 500 students. What we're proposing now is about 100 MFA students, which is a little bit lower than what they have now, and totals number of students who weren't just straight BFA students of fifty per class, which would be over four years 400. So it's a much smaller group of people.

So the question is would it be big enough so that it could sit as its own school reporting directly to the provost? But there's been a lot of conversation as well about it sitting as a unit with arts & sciences on the theory that there's going to be a lot of collaboration going on. We don't want it to be -- we don't want to create another barrier and other walls if it makes no sense. That's actually what they want to do. They want to have a very close relationship with arts & sciences, but in a way this is not -- this is certainly above my pay grade, and I think it's a decision that the central administration will make. But everybody agrees, everybody I've spoken with in central administration that it's exactly the kind of attitude they're oppressing that makes this. That's what driving this more than anything else. The financial piece can stop it and should stop it if it's going to cost us a lot of money with respect to either opportunity cost or just in flat terms. Then we can't do it. But if it's not, we feel like this is something that just adds across the boards to people that are already teaching on this campus.

PROFESSOR ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology. Jim, you kind of eluded to my question in your last response was your relationship with SMFA. When I hear the word acquire it sounds like they're separating from the MFA, but you're saying the relationship might build. I'd like, for me, the confidence that it's actually building a relationship and not severing a relationship. So I was looking if you could speak to that a little bit more.

DEAN GLASER: I just think the name Tufts has been beneficial to their admissions because the students coming in are getting a Tufts degree. The relationship of the school to the museum has been beneficial to them as well. It's a, you know, major, major, art museum in this country and we would not wish to see that connection go away. What it means is the SMFA wouldn't be providing IT, and wouldn't be providing security, and it wouldn't be providing management of the school. But it would continue to lend its name to the school. The school would still be located across the street from the museum. We would hope, and I think there's some indications that this would be the case, because we've met with the new director of the museum, there would be opportunities to collaborate with their conservators and their curators. With some of the leadership there, there would be internship opportunities there that our students could actually be
integrated into the museum as some of them are at present.

So some parts of the relationship will continue. We are negotiating a lot with them and these are part of the terms that we would be negotiating.

I think that we're down to the last question. Kim?

PROFESSOR RUANE: I have two sort of downer questions. The first is, and I think this was brought up in a couple of meetings ago, is acquiring the faculty, how many faculty that would be, and also how does that affect faculty growth in arts, sciences & engineering? That's one question. The other is, if we're taking a leap of faith, what happens if it fails? Who picks up the tab? Two downer questions. Sorry.

DEAN GLASER: I don't think that the answers are, at least to the first question, is much of a downer. Look, we acquire the faculty. We acquire everything about it. We acquire the endowment. We acquire the assets. We acquire the liabilities as well. We acquire their equipment. We lease the building from them. We acquire their faculty. There are still a lot of open questions about how that faculty would be integrated into Tufts. They would be completely Tufts employees. But right at present they don't have a tenure system there. They don't have ranking systems there. So they're all just faculty members. There's no assistant, associate, lecturer, anything, senior lecturer. So we would have a lot of things to figure out.

But the question of the size of that faculty and what it's relationship is to the size of our faculty, I think they're independent because the size of that faculty is dependent I think in part on the revenues that are brought in by the students there. So I don't think they would be connected. That said, if we had to cover major deficits there for a prolonged period of time that would be coming out of our budgets and that could affect indirectly our ability to support the faculty and all the other things that Dan was talking about at the beginning of this meeting. Because we are resource constrained. There's a limited pool or pie. So if it was a big drain on the school and the university we'd have to pay for it somehow.

Second question was what happens if it fails?

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT MONACO: I think it's going to be part of the arts & sciences -- A couple comments about the leap of faith. I mean, the enrollment issues as I understand is the BFA you're taking the lower end of where they're at at the moment, so it can only go up. We don't think it's going to go down. And for the dual degree we accept only five percent of the applicants we have at the moment constrained by the numbers that the program entertains. It's still ten percent below our average acceptance rate in to the school. So I think the room for growth there is imperative in numbers. So I'm not so worried about the enrollment, and I think it's in good hands with Lee. But it is the most important piece of this to make it successful.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you very much. We really want to make sure people know what's going on and want to be very transparent about it. The one thing I would just conclude by saying
is the decision has not been made. We're really exploring it. We're very excited about the opportunity. But we are going in to this with clear eyes. I spent the morning, Nancy and I spent the morning, and Kevin as well, with Tony and his senior staff. The questions that are being asked are skeptical and tough and the standards for making this decision are high. I hope that we can make the community feel comfortable that if we do go ahead and do this we're optimistic about it. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

PROFESSOR HABER: Thank you very much, Jim. We're a little short on time, but we have two very important bylaw changes which have to be discussed at one meeting and voted on at another. So I would urge everybody to stay. I want to thank Mark Brimhall-Vargas for holding back his presentation for a future meeting. First, something that I don't think should be very controversial, the bylaw change for the Library Committee, Daniel Abramson and Laura Wood.

NEW BUSINESS
DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY
DIRECTOR WOOD: Hi everyone. I don't think Danny could make it today. This is just to keep the bylaws in line with the changes and titles that have happened and specifies a title that no longer functions in the library. As some of you have heard we're losing our jewel and associate director to retirement at the end of this calendar year. So we wanted to broaden the language to indicate associate librarian or designee, which means it's prevalent other committees but not in these bylaws. So that is the sum of the change. Are there questions? Thank you.

PROFESSOR HABER: Now, these are going to be voted on next time. They're bylaw changes so they have to be discussed if there's a discussion at the end of next time, discussed and voted on again, like the T&P thing.

The second one the discussion was a proposed bylaw change for the Committee on Committees. Ioannis?

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
PROFESSOR EVRIGENIS: Thank you. So the committee is proposing a change to the bylaw that currently states that anybody who steps in to replace a member on an elected committee and serves more than half of the term becomes ineligible to run for the next election. I can't speak to the original rationale for this. I would imagine it was so that no one person or department dominated the elected committee. I can assure you that we have the opposite problem, which is that we have several times people who are willing to step in, provide excellent service, learn how the committee works, and then become ineligible for the next round. So really, the change is to allow somebody to serve at least one full term before becoming ineligible to run for the next election.

PROFESSOR CRONIN-GOLUMB: Mark Cronin-Golumb, Biomedical Engineering and Chair
of T&P. We have similar cases in T&P where members have sort of partial terms and have been precluded from serving again in a full time, and I think that change would be absolutely excellent for the operation of T&P.

PROFESSOR EVRIGENIS: Thank you. I should state that T&P is usually a committee in which that happens, where somebody who has been elected has to step down because that person has assumed a new role, and of course, as we discussed earlier, this is the meeting that has the most need for people who know its workings and are willing to serve. Very often we've had difficulty in finding candidates for these elections. Any other questions? Thank you.

PROFESSOR HABER: So does someone have a move to adjourn?

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Announcements

**AS&E Diversity Fund Award Recipients**
The members of the AS&E Diversity Fund Committee will announce the winners of the most recent round of Diversity Funding. The next round of applications for Spring 2016 programming will be due on November 30, 2015.

**Launch of the Revised AS&E Faculty Handbook**
The AS&E Faculty Handbook has been revised to more accurately reflect current practice, to update policies and procedures, and to update hyperlinks throughout the website. A complete summary of these changes accompanies the agenda for this meeting.

**Marty Guterman Memorial Concert, November 8th**
Marty was a beloved member of the math department who passed away in 2004. This is an annual concert by the Boston Artists Ensemble. People may purchase tickets online at the BAE web site, or at the door, and there are discounts for seniors and students. This concert is scheduled for Sunday, November 8, 2015 at 3 PM, and it is called "South of the Border" because they are doing two string quartets by South American composers. The concert will be held at St. Paul’s Church in Brookline at 15 St. Paul St.

Old Business

Vote on Proposed Bylaw Changes for Faculty Research Awards Committee (FRAC)

*Speaker:* Jeff Berry, Co-Chair, FRAC

*Summary:* With the restructuring of the Research Administration, its ex officio member on FRAC shall be referred to as the “Associate VP for Research Administration or designee” in the FRAC bylaws. The proposal was originally discussed at the September 30th AS&E Faculty Meeting.

*Key issues:* In its present form, FRAC bylaws include the Director of Research Administration (no longer existing) as its ex officio member.

**Proposed Change to the Bylaws of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering**

(k) A Committee on Faculty Research Awards, consisting of eleven members of the faculty of professorial rank, appointed for staggered five-year terms. The membership shall include at least one member from each of the following areas: arts, engineering, humanities, natural sciences and mathematics, and social sciences. The following shall be members ex officio without vote: the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences or designee and the Dean of the School of Engineering or designee; the Director of Research Administration or designee; and the Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations. The committee may appoint such additional members, without vote, as it deems appropriate. The committee shall elect its chair at the last meeting of the spring semester of each academic year and the Secretary of the Faculty share shall serve as secretary of the committee. The committee shall
distribute funds made available to it for support of research conducted by members of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering. Determinations concerning the distribution of funds shall be made by majority vote; in the event of a tie, the chair shall vote to break the tie. The committee shall be responsible for reviewing applications submitted to it, and, where appropriate, shall review evaluations, in support of the applications, from persons within and outside the university. In making awards, the committee shall promote faculty development by funding selected small projects and providing seed money for larger ones. The committee shall represent the faculty in seeking new internal and external sources of funding for the awards which it administers.

**Action required:** A vote on the proposed bylaw change on October 28th to approving the amended bylaw.

**Further Information:** See the proposed bylaw change in Key Issues noted above.

**Vote on Proposed Bylaw Changes for the Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee**

**Speaker:** Mark Cronin-Golomb, Chair T&P

**Summary:** The Committee on Tenure and Promotion would like to propose
1) that the size of the Committee be increased from six to eight, with at least two members from the School of Engineering (up from one) and at least four members from the School of Arts and Sciences (up from three). The bylaws would still require at least one member from each of the following areas in the School of Arts and Sciences: the humanities and arts; the social sciences; the natural sciences and mathematics.

2) that the position of Secretary be eliminated.

The proposal was originally discussed at the September 30th AS&E Faculty Meeting.

**Key issues:** The rationale for the first part of the amendment is twofold.

1) Since 1995 the number of tenure stream faculty in Arts, Sciences and Engineering has increased from 276 (226 Arts and Sciences, 50 Engineering) to 382 in 2013 (302 Arts and Sciences, 80 Engineering). The size of T&P has remained constant at six over that period of time. An increase in the size of T&P to eight will allow the committee to better fulfill its responsibility to provide faculty assessment of candidates who come up for tenure and promotion, as well as candidates tenured at other institutions who are applying for a tenured position at Tufts. It will help both in terms of caseload and in terms of evaluating the breadth of scholarship. The minimum representation form Arts and Sciences would remain at 50%.

2) In Spring 2015 the School of Engineering (SoE) convened an ad-hoc committee on tenure and promotion to respond to concerns regarding its representation on T&P in the light of its recent growth and status as a School as opposed to a College. The SoE Faculty discussed and voted on the following possible courses of action:
i) Maintain the status quo (received 17% of the vote)
ii) Increase the size of T&P to between 7 and 10, with at least two from SoE (received 50% of the vote)
iii) Create two five-member subdivisions of AS&E T&P Committee: one subdivision for Math, Natural Sciences and Engineering, another for Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (received 33% of the vote)

The proposal we bring before AS&E reflects the outcome of the discussion and vote by SoE and incorporates input from the current members of the T&P Committee.

We note that the Committee on Committees (C/C) has found it difficult to recruit full professors to serve on T&P. While associate professors are eligible to serve, the practice of C/C has been to recruit full professors only, so that associate professors are not asked to evaluate cases of promotion to full professor. This de-facto limitation has been especially problematic for SoE, where the number of full professors without administrative responsibilities (associate deans or chairs) is limited. With this in mind we note that an informal poll of full professors in SoE without additional administrative responsibilities demonstrated support for running in an election.

The requirement that one third of the membership be elected each year is removed. With inevitable unexpected turnover in the Committee, this requirement has become impractical.

The rationale for the second part of the amendment: removal of the position of Secretary is that it has become unnecessary for the operation of the Committee since the advent of electronic distribution of materials.

**Action required:** A vote on the proposed bylaw change on October 28th to approving the amended bylaw.

**Further information:** Please refer to the text of the amendment.

**Update on the School of the Museum of Fine Arts (SMFA)**

**Speakers:** Jim Glaser, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences

**Summary:** Tufts is exploring the possibility of acquiring the School of the Museum of Fine Arts (SMFA).

**Key issue:** There are several different dimensions to this decision, and we have established several working groups to look into facilities and operations; finance; admissions, financial aid and students affairs; advancement, as well as curricular and programmatic areas, so we will be able to report on some findings.
New Business

Syllabus Disability Access Statement

*Speakers:* Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Chief Diversity Officer, and Linda Sullivan, Director of Student Accessibility Services

*Summary:* In order to better serve students with disabilities at Tufts, we are asking faculty to add a statement on their syllabi providing information about disability access and services. The statement is optional, but very helpful in connecting students with needed support and resources.

*Key Issues:* Providing students with disabilities information about accessing reasonable accommodations in a classroom.

*Action required:* We are asking faculty to adopt a statement (already provided on the Student Accessibilities Services website) into their syllabi. Essentially, copy and paste.

*Further Information:* [http://students.tufts.edu/student-accessibility-services/faculty-members](http://students.tufts.edu/student-accessibility-services/faculty-members)

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for the Committee on the Library

*Speakers:* Daniel Abramson, Chair, Library Committee, and Laura Wood, Director of Tisch Library

*Summary:* The current bylaws are very specific regarding the title of the “Associate Director for Teaching, Research, and Information Resources.” This title is no longer in use. With Laura Walter’s retirement in December, we propose revising the description to be flexible for evolving library roles/titles and to include the option of designee which is used in other committee bylaws. The request is to change the title to “Associate Director or designee.”

*Key Issues:* Keeping bylaws accurate.

*Current version:* A Committee on the Library, consisting of four or more members, at least four of whom have professorial rank, with no more than one member from any one department; the Chair of the Committee on Budget and University Priorities; two undergraduate students designated by the TCU Senate; one graduate student designated by the Graduate Student Council; and ex officio members with voting privileges: the Director of Tisch Library and the [Associate Director for Teaching, Research, and Information Resources, Tisch Library](http://students.tufts.edu/student-accessibility-services/faculty-members). The committee shall study and make recommendations concerning library policies, budget, collections, and services. It shall also assist in the dissemination of information about the library to constituent groups.
Proposed Version:
A Committee on the Library, consisting of four or more members, at least four of whom have professorial rank, with no more than one member from any one department; the Chair of the Committee on Budget and University Priorities; two undergraduate students designated by the TCU Senate; one graduate student designated by the Graduate Student Council; and ex officio members with voting privileges: the Director of Tisch Library and an Associate Director or designee. The committee shall study and make recommendations concerning library policies, budget, collections, and services. It shall also assist in the dissemination of information about the library to constituent groups.

Action required: Discussion so that a vote may be taken at the next AS&E meeting.

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for the Committee on Committees

Speakers: Ioannis Evrigenis, Chair, Committee on Committees

Summary: Changing the bylaws to allow those replacing members on elected committees for more than half but less than a whole term to be able to stand for election in the next cycle.

Key Issues: Allowing those who have served less than a full term to do so if they are interested and have already acquired knowledge of the work involved, ensuring continuity and minimal disruption, as well as robust lists of candidates.

Current version:
(b) Re-election. An individual who has served either a full term or a partial term amounting to a half term or more shall be ineligible for re-election to that committee for two years.

Proposed version:
(b) Re-election. An individual who has served either a full term or a partial term amounting to a half term or more shall be ineligible for re-election to that committee for two years.

Rationale:
According to the Bylaws, "If a duly elected member of a committee cannot serve for any portion of the term, the runner-up for that committee at the most recent regular or special election shall be declared elected if the runner-up is available and is eligible" [3 (d)].
According to the existing version of 3 (b), if such a change occurs before the midpoint of a term, the member who has stepped onto the committee is not allowed to run for a full term for two years, even if he or she is willing to continue on the committee. The Committee on Committees recommends that those who have served less than a full term be allowed to complete one before becoming ineligible for re-election to the committee in question.

Action required: Discussion of the proposed amendment in advance of a vote to be scheduled at the next AS&E Faculty Meeting (December 2, 2015).
Summary of Changes to the AS&E Faculty Handbook 2015

Chapter 1: Organization and Governance
• Updated links to faculty bylaws and committees
• Updated voting rights for A&S professors of the practice

Chapter 2: Faculty Appointments
• Implemented approved revisions to the definitions of Professor of the Practice (Eng) and Professor of the Practice (A&S)
  o Updated voting rights for A&S professors of the practice
• Contract Reviews and Renewals: in all cases the language about course evaluations numbers has been changed to the following to reflect the changing nature of the course evaluation instrument:
  o a complete list of courses taught with both enrollment figures and the numerical averages from student evaluations for questions “overall rating of the professor,” the “overall rating of the course,” and, when available, “compared to other courses at Tufts, I learned…” for each course the candidate has taught at Tufts.”
• Adjusted the contract lengths and eliminated the term limit of Professors of the Practice (Eng) and (A&S) to reflect what has been approved in the appropriate school bylaws

Chapter 3: Faculty Responsibilities
• Updated references to SIS from iSIS
• Changed references of Office of Disability Services to the Office of Student Accessibility
• Added the School of Engineering Workload Policy

Chapter 4: Tenure and Promotion
• Updated links to Statement 11
• Replaced the text of Statement 12 to reflect the revised version from 2013

Chapter 5: Leaves of Absence
• Added guiding principles of academic leaves
• Updated school contacts for leave information
• Updated contact information for the staff contact person in the School of Engineering relative to leaves
• Removed the following statements to reflect changes that were previously approved and implemented in Chapter 4 to avoid inconsistency
  o “In no instance may the leave be taken in the academic year in which a tenure application is being reviewed.”
  o “It is important to note that faculty members cannot go on leave during the year in which they come up for tenure review (See Chapter 4, Probationary Period).”
- Under “Academic Leaves With Pay,” added a section on “Partially Supported Research Leaves” (Arts and Sciences)
- Under “Academic Leaves without Pay,” added a section on “Multiyear Academic Leaves of Absence” (Arts and Sciences)
- Under “Nonacademic Leaves of Absence,” updated text under “Returning from a Leave” to reflect current practice
- Under “Definitions of Terms,” several definitions have been updated to reflect current policy and legal issues
- Leave Eligibility Chart was updated

Chapter 6: Compensation, Benefits, and Faculty Development
- Under “Faculty Development,” added a section on “Faculty Research Accounts Policy” (School of Arts and Sciences)

Appendix
- Updated links as necessary
Text of proposed amendment of the bylaws of AS&E, Section IV part c)

Presented to the AS&E Faculty on September 30, 2015 and October 28, 2015

(Current as of 9/22/2015 revised)

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

The committee shall elect its own chair, and secretary and vice chair. In the event that an individual being considered is a member of the same department as the chair of the committee, the vice chair shall serve as chair.

This committee shall review the qualifications of all individuals who are proposed for consideration for a tenured position or who are proposed for promotion above the rank of assistant professor, or who request such consideration. It shall requisition and consider all evidence that has a bearing on the individual under consideration. This shall include a departmental statement, and a privately submitted evaluation and recommendation to the Chair of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion from each tenured member of the candidate's department(s); nontenured members are invited to submit evaluations and recommendations but are not required to do so. After review of the confidential letters by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, the committee will forward these letters along with the rest of the candidate's dossier to the administration, unless the case is tabled. Confidential letters will be kept secure by the Secretary of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering for three years from the date of official action by the Board of Trustees on the candidate's application, at which time the letters will be destroyed, unless the administration has been legally enjoined from doing so.

The departmental statement shall reflect the full range of opinion of department members who vote on the application, record the numerical vote, and be signed by all voting members. When department members cannot agree on a single statement, a signed minority statement shall be submitted. The statement(s), including a list of members who voted, shall be made available to the candidate who has the option to submit a timely written response to the department statement. When pertinent, the views of colleagues, both tenured and nontenured, in other departments, and of individuals from outside the university shall be obtained. The committee may ask any of the above persons, or the candidate, to appear in person. Each department will maintain records of student opinion of faculty members, from which information about a candidate will be made available to the committee when appropriate.
For each candidate under consideration for tenure, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall create an external subcommittee. Each External Subcommittee shall consist of: (a) two members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, one of whom shall serve as chair; (b) two members of the department(s) concerned, elected by the tenured member(s) of the department; and (c) one member, hereafter referred to as the outside expert, selected by the tenured members of the department(s) concerned. This outside expert should be from the same discipline as the candidate, or a related field.

Members of the External Subcommittee shall review and meet to discuss all the evidence presented in a candidate's case. At the request of any single member of the External Subcommittee, the External Subcommittee shall meet with all of the voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for further deliberations. Such request may be expressed prior to the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may take place immediately following the External Subcommittee meeting (for the convenience of the outside expert). Such request may also be expressed at the conclusion of the External Subcommittee meeting, in which case the larger meeting may have to take place on a later date. Following the External Subcommittee meeting, and, if requested, the larger meeting with all voting members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion also present, the Subcommittee Chair will prepare a written report that reflects the discussions and findings of these meetings; this report shall be signed by all members of the External Subcommittee and shall become a permanent part of the case that goes forward to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion and to the Administration, unless the case is tabled. In no case shall the External Subcommittee vote on the qualifications of the candidate.

For candidates who already hold tenured positions at comparable institutions, and whose appointment at Tufts does not involve a promotion in rank, the Tenure and Promotion Committee may, upon request from the department and the appropriate dean, review the case without the formation of an external subcommittee. In all other tenure cases or if after initial review of the case the Tenure and Promotion Committee feels that it is necessary, an external subcommittee shall be constituted and meet as described above.

For candidates under consideration for promotion to full professor or in any case where an external subcommittee is not convened, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall create an internal two-person Tenure and Promotion subcommittee responsible for overseeing and presenting the details of the case to the committee. If after initial review of the case the Tenure and Promotion Committee feels that it is necessary, the Tenure and Promotion Committee retains the right to gather more information in accordance with the procedures outlined in Statement 11 (see Guidelines for the Application and Review Procedures for Tenure and Promotion).

The Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall review and deliberate on all the available evidence in the case. The Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall (a) vote on the merits of each case, and it shall submit a written report of its findings for each case, including a record of the vote, to the appropriate dean; or (b) vote to table the case and report the vote to table to the appropriate dean.

The internal deliberations of the committee shall be considered strictly confidential and shall not be discussed with anyone except the voting members of the committee. The committee as a whole;
however, may meet with other concerned parties to discuss cases as prescribed in Statement 11. The committee's final division on the vote shall be conveyed to the candidate and the relevant department or unit chair by the chair of the committee at the time such information is transmitted to the appropriate dean. The committee's procedures shall ensure that the candidate is made aware of the names of all proposed referees, subcommittee members, and consultants, and of authors of all unsolicited communications regarding the candidate, in sufficient time to permit written objections and/or alternative suggestions to be considered prior to relevant actions. Confidentiality of communications received by or on behalf of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be honored to the fullest extent permitted by law.

The committee shall also, in consultation with the provost and the deans of the associated schools, prepare and review periodically the general criteria for tenure and promotion. These shall be made available in writing to this faculty.

Nomination and election of members of this committee shall take place in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws. With the exception of the Grievance Panel, membership on this committee shall not preclude membership on any other committee of this faculty. A member shall serve for three years, commencing on May 1 of the year specified on the ballot; with the exception of the first election, one-third of the members shall be elected each year.