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DEAN GLASER: Good afternoon. Welcome to the arts and sciences faculty meeting. We’ve got some juicy things to talk about today. Before we get underway, I would like to remind you of two things. First, our colleagues at the SMFA are at the other end of that camera right over there, and so this is being piped to them. They can see us and hear us, but we cannot see or hear them. So if there’s a vote taken, they will take the vote, and they will transmit through Jillian, and if there are questions coming from the SMFA, they will transmit them through Jillian. And we’re doing our best to integrate the faculty meetings together, so it’s sort of a work in progress, but we’re very pleased that we’re going to be able to include them. So those of you who are joining us from the Fenway, I welcome you to this meeting.

I also would like to remind you that as you are called upon to speak, if you could please identify yourself, both your name and your department. That’s helpful not only to some of our new faculty who are here in the room, but also to our colleagues on the other end of the camera. So please do that.

We’ll start with an announcement from Juliet Fuhrman.

FAB Review of Bárbara Brizuela
PROF. FUHRMAN: Hello. I’m Juliet Fuhrman from the Department of Biology, and I’m coming to you today as chair of the Faculty Advisory Board. We are organizing this semester the review of Dean Brizuela, and you will shortly receive by email a request for input on this review. Please note that your letters which will go to the Faculty Advisory Board, care of Jillian, your letters are confidential. They’ll be read by the Faculty Advisory Board members and appropriate administrators, but not of course by the administrator under review.

The review will be shared with Dean Brizuela, but all comments will be devoid of any reference to the writers. So we’re looking forward to your input. That would make it a very robust review if we get a lot of input, so please take the time to respond to that email. Thank you.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you, Juliet. Are there any other announcements, any events or things coming from the departments that anybody would like to share? David.

Curricula Committee Deadline
PROF. PROCTOR: David Proctor, history department. Just a reminder to all the departments that October 4th is the deadline, the first curricula deadline to submit any new courses or revisions. The October 4th deadline is important, because anything submitted by October 4th can go live in the spring. So any new courses that you might have or any significant revisions that you want to make for spring courses, the Curricula Committee needs it by October 4th. And that applies only to arts and sciences departments. It does not apply to arts and sciences within LA&J, or LA&J within arts and sciences, and not to the SMFA.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you. Now I would like to turn the microphone over to Lynne Pepall and
Vida Johnson, who are the arts and sciences representatives to the University-wide Faculty Senate Working Group.

**Discussion of and Vote on Proposed Bylaws for University-Wide Faculty Senate**

PROF. PEPALL: Hello, new members of arts and sciences at the SMFA. I’m Lynne Pepall, and joining me is Vida Johnson, and we are the representatives of the School of Arts and Sciences on the university-wide committee to propose a university senate. And we’ve now come with a motion to the faculty of arts and sciences to approve the bylaws that were distributed to you for this meeting. If all the schools vote for these bylaws, then they will be presented for a vote at the trustees meeting in November.

So that’s why we’re here today, and so I’ve got the rules straight. As a committee, we can bring forward to you a motion to approve the bylaws for a University-wide Faculty Senate at Tufts University, and that’s the motion I’d like to have a vote on. But before we vote, I assume there might be some discussion or questions about those bylaws. So Vida?

PROF. JOHNSON: I just wanted to say that this is a document that has been vetted by so many different bodies, it’s quite amazing, by all the different schools at the university. It was amazing how in a way different we are, what we found out how many things we had to go through in order to come up with a joint document.

Also, it has gone through the upper levels of the administration or some of the parties concerned and involved in this, and I think we’ve come up with a document. It’s slightly changed from the previous one you had seen, but I think if anyone has any bones to pick with any individual item, I want to sort of give a sort of preempted strike for coming to agreement and point to – if you will look under Article 3 –

PROF. PEPALL: Article 3 is *Senate Powers and Responsibilities*, and probably this is the one that has been wordsmithed the most. I think we don’t want to burden the senate with so many roles and responsibilities that they can’t effectively carry on their roles as faculty, and we don’t want to burden the efficiency of the central administration. So trying to work out a language that captured, that we want faculty input and decisions which we think affect the work that we do and how we do it, we want faculty representation and voice on that. So those are the ones I think in working with the administration we’ve tried to make sure we’ve captured that spirit on both sides.

PROF. JOHNSON: And the spirit of our discussions is here, too. I think this body has discussed this document more than any other school. I just want to point to Point 11 of Article 3. It’s the very last point on Page 2, and this is the catchall, in case you find things that you think we’ve missed. The catchall is, and I quote, “To study and make recommendations to the President or Provost on any matter of faculty concern.”
We can’t project or predict what might come up. I think in some ways, it’s a leap of faith. I think it’s a leap of good faith to come up with a university-wide body that I think from working on the committee with representatives of other schools, I think we’ve already felt how useful it is and how much information is information sharing, and sharing of positives, negatives, problems, etcetera, how useful that’s been to us as faculty members. And I think the Senate would only sort of continue that work. But we’re aware that we haven’t come up with all eventualities or all possible issues or procedures. So there it is; the catchall.

PROF. PEPALL: Any discussion on the proposed bylaws?

DEAN GLASER: I have a request and then a question, and my request is if there are any other changes since the last time we talked about it, could you just point them out to us?

PROF. PEPALL: Well, it was really to clarify the language in the powers and responsibilities that – you know, how in fact we’re supposed to participate in the searches. I think that before it – we want to have on the searches for academic positions, which are deans and provosts and presidents, it is customary for the search committee to have faculty representation. Now we have a process in which the faculty appointments will come through the senate. The senate will make recommendations for faculty to serve on these committees. So that’s one point that was clarified.

We also are interested in appointments that are made in the non-academic side of the administration, and more particularly the structure. So if there’s a major change in information technology, how that’s structured, or a major change in some other aspect of the university that isn’t an academic appointment, we felt it was important that the faculty understood these changes and how it was being restructured and what kinds of appointments were going to be made.

But the participation in the search of that would be somewhat different, and we don’t expect that. So it was clarifying what we want as members of this faculty senate in working with the administration on both the academic organization and what we call the non-academic, but the non-academic is in service of the academic.

DEAN GLASER: And a question of you. I assume that you are in some contact with the other representatives from the other schools, and I’m wondering if you could tell us if there were any concerns from the other schools about what’s coming down the pike that were different from ours.

PROF. PEPALL: I would say we already have much stronger faculty governance in the school, Arts, Sciences and Engineering, than the other schools. So for example, the dental school has never had a faculty meeting. So they have a longer road to travel to sort of get their faculty engaged in this.

PROF. JOHNSON: I think early on, I think there had been concern from the smaller schools, like
the Friedman School, etcetera, whether we’re the big behemoth.

DEAN GLASER: We are.

PROF. JOHNSON: But their voices wouldn’t be heard, and I think that’s why we came up with a structure that’s sort of partially senate and partially house of representatives; that is, that each school has a minimum of three representatives to the senate, as I recall, and then the rest are apportioned per I think every 30 faculty members, etcetera, are apportioned by size. So at this point, we have seven – we will need to elect seven faculty members. And we’re aware that now we have the SMFA; we didn’t have those faculty here before, so nothing prevents us from going back and say, “Look, we have a bigger faculty.” But what we want to do is have at least – we’re worried, Lynne and I, that we’re going to find seven able-bodied faculty members who will serve on the senate. So I think at this point, let’s start the way we have it.

PROF. PEPALL: And this was something we discussed at an earlier meeting. Each school is deciding who the voting members of their faculty are and who can serve on the senate. So we as the School of Arts and Sciences decide who the members of our community who can run and serve on the senate are, and I think with the acquisition of the SMFA, that’s an important conversation to have, but that’s not really a university senate matter. We have the number of senators that will represent arts and sciences, but how we constitute that among ourselves is a school decision, and we will definitely have that conversation on a future agenda meeting.

But right now, what we want to do is get these bylaws reviewed and voted on by the trustees so that we can get the senate actually up and running. But that’s an important point. And if we feel that our size now has grown because the number of voting members is substantially different from what it was when we created the metric, then I think that’s an issue that we’ll bring up to the senate.

And I agree with Vida. We feel like it’s important that we get seven members who are committed to serving on this. I mean, there’s a sense in which we really feel this will only work if the senators participate fully, and it’s not –

PROF. JOHNSON: And nothing prevents us when we come to the nomination process, etcetera, for making sure that, for example, we have a full-time lecturer from this campus. We may have a representative from SFMA. I mean, I think generally, in our elections to committees, we have been cognizant of representing the whole faculty, at this point, the whole full-time faculty, because those are the voting members in arts and sciences.

PROF. PEPALL: That’s our bylaw.

PROF. EVRIGENIS: Ioannis Evrigenis, political science. First of all, thank you very much for
this important work. I’m sure not all of it is pleasant. I want to take what you were just discussing just one step in a slightly different direction, and I wanted to ask you, given that we’ve had a conversation about the composition and the size and the representation – and I understand the formula – I want to ask you, since you’ve had a chance to speak to the other schools and to participate in the deliberation what your sense is about the extent to which arts and sciences will be represented, given that we are the behemoth, we’re very different from the other schools.

And at first glance, it looks like we’re putting ourselves in danger of yielding the majority of professional schools. So are you satisfied with the current representation, given everything else that you know? Thank you.

PROF. PEPALL: I feel that when we drafted the numbers, we were cognizant that there couldn’t be a coalition of smaller schools that could sort of out-maneuver arts and sciences, but we were also aware that the other schools felt very sensitive about the fact that they have a place at the table, and we’re not going to ever hurt – you know, it was really this is just a dialogue between Arts and Sciences and the central administration. So that’s the balance.

But honestly, I think we did feel that to get seven members from this faculty who will agree to serve on this, that will be I think an important challenge for arts and sciences. And also, there are how many members in Engineering? Three. And in some sense, as a faculty, we are Arts, Sciences and Engineering as a faculty, even though engineering has different school issues.

But as a faculty, and this is faculty governance, and that’s the other sort of complication with the Senate and faculty, is that as a faculty, we are Arts, Sciences and Engineering, but as a school, we’re Arts and Sciences. So how we work with the committee structure, you know, Committee on Committees, Budget and Priorities, we’re all AS&E faculty. So I think it’s important to sort of keep that in mind, too.

PROF. JOHNSON: Also, pointing out the very last point, 11, I’d like to point out in Article 3 the sort of preamble. It says, “While respecting the autonomy of the individual schools of the university, the senate shall have the following powers and responsibilities.” I think everyone, not only we, but everyone was concerned that they didn’t want the Senate meddling in the internal affairs of the school.

So Jim is our fearless leader in Arts, Sciences and Engineering, in a sense in both schools. I’m sure the engineering dean will have contact with us, too, whoever is on the senate. But I think you just expressed the same kind of concern. Yes, we are the big behemoth, but still, you’d be amazed to see how other schools feel about their roles in the university as well.

But I think that’s very important, that nothing changes within the structure that we have now for Arts, Sciences and Engineering. It doesn’t mean that it won’t change in the future if the schools decide that having a Senate will necessitate some other kind of changes, but those who are
working on the sort of senate did not go in that direction at all, because that would be politically
impossible, strategically, logistically impossible, financially impossible, etcetera.

PROF. KILMER: Misha Kilmer, mathematics. I just had a quick question about Article 3, Item 5.
It says, “To be consulted early in the decisions to create new schools,” dot dot dot, “inter-school
degree programs.” Would that mean that if arts and sciences, say, wanted to do something with
the School of Engineering, they would go here first?

PROF. JOHNSON: I think arts and sciences has their own –

PROF. PEPALL: Arts, Sciences and Engineering at the graduate level, which is a lot of where
this inter-school happens, does not have a curriculum committee that would review. So in some
sense, if you did a joint degree with engineering and arts and sciences, there would be the
curriculum committees of the schools, and I think the idea is that the senate would like to be
aware of what kinds of school programs are being established. But I don’t think it’s very clear
exactly what role they play in that. But in terms of creating programs, the School of Engineering
is really not that different than Fletcher in terms of if we wanted to create a joint program or an
inter-school program. There’s the school, and then there’s like – there isn’t an organizing
principle that crosses all the schools in terms of curriculum or program development.

DEAN GLASER: I’d note that the verb in that sentence is “consult.”

PROF. PEPALL: Yeah. We don’t vote on it. The senate wouldn’t approve it.

DEAN GLASER: Any other questions?

PROF. PEPALL: By the way, just as a footnote, there used to be a university-wide committee
that was called the Committee on Graduate Education that would perform that role, and I believe
it’s no longer active. So in a way, there was a body that did that. So any inter-school program,
when I was dean, I would present that – Vin Manno was the associate dean of that. So in a way,
this is sort of replacing that body to some degree, I think.

PROF. JOHNSON: I think also, there’s a sense that “consult” does not mean this body would
extend the way of the kinds of initiatives. In fact, I think the whole conception of the senate is
that we’re recognizing that we’re a university with all of these schools and that we do need to
work more closely. So we would hope that would encourage more cross-school connections and
participation.

I think primarily what we were thinking of is that when some new large entity is being
considered, like a new school completely, that there should be some place for faculty input on
that, and we have no place now for that input. In fact, we wake up, come back in September, and
discover “oh.”
PROF. PEPALL: And I think there’s a learning curve, because if schools are creating these programs, that’s beneficial to other schools to understand in what way we can make that work.

DEAN GLASER: Lynne, what is the timing?

PROF. PEPALL: The timing of this particular – today?

DEAN GLASER: Not today, but –

PROF. PEPALL: So if the bylaws are accepted by all the schools, then October 14th, they go to the provost’s office to be prepared for the trustee meeting in November.

DEAN GLASER: And when do you expect the first meeting if it’s accepted? When would this all start?

PROF. PEPALL: Well, I think us as a faculty next have to decide how we’re going to elect our senators, and then I believe we’ll probably want to have the elections and the senate up and running next spring.

PROF. JOHNSON: Just one thing, I think no one is going back to their faculties with the changes, because everybody had I think voted or accepted provisional, and the other schools I think were it. So if we pass it, it basically goes forward.

DEAN GLASER: Are there any other questions or comments? So let’s get to the motion.

PROF. PEPALL: So we would like to move that the faculty of arts and sciences approve and endorse the bylaws for the creation of a University-wide Faculty Senate at Tufts University. Should we do it by the “aye” and the – is that acceptable, or hands? How would we like to do it?

DEAN GLASER: Well, we’re not going to be able to hear on the Fenway.

PROF. PEPALL: So hands?

DEAN GLASER: Why don’t we do it with hands?

PROF. PEPALL: So all those in favor?

PROF. MAHONEY: A committee doesn’t have to be seconded.

PROF. PEPALL: I just learned that today. All those in favor?
DEAN GLASER: And these are full-time faculty –

PROF. PEPALL: Oh, yeah, that would be sad if I didn’t vote.

MS. DUBMAN: I got 68.

DEAN GLASER: And then we’ll add on from the Fenway. All opposed? Abstentions? There are two abstentions. I think that’s a statement from the faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences.

PROF. PEPALL: Thank you very much. I look forward to now electing a Senate. We should give a shout out to Kevin Dunn, who actually worked very hard to get these proposed bylaws. He was really helpful, and I think he understood the faculty concerns. So it was great.

PROF. JOHNSON: And also, by raising your hands, you have just made yourself available for being approached to run for the Senate, in case you didn’t know.

DEAN GLASER: Thank you to Lynne, and thank you to Vida for representing us so well.

Proposal from the A&S Workload Committee

DEAN GLASER: And now the remainder of this meeting will be a preliminary discussion of the Faculty Workload. This is a project that Bárbara has been leading, and I’ll make this one statement and then turn it over to her, which is that we have been talking about this for a very large amount of time, and every time we put something out, we’ve gotten lots of feedback, lots of mixed feedback, and we’re doing our very best to come up with a plan that has broad approval.

But what we’re floating today is yet another possible plan, and we’re looking for feedback. And I think the important thing to note is that we’re not ready to do this tomorrow. We really want to make sure before we put this out there that it has broad support from the faculty. So with that, I’m going to turn the microphone over to Bárbara.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you, Jim, and thank you, everyone. I’m not sure whether you’re all here for the senate vote or for the workload discussion, but either way, I’m happy to have you here.

As Jim said, we’ve been working on this for now over a year, and some of you have been present at the earlier discussions in the spring, and this is our most recent proposal, which was crafted mostly as a result of conversations, one-on-one conversations, and also department level conversations with chairs, with individual faculty who had expressed concern and wanted to provide their feedback.

So the goal for today is really just to listen to your feedback and to figure out if this would work for you. Inevitably, because we’re talking about a unit that is so heterogeneous, there is some
vagueness in the language, and that is in parts intentional to be able to address differences across departments.

So two things to point out are that the proposal you have in front of you, which I hope you read, because I’m not going to read it out loud, the proposal does not address directly the issue of the credit course, the course credit conversion, the SHUs that we discussed last week. And also it does not address specifically the SMFA. Nancy, do you want to say something about the SMFA?

DEAN BAUER: Sure. I’ll just say this super quickly for the benefit of SMFA faculty. This is a workload proposal that covers full-time faculty, and it will also apply to the SMFA faculty, although because there are some differences in the way the courses are accounted for and so forth over there, some of it will change. So, for example, this refers to the course loads for full-time lecturers versus tenure-stream faculty. The full-time lecturers at the SMFA are a different category from what they are here, and we don’t have tenure-stream faculty. So just a note to the SMFA faculty that I will be discussing this with you. The same sorts of things will be (inaudible).

DEAN BRIZUELA: And there are a number of members of the workload committee or working group who are here today, so at any point, feel free to jump in, and at times perhaps it will be addressing your questions.

I’d say the biggest change to highlight in this document from what you’ve seen before is that we’re providing – we’re proposing that departments will have the authority to develop their own guidelines at the level of the department, and that those guidelines would be put forth to the deans.

And we’ve tried in some way to provide some kind of unifying, although not entirely make things consistent across departments. We understand that different departments work in different ways. So the kind of example I was giving last week among some colleagues was if there is one department that’s saying that one independent study counts for one course release, and there is another one that’s saying 15 independent studies count for one course release, well, of course that would be a situation where you have a conversation and bring up what other departments are doing.

That is the biggest change in the document that you have in front of you. So with that, I think I’d like to open it up to your questions and your feedback. Again, there might be places to clarify within the document. I’m all ears.

PROF. MAHONEY: Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics. I notice that the very first thing under extraordinary activities above and beyond is advising. And I sort of thought that advising was a normal part of what we normally do. So I’m not quite clear what’s meant here.
DEAN BRIZUELA: What is meant is that if there is advising which is over and beyond what you would normally be expected to do in the department. So one example that we discussed was actually, Jim was sharing that there was one year where all of the American politics professors in political science were on leave, and he had 60, 70 –

DEAN GLASER: 75.

DEAN BRIZUELA: — 75 advisees that year, because he had taken on the load of everyone else in American Politics. That would be a situation where you’re doing extraordinary advising which is over and beyond the average, where your chair might say he deserves a course release.

PROF. ALLEN: Jennifer Allen, community health. I wonder if you want to further explain the average load, which will obviously be different by department and program and number of faculty. If we’re talking about average, we’re talking about the unit, the particular unit from that average?

DEAN BRIZUELA: So yes, the averages would be determined by each department, and you’d figure out within your department what would be the expectation for the faculty, and then what would be above average would be a situation where you might want to acknowledge that in some way. Did that answer your question, Jen?

We can’t establish averages across the school, as you understand, and that is a situation that we want to avoid, and that’s a shift from the spring to today, where trying to come up with a general rule for all departments is, I think, probably a recipe for disaster and will not necessarily get us to a place where everyone is happier.

There was someone this summer I met with who asked me what would be a metric in your mind that the workload proposal is working. And I think one metric in my mind is that faculty are happy and are satisfied, and what might work in political science might not work in Education, it might not work in physics. So that’s a reason why we’re avoiding coming up with a school-wide average.

That said, I’ll clarify where like the specifics of the proposal have come. We have shared vague resemblances of this with some chairs, and in general the feedback has been quite positive. The committee also has met and looked at this, and the deans have discussed it.

One thing that I think might be helpful is if departments that feel some kind of similarity among them, like the science department, the science and math departments, might want to get together and figure out what are you all doing. And we’ve also discussed the possibility of having some presentations when departments feel comfortable doing so at chair and directors meetings. And so that we’re not all reinventing the wheel, there might be some departments that are already doing things that might work for our own departments.
And I know that some departments already have guidelines of their own in their departments, and this might be an opportunity to look at those guidelines. The fact that we’ve been doing things a certain way for the last X number of years doesn’t mean that we can’t revisit the way that we’ve been doing things for departments that already have guidelines.

And then some departments this summer have already engaged in this process as a result of the fact that they need to look at their credit conversion, have been looking at their workloads very carefully. Other feedback or questions?

PROF. MANZ: I notice hearing a mix in number 6, a mix of activities within the department and outside the department. This puzzles me a bit, especially outside because at the moment, for instance, you give course releases for having some interdisciplinary programs and not for others. I find it hard to believe that history would decide that having Middle Eastern Studies deserves a course release, when someone else might not. So I wonder how that would work out.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Those decisions would still be made at the dean’s office. As far as my first reaction to that, that a department doesn’t always have all the information about what a faculty member is engaged in. But of course this would need to involve a conversation with the chair.

PROF. PINTO: Sarah Pinto, anthropology. 5.ii, “faculty may be awarded up to one course release per year.” Will that course be replaced? And it ends with, “except in extraordinary circumstances.” What do you mean by that (inaudible) what that is?

DEAN BRIZUELA: So let me start with the last one. So there are some faculty who are engaged in a number of different activities. They may be supervising a large number of theses or dissertations, and they may also be directing a program. That would be an exceptional circumstance that would merit more than one course release. So that’s an exceptional circumstance.

Like I had a back and forth with a faculty member about this, because in their department, doing that kind of thing is like a normal circumstance, but when you use a unit of the entire school, it is an exceptional circumstance that you’re doing all of this work. And remind me, Sarah, what the first part of your question is?

PROF. PINTO: Will the course releases be replaced.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So no. Number 2 says that, “Departments and programs will need to continue to offer their curriculum with their current resources.” So they could not be replaced.

DEAN GLASER: Well, they could be, but it’s not guaranteed.
DEAN BRIZUELA: Did everyone hear that? They could be, but it’s not guaranteed.

PROF. URRY: Heather Urry, psychology. My question is related to number 6. All the activities listed have to do with things that faculty do within the department and within the university, and I’m wondering how does service to the field factor in; for example, serving as the chair of a program, committee, or a society, that kind of thing.

DEAN BRIZUELA: My understanding is that we have never acknowledged that kind of activity. So if there’s faculty who edit journals and who don’t get any kind of release from their activities for that kind of activity – you know, I’m putting my opinion aside, but I think the current proposal is that that will continue to be the case, unless there’s other decisions made.

PROF. TOBIN: Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. I have comments, but I have a question in that process. I feel that it’s fundamentally misguided to attempt to write such a document that applies equally to full-time lecturers and to tenure-stream faculty. I think those are two fundamentally different categories with fundamentally different responsibilities.

And correlated to that is a systematic undervaluing of scholarship and research in this whole document. It’s treated as a justification for the deduction from a baseline that seems to be entirely based on teaching. And I think that’s just a fundamentally wrong (inaudible) that cannot hold what we do to what our responsibilities are.

And I think the comment about professional responsibilities or professional service is not counted is wrong. If we’re writing a new workload policy, why should that be based on past practice that under values in our professional fields? I think that’s inefficient.

So those are my comments. I think those are really a fundamental briefing of assumptions, and I feel that if this document were put in the hands of people we’re trying to recruit for faculty positions here, I think it would be a strong disincentive to come to Tufts instead of another place that displays more respect and attention to scholarship research.

And my last thing is a question. When we reach a point, will this policy be voted on? Who’s going to decide whether this policy is in fact implemented or some future policy? Thank you.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So I would appreciate, Roger, your thoughts on what you think we should do to address the concerns that you have about the two issues, the full-time lecturers and tenure track being addressed in the same proposal, and also how you would address the issue of workload in a way that you think values research.

But the idea that we discussed in the spring was that we would be voting on this on the floor of the faculty. We may want to revisit that. Right now, it’s status quo. Right now, we continue doing what we do, although there are some departments that are developing their workload
guidelines. And in the dean’s office, I think we’re happy to look at these. So it may be that we vote on them, or it may be that you all say we don’t want to do this. And we want to keep doing things the way we’ve been doing them. I don’t know if you have some comments about how you might address the first two issues you brought up.

PROF. TOBIN: I don’t have a draft, but I’d be happy to talk to you about it or put something on paper.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you.

PROF. PEPALL: Lynne Pepall, economics. I’m just going to follow up on Roger, just because it occurred to me that point 3, there is this line that says, “is reduced to 2-2 or the equivalent given their research expectations.” That’s the only place I see where the recognition of excellence in scholarship is – I mean, people regularly have course releases, grants or whatever, and they’re very active in their research, and they have reduced teaching loads.

And so it looks as though this document says, “Okay, that’s all sorted out, and now this has to deal with advising the service.” But somehow, I don’t know if that point, I mean, it seems to me like it’s a two-step process. You’ve already worked out a teaching load based on research expectations, and then after that, this is what happens with the service piece. That’s how I’m reading it, but then it doesn’t really –

If we want to frame it on what it means to be a faculty member in Arts and Sciences, then I think this proposal doesn’t really do enough justice to the research, and I think that’s sort of what Roger is sort of mentioning, that if we’re going to ever have a proposal, it should really make explicit that research is a very important part, not only of our faculty, but also it serves the teaching mission as well and shouldn’t be just a phrase.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So that was definitely not the intention. And in fact, the intention of the proposal is definitely not to devalue research, Roger. And I say that as a researcher. So there are a number of points in Section 6, the vast majority of them, in fact, that have to do with research activities. So perhaps there is a way of framing this in a different way that highlights that and brings that to the front because the intent is to provide support to faculty who are engaged in research and to value that.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, international literary and cultural studies. I worry about the unintended consequences. I’m not against new things, as you can tell from my participation on the Senate, but I would bring my almost decade of being chair of my department, back quite a few years ago – I stepped down about ten years ago – and it was my experience in reading faculty evaluation sheets, the self-evaluations, that those who did the least ended up having the fullest faculty evaluation sheet with every single little thing that they have done.
So I’m concerned about that, truly. I’m concerned about faculty morale. I’m concerned about how a group of faculty members would come together and agree on each other’s sort of contributions. I think that might be very, very disruptive.

I’m also concerned about the timing. I know that this process was started earlier, but I’m concerned about the lecturers, the union issues that will be raised kind of with this as we define what workloads are for lecturers. So I’m concerned about the fact that our faculty is undergoing a huge number of reviews supported by a person in a department. We have 25 reviews this year, 18 regular contract reviews and 7 votes applying for senior lectureship.

So I don’t know that we have the kind of energy in our departments to really put this front and center. I think we should go ahead, but I’m seeing it as a really big issue, and I don’t know who will have the energy to really give their full time to it. So that’s just a word of caution.

I would also give a shout out for faculty members who are chairs of big departments. I won’t ever again be chair of mine, because it’s not self-serving. But frankly, until now, chairs have been given the same release, one per semester, whether they have an eight-person department or a 45-person department.

So I think that you guys over at Olin are probably several courses off once Greg steps down as chair until now. Thank you.

PROF. WINN: I want to return to what Roger Tobin was talking about. I think it was not just about individual research with respect to the university, but also about service to the profession, and not necessarily any adversity for being in professional associations, etcetera. And frankly, I’m shocked to hear that a member of this faculty is editing a major journal or has become an officer or that possibility of his or her professional association that the university does not support that by giving some kind of release time. Because I know that many of our peer institutions certainly do.

DEAN BRIZUELA: I may be wrong.

PROF. WINN: Well, I hope you’re wrong. But if not, it seems to me this is the moment to reconsider those policies and to integrate them into this new notion of what a workload should be, not only the average, but also what we’re encouraging our faculty to do. And that should be something which reflects well on this university, and therefore something that the university should not only accommodate, but also should encourage.

PROF. GARDULSKI: Anne Gardulski in earth and ocean sciences. I attended three or four of the meetings of this workload group last year, and one of the things that came up at almost every meeting I was at, but what I’m not seeing here, is the fact that different departments have different parallels with what’s going on in other institutions, and I think this goes a little bit to
what Roger is talking about.

If you send out a contract letter to somebody saying that he had to teach 2 and 2 in physics or earth and ocean sciences, even, they would walk away. You’re not going to get good people coming if that’s the procedure, because – unless you do extraordinary research.

I worry – my sense over the years here at Tufts is that we try to bring everybody to – whoever is the most miserable, we try to make everybody equally miserable, instead of trying to bring up those poor folks who are miserable. You know, give them a reasonable workload.

I would love to see something more aspirational, and instead of saying 3 and 3 for lecturers, which I think is way too much, and 2 and 2 for tenure stream people, let’s be realistic about what we’re asking people to do, at least knock that down by one and maybe two in some circumstances, given the fact that people are working 60, 80 hours a week sometimes, trying to get all the other stuff done.

So I’d say let’s be real careful. And if you’re going to put this in, I’m just really concerned what’s going to – the unintended consequences was a good term here. How this gets translated into contract letters for people coming in.

DEAN BRIZUELA: I’m just thinking out loud right now, and I’m wondering how you would all feel if there were some departments that develop their own guidelines that would work within their own units, and then other departments who said – and again, I have not consulted with anyone about this, I’m just reacting to what I’m hearing – and other departments said we want to keep doing things the way we’ve been doing them. Would that be something that would be appealing to faculty or not?

MANY VOICES: Yes, definitely.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Sorry, there were more questions. I interrupted.

PROF. MIRKIN: Sergei Mirkin, Biology. So I was actually a member of this workload committee. So I wanted to say the one huge change that happened over the duration which was very important that Bárbara already mentioned, is that instead of even the guidelines (inaudible) for the departments throughout the school is now really given to the departments. And what it says on the surface doesn’t actually read 2-2 anymore, because it’s very easy to make it 2 plus 1.

I agree with you, you don’t need extravagant circumstances to make it 2 plus 1. And that’s relatively more difficult, but possible to make it 1 plus 1 if you define extravagant circumstances within the department in the right way. And that’s again given to the departments. So that I think is very positive thing.
Regarding what Roger was saying, we tried to discuss what’s research active, (inaudible), and there was basically a stall, because different departments define what research is in a totally different way. In Biology, we have to publish papers, and certainly (inaudible) journals you have to have (inaudible) funded at a certain level. But that’s not (inaudible). And that’s very easy to stall. That’s why research is kind of given to the department chair’s discretion.

And the last point I want to make, I agree that it’s difficult to recruit junior faculty when you say bluntly 2 plus 2. And we have two experiences recently in biology where it was written in the contract, and in both instances, the junior faculty asked me directly what is exactly the meaning of this, and I said, “Well, really, you will not be teaching 2 plus 2. You don’t need to worry about it, being on the tenure track, as long as you do some research, you publish paper. Just trust me on that.” But with the contract that says 2 plus 2, but in consultation with the department chair, because that really would relieve a lot of worries. It’s the current contract that doesn’t say so. Just say 2 plus 2, and then with a handshake with the chair saying that’s not going to happen. But chair may change over the tenure track time. So I think if you do that, that’s acceptable. If you want to define in a uniform way what a research area means (inaudible), I think we will not find the universal formula. I cannot find the universal formula between, say, us and Drama and Dance or others.

PROF. RUANE: I’m Kim Ruane from the math department. So I want to bring back Roger’s first point, which is I’ve actually never understood why we want one document that works for both lecturers and faculty. That, I’ve never understood. You can try to explain it.

The other point is I think that’s causing part of the problem with the research part, and also because lecturers – even within lecturers, in different departments, they do different things. In some departments, they really just teach and really aren’t expected, in fact are sort of protected from doing anything else. And then in other departments, they might have a lot of other responsibilities.

So even that, again, I realize the document is supposed to be let departments decide, but I think that’s like two levels of confusion. Really, there shouldn’t be one document for both tenure track versus full-time lecturers, and even within either one of those, there’s confusion, because within the tenure track group, the research expectations are very different across departments. But also even within the lecturer group, each department deals with them differently. I think that’s what’s bothering me from day one since the whole thing. I have no idea why we’re trying to create one document at all for both groups. What is the reason?

DEAN BRIZUELA: You know, we’re all contributing towards the same project, which is the education of our students, and there are a lot of things that we share. I agree with you that our jobs are quite different, and I’m not – I personally am not necessarily opposed to separating those projects.
PROF. ALLEN: Jennifer Allen from community health. I recall the whole purpose of this exercise was to insure transparency and equity. Those are aspirational goals, and I think we should continue to have aspirational goals. I agree that setting up one document that basically focuses on how you get release from teaching is kind of contrary to the mission of the university.

I also want to say that for the sake of equity – and this is my personal issue, because we have this problem in community health – we have five faculty, and we have nearly 250 students, and so it’s not comparable with other departments, nor should it necessarily be at this point. I mean, we’re growing, and we need to hire additional faculty, but I think we have to acknowledge that people are in different positions with different demands, based on the resources that they have.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology again. I don’t want to sound cynical, but we may already be there. I wanted to bring up another unintended consequence of this. Defacto, there are many departments where the teaching load is not 2-2 right now. And when you say that, “Well, we’ll just call it 2-2, but you can have a course release for this and a course release for that,” my fear, then, is that people who were rewarded with merit raise, increases in their pay line because of extraordinary research activity or exceptional service to the university, now we’ve essentially given them a course release, which they would have had before anyway, and has that now removed the incentive to then give them merit pay increases. So just in terms of unintended consequences, it’s something we should think about for many departments.

DEAN BRIZUELA: There are a couple of people, Anne, and then there are a couple of people in the back.

PROF. MAHONEY: Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics. I’m a full-time lecturer, and I do the same work as the rest of you guys. I am the president of a professional association. I publish, I teach my share of courses. One apparent unintended consequence that’s coming up in all this is the idea that somehow, we’re a different species. But no, we’re doing the same work.

PROF. HOLLANDER: Justin Hollander, urban and environmental policy and planning. So yeah, I think that this version is a huge improvement over the last one I saw, so I definitely appreciate that.

I have a two-part question. One is I just want to get a sense of is there currently a written policy that belongs to A&S around teaching loads?

DEAN BRIZUELA: I don’t think there’s one that’s written.

DEAN GLASER: There’s not.

PROF. HOLLANDER: I think if we’re going to be, as a faculty, writing the first, in the history of the college, the first policy on workloads, let’s not start with 2-2. Let’s start with 2-1.
DEAN GLASER: May I just say one thing, is that we have a finite number of dollars in the school, and we cannot balance the curriculum that we require by just handing out an extra course release to every member of the faculty. I’m not picking on you Justin, but you just punched a button on me.

In my mind, there are things that people do, and Sergei mentioned in biology that they have fewer courses that are expected, but they’re running laboratories, and there’s pedagogy that’s going on in those laboratories. In my mind, that’s equivalent to some degree to teaching a course.

So we already have this equivalent going on. But what I’d like is for everybody to feel that the workload is equitable across the school, but there are different ways for people to accomplish it, and that we should be flexible, and that’s what I think this proposal is attempting to do.

But I just want to make sure that everybody knows that Number 2 says that the departments and programs will continue to offer their curriculum with their current resources, because our ability to raise more resources is quite limited, and we have increased the number of faculty in the school since the 2005 strategic plan, where we very strategically suggested an additional 60 lines in the full-time faculty ranks in the school.

We have gotten to about 52, 53, so we didn’t quite get there, but we came pretty close. So we’ve tried to expand the number of people, but given the additional responsibilities that people have, the extraordinary things that people do and the expectation that we’re not knowledge creators, and not just knowledge transmitters. We want people to be active researchers and active scholars, and that was an attempt to make that happen.

But our ability to go beyond that, not just in terms of the dollars that we have, but the space to put people in is very limited. So I just want to be clear that as much as we would like to make everybody gloriously happy by having opportunities to have their course loads reduced, we don’t have the ability to just sort of wave our hand over this whole thing and say, “Everybody’s teaching 2-1.”

PROF. KELLY: Erin Kelly in philosophy. I like the effort in this version of the proposal to be centralized of the guideline writing, and it seems like one way which we could proceed is by letting departments who would like to develop guidelines that they think would be fitting to their departments to do so and bring it to you, and then you could report back to the group to see what we all come up with and how similar or different the guidelines are. We might learn from each other, and we could also see who thinks it would be productive to try to do something that would be specific to their department and just sort of see what happens.

DEAN BRIZUELA: I agree. I’ll also say, like Justin just spoke, UEP is an example of a department that has, as far as I understand, quite clear and explicit transparent guidelines for
workload. So our whole range of outcomes from this process, one could be that there’s a uniform proposal that’s accepted by the faculty, and we move forward, but I also think that departments that didn’t have guidelines, like UEP does, and has started these conversations have found the conversations to be very helpful and productive in thinking about how to handle workload within their unit. I’m speaking now as a faculty member, Erin. I agree with what you just said.

PROF. CARLETON: Greg Carleton, chair of international literary and cultural studies. Having been the CBA (inaudible) partner, it seems to me that it would be problematic to actually combine the two groups, the lecturers and the professors, because in the CBA, in the union contract, it’s spelled out explicitly what is expected of lecturers. And if we have two documents, or two policies with two guidelines, they’re going to conflict with each other, and that could lead to a number of problems.

DEAN BRIZUELA: The current document is not in conflict with the CBA.

PROF. CARLETON: Right, but it’s already there, so why isn’t it in here as well? It’s already spelled out clearly on another document on what is expected of lecturers not in the union.

DEAN BRIZUELA: So you’re coming back to the point about separating the full-time lecturers –

PROF. CARLETON: Right, because it just leads to confusion (inaudible).

DEAN GLASER: Well, the CBA says it’ll be worked out in this process.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Yes, the CBA does say that if the faculty arrive at a vote and make a decision, then there will be a renewed conversation around that article for the full-time lecturers. There is a small provision at the end.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson again, international literary and cultural studies. I just want to bring back some history. I think Jim said that we had not had a workload. Ever since I was hired here 40 years ago, we have had a workload across the university. And I remember when I was hired, we were teaching 2 and 3 for tenure-track faculty in some departments, romance languages, in my department, whereas the English department was only doing like 2 and 2, etcetera, and there was a big issue about reducing us to 2 and 2. And the lecturers were always 3 and 3.

So I don’t know where it came from, but it’s not true that we haven’t had a workload, which is one of the reasons why departments have tried to go down to 3, because there is an assumed – and the university certainly in the humanities field across the country, the better universities that we compare ourselves to, teach 2 and 2. And I understand the Sciences teach differently. But we shouldn’t say we have not had a workload. We have had a workload for certainly all the years that I have been here.
DEAN BRIZUELA: I think Vida, I can’t remember who brought it up, but as far as I know, it’s not in writing, so it’s not in the bylaws or it’s not in the handbook.

DEAN GLASER: I want to make sure, Jillian, do we have any questions from the Fenway?

MS. DUBMAN: No.

PROF. MIRKIN: So I wanted to speak out, first of all, the lecturers issue, and it’s a very interesting discussion. And the big issue for the lecturers, they actually can be given a course release equally to what is given to our tenure-track faculty. And I think this is a very, very good thing, because, say we pay less to lecturers than Harvard pays to their lecturers, but (inaudible). And say in biology, lecturers go to the faculty meetings, and they have to vote, which would not be true to say about (inaudible) department and Harvard, but they have no vote at the faculty meeting.

And so I think if we have a goal to recruit (inaudible) lecturers, which is probably a goal we have, because it’s (inaudible) biology and chemistry, and for all I know, they carry very heavy teaching load, particularly when it comes to lab courses. And we want these courses to be taught by extraordinary people.

So to be nice to them is probably a good thing. And I think that the worst thing that can happen in terms of recruiting lecturers, because they will feel themselves as secondary citizens, and then we will just get average people who will teach so-so. It’s a minor thing to say, “Okay, if you do extra work, you have a course release.” And particularly given how little they are paid at the university, that’s really the problem.

PROF. ROMERO: Michael Romero in biology. I guess one of the confusions I’ve had about this entire process from the very beginning was I didn’t know whether or not the perceived issue was that there were people who were not teaching enough or were not working hard enough, or people who were working too much. But what comes out of the document – I think part of the reason why many of us are having such a visceral reaction to it is because the tone of it is that most of us aren’t working hard enough, and that part of the reason why –and a lot of us in our departments have made this work.

I keep telling people we’re a very unique institution, and we’re trying to be a Williams teaching college and a Harvard research institution, and it can’t do both. And almost every department has succeeded over the last how many years making it work. And the tone of these documents is that we’re not working hard enough. And somehow, I think the tone has to change.

DEAN BRIZUELA: That definitely is not the intent, and I will say it’s more to address the latter of faculty taking on more and more and more, and under the current conditions to make
adjustments to their workload. I think in some departments, it does happen, but it doesn’t happen in all departments. So if anyone wants to help with tone as we move forward, I would appreciate it.

PROF. RUANE: I just wanted to make a follow-up comment after a serious comment. When I said this about separating the document from tenure-stream to full-time lecturers, I was not saying full-time lecturers should never be given any sort of niceties of any sort. I’m saying that they’re hired for different reasons, and there are different expectations. I certainly believe that there are full-time lecturers in my own department that can develop course curriculum and do things that are extraordinary for our introductory courses and that we should value that. There’s no doubt in my mind about that. So I just wanted to make it clear that I wasn’t saying to take them off the document because they don’t deserve to be treated well. I just want to make that clear.

DEAN BRIZUELA: Thank you. So I think our time is up. I have sent out an email to all departments offering to come to your meetings. I have a few scheduled. I’ve already attended at least one. Please reach out. And in the meantime, if there are departments who want to develop their own guidelines, I would encourage you to do that and to have conversations within your departments. I don’t think it can hurt at all, and I don’t think it will be counterproductive. We’ll be back. Thank you so much.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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