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MEETING ADJOURNED
ANNOUNCEMENTS

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you for coming. Thank you all for being here. Just a couple of reminders and announcements. Please if you’re participating in the discussion raise your hand, wait for a microphone, and then please identify yourself by name and department. Keep in mind that we do have colleagues at the SMFA who are participating in this remotely. They can’t see you. So it’s important to wait for a microphone and identify yourself.

I also have an announcement from the Executive Committee. The faculty forum that is on the calendar for two weeks – the day after the election, the 9th, will not take place. We’re not going to have a forum this semester. We will have one next semester if there’s a specific topic that people need to discuss. If you have such things, please suggest them. We figure everyone one way or another will probably be hungover that day anyway.

Juliet Fuhrman wanted to make an announcement.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. I’d just like to remind everybody that the Faculty Advisory Board this semester is conducting a review of Bárbara Brizuela and your input is due this Monday, October 24th. So please, we’d love to hear your thoughts. So the Faculty Advisory Board can use that input.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, Juliet. Are there any other announcements from the floor? Then we’ll move on to our agenda. The first is an announcement from Anne Moore.

**Summer Scholars Poster Session on Friday, October 21**

Anne Moore, Program Specialist, Scholar Development

MS. MOORE: Thanks. I’m Anne Moore from Undergraduate Education. I just wanted to let you know that Friday is the Summer Scholars Poster Session. That will be from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the Chase Center in Carmichael Hall. So if you can – it’s a great opportunity to see some of the different kinds of research that undergraduates are up to over the summer but it’s also a really cool overview of the work that our students are doing all over campus. So please come if you can. There will be fancy eclairs and cannoli.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you. So we’ll move on to the new business. Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair of T&P Promotion, has a couple of topics he’d like to discuss here.

**NEW BUSINESS**
Discussion of and Vote on Proposed Changes to Statement 11 for 2017-18

Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair of T&P Committee

PROF. SLIWA: So the T&P brings three items. The first one is for a vote. The second one is just for your information. The third one, if you’d like to initiate a discussion are two items which will be brought for a vote next time in November and perhaps December.

So the first item has to do with lateral hires increasing in time. The proposal has to do with a change in policy. This is why it has to go for a vote from the faculty. So if you look at the proposal. The current phrasing is both the department and the appropriate dean must request the expedited process. The proposal is added to it after the comma: “The T&P Committee must approve this request before an offer of employment is made by the deans. If the request is denied, the case would go through a full review as described in Part 4,” which pertains to lateral hires. That’s the change we’re suggesting. That’s the change we would like to vote at this meeting today.

Now, the other item is to clarify the meaning of some words which were not too clear. Up for discussion is part three. It has to do with the result of the vote which was taken by the faculty in the School of Engineering last year, actually 2015. The question was: do only full professors deliberate on cases of promotion to full professors? The vote of the faculty in the School of Engineering was 33 yes, 24 against. So in essence we did have time to prepare a complete proposal. What I’d like to do today is to hear your views about it. We will prepare a complete proposal. Some are very simple. We’ll change the wording. But there are some consequences. For example, if we vote yes, then we will have to change the bylaws about the composition of T&P. Right now it has been practice that only full professors were members of T&P, and every effort was made to keep it this way. However, it’s not a formal requirement. So this will require a change of the bylaws and as such perhaps we will make a proposal in the November meeting. We can discuss it here today and in November it will be voted in December only because those are the rules.

The other proposal to think about is in line with what the School of Engineering already voted for. Only full professors deliberate. The change is very simple. But then there may be some problems as some departments have very small numbers of full professors. So we have to think about how to come up with such situations. This is why we don’t have a proposal at this moment because we don’t know what it will entail. But primarily, what are your views about this? We would like to hear basically an indication because we will take the vote, which we will ask for this vote at the November meeting as a reminder to make the changes because it will take a while to prepare all the changes.

There are two separate votes because actually we were thinking that changing the
composition of the committee or the fact that only full professors are serving on T&P is an independent issue that we feel should be brought to a vote.

The other issue has to do with what do we do with departments who have a small number of full professors. We have to think about what to do. Before we vote on it, I would like to know from you whether you support this motion or not.

PROF. PENVENNE: Jeanne Penvenne, history and international relations and Africana. I’m really concerned about only having full professors. I am now finally a full professor, and I still don’t think it’s a good idea. We talk about diversity. We talk about inclusivity. We’ve been trying to diversify our faculty. A lot of those folks are in stream. It seems to me that once you are tenured at this university you are a member of this family. You are a full-fledged speaking member of this family, and I think this needs hierarchy, which I mean, there’s a dynamic towards that in the first place. So I’m worried about this or its implications on many levels, and I will not support it.

PROF. SLIWA: This is the purpose of the discussion. So thank you very much.

PROF. MANZ: Beatrice Manz, Department of History. I am speaking not only for myself but for the whole history department because we discussed both these issues in our last meeting on Monday, but unfortunately our department is currently having a meeting, so I will speak for them.

I’d like to take them in the order in which they are given. And to say first of all, we’re very much against the idea of having the Tenure & Promotion Committee play a role in the hiring process. The Tenure & Promotion Committee is here to judge tenure and promotion. Our feeling is this: when you are making an offer it is time sensitive. Time is of the essence. You already have to deal with the deans, with the formalities of the hire. And you have to deal with the decision making of the person who offers. The second in line for a job is very aware that every delay means it can be read as not being in favor. So there’s actually no reason at all that this should be done before the hire. The contract letter – I’ve looked at the three last lateral hires in history – the contract letter says nothing about what kind of tenure process it is, that you have to undergo a tenure process and this will take approximately X amount of time. I think we should continue to write that kind of letter and immediately after the hiring then the dean and the chair should obviously make the request in a very timely fashion to Tenure & Promotion because the difference that this makes is a difference of process of time, not of the need. We also felt that there was a possibility that this process could influence the hire. In one sense you’re there for giving some sort of voice to a group of eight people unconnected to your department because there will be an opinion to some extent about the background of that person.
So as I said, unanimously, the history department has had quite a few recent lateral hires, is strongly against this.

On the full professor, I’m going to speak less time. I agree with Jeanne, who was part of our discussion, that the department should be allowed to follow their (inaudible). We are currently discouraging associate professors from taking any leadership role in the university. We really want them to demote them in some sense, not to consider them yet full members. Furthermore, we’ve always had associate professors. We’ve never had a problem. You do get situations in departments where you have only full professors. (Inaudible). The power to judge in a sense (inaudible). Thank you very much.

PROF. FANTINI: Sergio Fantini. I was actually the chair of the committee that was appointed by Linda Abriola, the Dean of Engineering at the time. Not making accommodations about this issue of full professors or the demotion of full professors (inaudible) exactly those that were measured. We reached out to a number of A&S faculty members and clearly one issue is that we would lose the voice of associate professors (inaudible). The reason behind this is there would increase a conflict of interest. The faculty members vote for other colleagues, faculty members, who are possibly within a few years of coming up for vote for their own full professor. So this was a major reasoning. We also at the time looked into other institutions and the vast majority that we looked at always had only full professors – BU, Cornell, Dartmouth. There was one exception, Northeastern. What they do is they have a promotion committee that in the case of the promotion to full professor, they have to have a majority of full professors. So professors are allowed there, associates are allowed there, but the majority has to be full professors. However, any department can request the promotion of their own faculty. Only full professors deliberate. So it’s individual departments who have an option to request that only full professors would participate. Maybe this is a compromised solution.

PROF. SLIWA: I’d like to make one comment in answering this. I don’t think it promotes change, which won’t slow down the process at all. Because the committee’s concern with just basically basic requirements that they request for the expedited hire should satisfy. That’s the objective. It can be done in almost no time. It actually does another thing. It creates some room for T&P to just have an input whether this is the correct process to proceed. It may not be, and in which case otherwise T&P is faced with a failure to compete if you think about it. So I think this solves two problems at the same time. Now, regarding (inaudible) I open for discussion (inaudible) but is the best way to proceed. The other issue is (inaudible) because that’s something (inaudible).

PROF. PEPALL: Lynne Pepall, economics, and I’m also a member of Tenure & Promotion. I think the spirit of this change is not for T&P to get involved in hiring. I don’t think that’s the spirit of it. The spirit of it is just to clarify how the decision when
the process is expedited is made because Statement 11 is governed by faculty, and Statement 11 that describes the process, nowhere is it clear how that happens. So it’s really more, I think, a clarification than it is, I think, of trying to say that we would like T&P to be involved in the hiring. I don’t think that is the intent of the change.

PROF. SLIWA: Basically to decide two. One is expedited, the other is not expedited. And the problem of the issues at T&P, they should be involved in deciding on this issue which part should be followed. Nothing else and nothing more.

PROF. MIRKIN: I was a lateral hire myself –

PROF. TOBIN: Who are you?

PROF. MIRKIN: Sergei Mirkin, biology. So I was a lateral hire myself. You know, for a lateral hire you have tenure in your own institution, right. Then people ask you, “Would you be interested in coming to Tufts?” By default you assume you are approved for a tenure position. That’s a false statement. You know, if it’s not a default you would never consider it. So that’s something to keep in mind when you make this change. You don’t have to (inaudible) lateral hires. There’s always an exception (inaudible) when you hire a full professor. In doing this, if you just say, “Look, we hire you but we have to go through this long process, then people don’t want to consider it seriously. So the expedited process we have right now is an acceptable compromise.

The second thing I wanted to say was about this full professor issue. For biology, when you consider going to full professor, associate professors vote. The (inaudible). First of all, you don’t create the secret test of full professors that make a decision and no one knows how to make it. In fact, in this practice, associate professors know what to expect to become full professors. Actually, in my short experience as a chair, many people say, “Well if I promoted this person, I’ll assume, in a year or so I’ll be ready for the same promotion.” So I think the problem is good that the criteria for promotion for the full professors are very vague. If an associate professor is tenured, more or less junior faculty more or less know what they need to accomplish to get tenured, but full professors, that’s exceptional. You have to be a leader in your field. That’s pretty much the definition. That’s why I think creating the situation that only one group of full professors know what it is, I don’t think that’s helpful.

PROF. MANZ: Beatrice Manz again. I want to sort of answer some of the answers as to why it is that I feel strongly about this. First of all, intent and effect are not necessarily the same thing. Naturally, of course T&P intends not to interfere, but you are at a very critical moment. You have to go through the deans. The deans are going to tell you if your choice is likely not to make the tenure decision. Deans have a very good idea of whether expedited or non-expedited is necessary. In fact, that’s not something you have
to know before you make the offer, as I said.

I feel that first of all I’m not confident that no additional time would be needed when often there are new hires in the fall semester. You’re talking about the period when T&P is busy with sub-committees. Can you really meet within a day of getting something? This is what we’re dealing with, one or two days, I think, often before you made that decision. I feel it does have, could have an effect of discouraging the department from chasing a person who would require the full tenure process. Let us remember that excellent faculty, when you’re talking about mid-career faculty, you’re very likely to get an excellent person either from the smaller liberal arts college, which does not have the same tenure requirements that we do. (Inaudible), Carleton, (inaudible). Superb places. They don’t have the same requirements we have. Then there are the state universities at which might not be (inaudible). So I feel to be told that you need to stop in the process just at the most critical moment, often not that long before Christmas, and not only go through the dean, as I said that process, but also have to go through Tenure & Promotion, have to get the opinion of eight more people who have to look up the university, who have to look up the standards of that university. I cannot believe that that will have no effect on the hiring process. I really feel that there’s a significant danger of complicating and delaying or influencing our hiring process which then will be less democratic. Thank you.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, former member of T&P. And I hate to go against my fellow co-sufferers through the process. I think I know where this is coming from. Our T&P Committee in three years understood that we saw some – yes, these cases come to us and basically it’s a ‘fait accompli.’ You feel like it’s a rubber stamp because it’s a short tenure, and of course, they need to be tenured. But on the other hand, I’m with my fellow faculty member here and former chair of T&P, both of us were chairs, that we do rely on the deans and the department to really find the exceptional people. Exceptional meaning a number of things. Not only scholarship. So that middle range someone who is already tenured and someone who is a senior person somewhere else, I think is – I have no problem with going through this process and feeling like we don’t have sort of real input. But I think that the dangers are much worse. I see it as a case of a bit of double-dipping. The T&P Committee really, unless it goes through the whole process of hiring, cannot make a reasonable decision by looking at someone’s CV of some sort. I mean, not reasonable, but sort of guide, you’re going to have a response. Otherwise, if you don’t have a response why are you being notified before the offer is made? I really don’t see that T&P has a role in the hiring process at all.

Second is I’m also against excluding associate professors. They’re full members once in the club. And frankly, if you want new blood, and you want new ways of looking at things, we really do need to get those associate professors up and running in every aspect of university and department business. I’m with Sergei on this one. I feel acutely
as I get closer to the end of my career that I think it’s absolutely wonderful to have different generations in there and making me think and rethink things as we sit and discuss it. I don’t think there’s a conflict of interest frankly either because there’s no limit on the number of full professors you can have in your department. I don’t see that that – whether it was someone else – it’s not going to be a quid pro quo because that’s where the T&P Committee really comes in in a big way. They can always not promote. They can always delay or table, et cetera. So I think it’s a bit of a red herring.

Finally, I was here when the decision was made. Some departments were including assistant professors. And a previous dean had checked with the legal department that they were very worried about being sued, that some departments included assistant professors and others didn’t. So the rule came down they all had to be the same. In other words, it wouldn’t be up to the department whether they decide to include associate professors or not. It’s up to a larger body. It’s up to the university. It’s up to the school, et cetera, who participates. The department can’t change that. So I’m against both of these.

PROF. SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science, and also having served on T&P. I want to speak on the first measure that I’m very conflicted about. I agree with everything Beatrice said, but also I served on some of these expedited committees. First of all, these expedited committees meet in the summer where you’re spending your precious summer time reading the files, going to the meetings, and you get there and this feeling of, “Why are we here and why did we do this?” I think you’ve raised this bigger question of what the role of T&P in lateral hires is. If it feels like (inaudible) the hire if they don’t think this person is worthy of tenure. Well, the department wouldn’t have supported it. At the same time, sometimes at those meetings red flags come up and the committee feels completely helpless to do anything about it because as frustrating as it might be for T&P to have concerns when that offer is made, it’s even worse for these to be made after the person has signed a contract, they’ve sold their house, they’re coming here in two weeks, and T&P is seeing something that says, “Wait, we want more time.”

So the feeling I think that led to this proposal is T&P either needs a bigger role or should have no role because it just felt like it’s a very frustrating in-between status that frankly felt like it was wasting our time, but it was also about something as important as tenure. So it is a difficult issue and that’s why I’m conflicted having appreciated your comments but also being on the other side, being frustrated and feeling like I’m using my summer for something to raise concerns that this is happening anyway and who are we to now say no to this and put the brakes on this when a person has got their bags packed already.

PROF. HASSELBLATT: Boris Hasselblatt from mathematics. I’ve never served on T&P so no pertinent experience. Our department has done many lateral hires so I have no
stake in the game, but my instinct is very much with Beatrice talking about the expedited reviews. I appreciate that the intent is not the effects that Beatrice disclosed but my concerns are the same. I don’t know that I would want as a department chair, or member of a department, or dean, to have this extra hurdle and especially when I hear concerns about members of T&P thinking about whether they want to spend the summer on expedited review or not. That suddenly has a really disconcerting motivation to vote on whether that’s the right process or not.

I think the other thing being I appreciate that there are concerns about red flags being raised, but that suggests that T&P would not approve an expedited search until T&P has looked at the case substantially enough to discern red flags. That runs entirely counter to the claim that T&P can instantly decide which of these processes to actually approve at the time. For me, maybe there are ways of working it out, but at this point my concerns by a great margin the possible virtues of this approach.

PROF. LITVAK: Joe Litvak, chair of the English department. Also, never have served on T&P, but I can say from experience that if I had been required to have an offer approved by T&P, a lateral hire offer approved by T&P in the past, I would not have been able to make an offer for the candidate who we were trying to attract. It would’ve been put off by the additional bureaucratic complication.

PROF. SLIWA: If I may comment. The proposal is not about reviewing an entire case. The proposal is only to decide which of the two processes, expedited or not expedited.

PROF. LITVAK: I guess what I would like to know is on what basis will that decision be made? Because I can’t see having –

PROF. SLIWA: There’s a danger. Even in the current state there are certain conditions which are listed. There’s a danger (inaudible) pursuing a case (inaudible). This can be done. Which of the two processes?

PROF. LITVAK: Right. But it still seems to me that that check is going to involve delay that is inevitably going to be discouraging for both the candidate and the departments.

PROF. SLIWA: But the danger is that you may make an offer and you may think everything is beautiful and perfect. You may even say that it will be an expedited case, and then as we come to the T&P review it’s a mess.

PROF. LITVAK: One last point that I wanted to make was that the lateral hires are very often a way to increase the diversity of faculty and to bring in new talent not already a part of the institution. I think we weaken our hand if we institute this new policy. It makes it that much harder to attract diverse faculty members.
PROF. PEPALL: I just wanted to make a point, a clarification, that I think it was this faculty that voted on the criteria for an expedited case, which is that the person would’ve gone through the tenure process at a peer institution. That’s the only criteria that we act upon. So there’s no sense in which you have to see the full file. So it’s not a red flag that might come up at that time. The process is whether or not – because it’s shorter, it’s more abbreviated. So you think you can do that because the person has gone through the process at a peer institution. If you feel that’s too tight and that restricts, ties your hands too much, then we should change the criteria. If you want to make it up to the dean of the department, but it’s just that the rule that we have right now says this is the criteria. I think you could put in the word “normally” or something if you want, but right now that is the criteria. And I think T&P just wants clarification of by whom and at what point that decision is made, that this individual has gone through a process of tenure at a peer institution. So that’s the only piece, only piece, that you’re really considering.

PROF. PENVENNE: Jeanne Penvenne. I think the whole question of a peer institution, we might want to think about that as well; we are trying to diversify. Actually, having people who are not coming from top universities or peer universities is a kind of diversity. It’s a kind of diversity that we ought to consider and might actually need. Again, these kinds of questions go back to the hierarchical and to assumptions that are against (inaudible), are against the kind of university that we’re trying to become. I would want to see all lateral hires simply move directly in to expedited and have that be that because that way no one has to say, “Well, what school did this person come from?” Again, I don’t think that T&P has any business being in between a department, the dean, and the candidate.

PROF. TOBIN: Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. So I have several hands in this game. I was a lateral hire before this process existed, and it very nearly fell through because it was almost impossible. I had to take a sabbatical, and it wound up not being a sabbatical, so that I could come here for a year while they did the tenure review. And I lost a sabbatical year for doing that. It was only under special circumstances that they were willing to do that. At that time it was almost impossible to do lateral hires.

I was chair of T&P when the current policy was drafted and adopted and it was a compromise because there were a lot of people that were uncomfortable with getting any kind of an expedited process, but there was also a push that if Tufts wanted to go where we wanted to go, we needed to be able to hire excellent people at a senior level or mid-career level. And the current policy of not having any process for that was preventing us from doing that. We were losing good people who we otherwise could’ve hired.
But because we were coming from a system where there was no expedited process, I think we had a very conservative set of criteria. And I kind of agree with Jeanne, that now having quite a bit of experience with this, we can loosen that up a bit. I agree, I don’t think the ‘peer institutions’ is really the right term.

The other way to go would be to do what many other institutions do which is to take this out of the faculty’s hands altogether and just allow the deans to make tenure offers. That is probably something we can consider.

But I would like to respond a little bit to Debbie’s point, too. It is true that when you’re doing expedited hires you don’t really have the option of saying no. But I think that a little bit as the same reason that a baseball manager argues a bad call, you never overturn the call. You have a side replay. But I think the purpose of doing it is you’re making a signal that you think they screwed up and you’re trying to change it for the future. I think what T&P can do, even under the current system, is send a signal to the deans. You know, “We really have a problem with this case; you need to vet these a little more carefully for the next one.” So you probably can’t be vetoing the one you got, but you might affect things in the future. So that might be a reason to keep it. Whether that’s worth the effort involved I think is another question. But I would rather see us go in the other direction of making this easier rather than introducing T&P into the process.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Mark Cronin-Golomb. I was chair of T&P last year. I’d just like to point out that maybe it doesn’t really make all that much difference what we’re talking about because, this is for the lateral hires, the process of T&P for lateral hires is in any case very weak, especially considering that there are only five external letters and I believe two of them can be taken from the hiring letters. So in one sense you maybe just have to put up with the T&P process for lateral hires that is weak, or perhaps even to do away with it and just leave the process in the hands of the deans and the departments.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, again, former chair of T&P. I have this feeling like if it ain’t broke, why are we fixing things? Why are we fixing this? Why are we fixing having associate professors there? I mean, yes, the engineering school voted, but it was a pretty close vote. So my thinking is to just leave it alone and perhaps broaden the language about what the lateral hire, what hoops he or she has to jump through, like whether it’s peer institution or, and suggestions made right here, peer process. That they have gone through a peer process or something like that as we have here. Because they’re brilliant people who are working at peer institutions that we think we’re better than.

But I still think we should have the process for the reasons that Roger mentions. It’s really nice to know that the deans know, and the department knows, that there is a
process and even though it ends up being sort of rubber stamped. And Debbie, you forgot to mention we did the expedited case to the sum of $300 for participating in the summer in the external reviews. You don’t spend as much time on that as you do in the regular T&P process. But I think it should still be there. I really feel like let’s leave well enough alone and let’s see if next year this committee thinks this is a problem or not.

PROF. SLIWA: I think at some point in the near future we should just move to the vote. We’ve heard enough. Regarding item number three we will discuss it next time. At least think about this issue of allowing only full professors. We don’t have a proposal but we’d like to hear, and I think we’d like to call it for a vote next time because we are only suggesting changes and (inaudible). But the issue was today is just to bring a vote changing the wording of Statement 11 regarding expediting lateral hires. Is there a motion to vote?

PROF. TOBIN: As I understand it, this motion comes from the T&P Committee, so I believe it doesn’t require a second. Let me just tell you the process is going to be a little different because of our colleagues at the SMFA. So we will do a vote here by a show of hands and count that, but then we need to allow some time for our colleagues at the SMFA to submit their votes. Then we’ll collect all of those and proceed with other items. We’ll announce that when it’s ready.

So all in favor of the proposal as presented by T&P. We’re talking about the proposal regarding the change to the expedited lateral hire process.

PROF. SAIGAL: This will require a change in the bylaws so shouldn’t we vote on this at the next meeting?

PROF. TOBIN: This process is not in the bylaws. It’s Statement 11. Any other questions regarding what we’re voting on and the process? So all those in favor of the proposed change to give T&P the role of improving the initiation of the process about expedited lateral hires please raise your hands and keep them raised. For our colleagues at the SMFA who should vote in favor, please transmit those votes. All those opposed to this proposal? Again, our colleagues at the SMFA please transmit your votes and any abstentions that need to be recorded.

MS. DUBMAN: There are no votes from the SMFA.

PROF. TOBIN: No votes, okay. Any abstentions that wish to be recorded. I think it’s safe to say that the motion fails.

PROF. RIDGE: The votes are 7 for, 33 against, and 3 abstentions.
PROF. TOBIN: So the motion fails. Is there any further comment on the other parts of the T&P issues today, any other comments people want to say about the full professors?

PROF. HABER: I just want to ask – Judith Haber, English department and T&P. If we’re going to suggest this since engineering has voted for this, is it for them to do one thing and A&S to do another thing because that would create a problem. No, it’s not, okay.

MR. MATSON: For the SMFA, one abstention, and four against.

PROF. TOBIN: One abstention and four against. Thank you.

DEAN GLASER: Jim Glaser, Dean of Arts & Sciences. In the spirit of the administration whose consciousness has been raised, what will happen now is the deans will, as we go through this next cycle, if we see a case where this issue comes up, I think Joe, Bárbara, Nancy, Bob, and myself will discuss it and try to on the fly figure out how to proceed. We’ll talk with our colleagues in T&P about how to do that. Thank you.

Discussion of and Vote on Campus Closure Make-Up Policy Proposal
Anne Mahoney, Chair of EPC

PROF. TOBIN: Let me call on Anne Mahoney to present the proposal Campus Closings.

PROF. MAHONEY: Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics and Chair of the Educational Policy Committee. The proposal is really just housekeeping, just codifying the decision we made two years ago when we got a million inches of snow or whatever it was. We decided then that it was okay to hold makeup days. That particular semester we lost six days out of the 66-day semester and something like four of them were Mondays. So we decided it was appropriate to make up some Mondays. We’re just codifying the idea that, “Yes, it’s okay to have makeup days.”

Two years ago this faculty voted on which days we were going to do makeup days. We are providing a list of potential makeup days, which are exactly the ones that we agreed on at the time. And also, it was the vote of this faculty that decided to hold makeup days in the event of the many campus closures. We proposed to delegate that decision to the deans because that’s going to be much more efficient to gather the faculty to vote on it.

The only thing that’s actually new is that we proposed lengthening the spring semester by one day, from 66 days to 67. Doing this with one day tacked on at the beginning. And making that extra day into a bonus day which would come somewhere between spring break and Patriot’s Day of the same day of the week. So if the semester would’ve started
on a Thursday and we push it back and start on a Wednesday, then some Wednesday around the beginning of April there are no classes unless we happen to meet that day for a makeup day. We realize, of course, that if there are six years in a row when we don’t need to use that for a makeup day and it actually acts like a holiday, and in the seventh year it snows. The students will be angry that their holiday has been taken away from them but I think that’s the price we have to pay. So fundamentally, this is just writing down the precedent, codifying the decisions that we made a couple years ago so we don’t have to scramble the next time it happens. Questions?

PROF. SAIGAL: Anil Saigal from mechanical engineering. When we talked about this two years ago, one of the other things that was proposed was because we have 66 days in spring and 65 in the fall, we have an extra Friday in spring semester compared to Monday to Thursday. That’s what (inaudible). We want to make a Friday (inaudible) but a lot of people objected because they already planned their trip or are off campus. Why isn’t the first choice to make one Friday so that we are not normally 65 days just like the fall semester, a Friday which is (inaudible) a holiday and is basically not a holiday if we get snow? Why is that not on this list?

PROF. MAHONEY: That would’ve worked, too. Sure. We could do that. But it’s actually rather nice to have more instructional days so we chose to do it this way. But we are perfectly open to amending if you want to eat the extra day, the existing Friday. There’s nothing wrong with that. We just decided that having one more day was probably better. I would say it was a vehemently strong preference.

PROF. SAIGAL: I would just like to propose an amendment that we pick a Friday and that is the bonus day so that the semesters are actually even, 65 on both, and a Friday that is not a (inaudible). And that be the first choice.

PROF. MAHONEY: So the amendment would be that for the spring semester bullet point A, the bonus day will not be inserted into the spring schedule but will be a suitably chosen Friday in the appropriate time of the year. Jillian, is that okay?

MS. DUBMAN: I was just asking my colleague Paul Tringale if that was okay. I don’t know the answer to that.

PROF. MAHONEY: Since fundamentally the control of the calendar is a practical matter under control of the Secretary of the Faculty.

MS. DUBMAN: I would need to check into that just to make sure that we’re okay by cutting down the spring semester by one day. I would need to check.

PROF. MAHONEY: We should vote on the amendment. Is there a second to the
amendment?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PROF. MAHONEY: All in favor of – should we continue discussing the amendment.

MS. DUBMAN: Can you just restate the amendment?

PROF. MAHONEY: The amendment, this is the paragraph after the list of options for the spring semester. The bonus day in the spring semester will be a Friday, which will effectively be a holiday when there’s not a makeup day required, and we can move the last two sentences about lengthening the spring semester by one day given it’s already one day longer than the fall semester. Given that, we aren’t quite sure whether this is generally acceptable given that Jillian still has to check up on whether this is acceptable. If we pass this amendment I think we’re going to need to table the rest of the proposal. If on the other hand we reject the amendment, then we can carry on to vote for the rest of the proposal. Further discussion to the amendment, that is to say, using the existing extra Friday rather than having an extra day.

PROF. RIDGE: Jack Ridge in earth & ocean sciences. There is a special problem with getting rid of days during some random week during the semester, which is that many courses teach things like labs or recitations that meet every day of the week. So when you miss a day what happens is one of those labs or recitations is skipped and it puts it a week behind. This probably isn’t a big deal with recitations, but with labs it’s a huge deal because whole rooms have to be set up and taken down and that’s not really possible. I would discourage us from breaking up or doing as little as possible to full weeks as we can.

So for instance, if we did take a Friday, make it the last Friday of the semester or the first Friday of the semester.

DEAN LOWE: Carmen Lowe, Dean of Undergraduate Studies. One of the things to be aware of is scheduling the spring semester especially in April is Passover and when it falls. I just want our faculty cognizant of that. I don’t know whether Friday is difficult to schedule for that time of the year because of the holiday.

PROF. SAIGAL: I would be happy to accept the amendment to be the last Friday of April when it is not Passover or anything like that.

PROF. MAHONEY: Further discussion? So the amendment has reworded –

PROF. JOHNSON: I’m not sure if this is slowing things down but I guess it is. The
committee has worked its way through this and to make these changes on the floor right now I don’t think it’s a very good idea. So what I was going to suggest is that instead of voting on this that we maybe give it back to the committee for consideration where they can get some more input. I’m just making a suggestion. I don’t know what this can do. But I think when we do things, especially with amendments on the floor, we have extended consequences we can’t possibly consider here, religious holidays.

PROF. MAHONEY: Remember that this is not something that’s going to happen all the time. All of this only kicks in if A, we miss enough days that B, in the judgement of the deans we need a makeup day. This doesn’t happen very often. This has happened like once in memory, right. So it’s not something that we’re going to be dealing with every single semester. Let’s just keep that in mind. So Vida has moved that we refer the entire thing back to committee. Is there a second for that motion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PROF. MAHONEY: Is there discussion for that motion? As the senior parliamentarian informs me that trumps the motion to amend, so we need to vote on that first. So all in favor of referring the issue of makeup days back to EPC?

PROF. TOBIN: Again, let me remind our colleagues at the SMFA to submit their votes as well.

PROF. MAHONEY: I was wondering about that because this explicitly says the Medford campus. This came up two years ago before we had the SMFA campus. Are the rules for campus closures going to be similar or different there? It could be whatever the deans believe it needs to be.

DEAN BAUER: If there’s a catastrophic event on the Medford campus that involves, for example, water pipes breaking, then we can keep the SMFA open. But we’re thinking, I imagine, when we’re talking about the spring semester, of the weather catastrophe. It’s very unlikely that there will be A, one here and not one there, and B, the SMFA students, as everybody knows, take lots of courses on the Medford campus and our students will be participating and taking classes also at the SMFA campus and do already. So I think for the purposes of this issue they’re the same.

PROF. MAHONEY: Then that’s another thing that will need to be amended on the committee is that it’s for the SMFA campus and the Medford campus.

MR. MATSON: The SMFA chimes in that they believe they’re the same.

PROF. MAHONEY: Good. Then we ask the SMFA to give us their votes in favor of the
motion to refer this back to committee. The next step is those opposed to send it back to the committee.

MR. MATSON: MFA votes three abstentions.

PROF. MAHONEY: Is there anyone here wishing to be recorded as abstaining? Then the vote is overwhelming in favor of bringing it back to the committee. We will look into it again. Thank you very much.

PROF. TOBIN: Thank you, Anne, for all of your work and your patience with us.

**Dowling Hall Administrative Reorganization of Student Affairs and Student Services**

    James M. Glaser, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, and Jianmin Qu, Dean of the School of Engineering

PROF. TOBIN: The next item, the last item on the official agenda, is Jim Glaser, Dean of Arts & Sciences.

DEAN GLASER: Dean Qu is not here. He’s traveling today. But he is here in spirit and the two of us together are responsible for what I’m about to talk about. I will say also that Dean Qu and I have consulted extensively with Provost Harris and with others in the administration as we have been through the past several months an organizational, a reorganization, of what we all know as Dowling Hall.

Every so often it does make sense to look at an organization and re-align it to make sure that it’s set up to best meet the challenges of the day, which often are new challenges. To make the best use of talent and skills are the people who populate the organization, and of course, those people change over time, retired and departures and new arrivals. And to offer opportunities for people to grow and to change and to advance in their careers.

Dean Qu and I have been talking with leaders of the Dowling organization asking whether it’s time for a refresh. And after a lot of consultation and a lot of discussion we’ve come to the conclusion that it is.

Of course, many of you know that I myself have been affiliated with Dowling Hall for seven great years. I have a great deal of appreciation for the work that goes on at Dowling Hall. I have great respect for the people who work in that environment and do so much for our students. I think when I was a faculty member I had absolutely no idea how much went into supporting our students in Dowling and my eyes were opened from
being there, and I have great appreciation for the outstanding work that’s done there and the dedication of our staff there.

That continues to be the case today. So what we’re about to unveil is really not an attempt to correct a significant problem in the organization, but periodically it is our responsibility to self-examine and to make sure we are organized in the most appropriate fashion.

We’re now at that moment, and I am very pleased to inform you about some of the upcoming changes to the organization. I’ll sketch them out in very general terms. In the upcoming weeks and upcoming months there will still be some details to work out but there are some basic principles so let me describe them to you.

First, whatever changes there are in the organization chart we expect and our confident that our colleagues in Dowling will still operate as a whole unit. That there will be cooperation and collaboration across all the different units in the building as has been the practice since it was created – how long ago, Paul?

MR. STANTON: Sixteen years ago.

DEAN GLASER: Sixteen years ago. It is really what makes Dowling distinctive. It’s what makes it such an extraordinary place, that financial aid, the alpha deans, the Academic Resource Center, registrar, judicial affairs, dean of students. Everything is in the same building and the same organization and people work very well together to maximally support our students. And that will continue to be the case. I’m most certain of that.

Second, we are budgetarily challenged in the two schools, and one of the things is that we’re very aware of is the need to create new revenue streams in the school and in the university as a whole. As our resources are constrained and the demands upon them are growing we will be separating out opportunistic international and revenue potential units in the organization and giving them concentrated leadership. John Barker has agreed to have this portion of the organization. This new title will be Dean of International Studies and Extended Programming. He is right now in China, already advancing Tufts’ interest in our international programming there. We believe that in this new capacity John will really be able to focus on new opportunities and really help us to build upon some of the basic things that are going on at present.

Third, this world, this student world, has gotten much more complicated in the years since I left Dowling Hall. Social media, sexual behaviors, new federal regulations, protest activity – we had a little bit of that today – complicated relationships with our host communities, the huge new demands on our accessibility services, new demands
from students’ families in the areas like career services make this domain very, very challenging. I look back on my years at Dowling as a simpler time. It is a complex time right now. We have asked Mary Pat McMahon, our Dean of Student Affairs, to take on a more expansive role leading the student organization. Up until recently Mary Pat had an organization in Student Affairs that included judicial affairs, campus life, the group of six, and various other units. She will now be adding to her portfolio accessibility services, career services, and health services and counseling. This is a large expansion of her responsibilities. The fact that we’re doing this is an expression of our confidence. I think Mary Pat is here. Mary Pat is right here. I have to tell you I have such great admiration for Mary Pat in the two years, year and a half, that she’s been here. Her ability to prescribe or diagnose some of the real challenges that we face out, to map out a plan to deal with those challenges, to put it all together is very, very impressive and I have great confidence and Dean Qu does, as well, in Mary Pat’s leadership, in her vision, and in her ability to manage this very complicated and complex area and to design a comprehensive solution that will work across units. She will continue to be the Dean of Student Affairs, but she will now be reporting directly to me and to Jianmin.

Actually, that might be the – I have more to say, but that might be an appropriate time to clap.

(Appause)

DEAN GLASER: It might be the hardest job on campus. I think that that’s fair to say, and we are extremely fortunate to have Mary Pat in this capacity.

Fourth, we believe that there is real value in having some of the units in the organization report directly in to the academic leadership of the schools. That was lost when John replaced me in Dowling Hall, and in particular with the very complicated new demands upon the curriculum, changes to the credit hour system, Carmen and Carmen’s operation, particularly the alpha deans, will report in to my office, not to me directly, but to Joe Auner. This will actually make whatever is happening with the alpha deans parallel to what happens in engineering because Jennifer Stephan reports directly to engineering.

Carmen and the alpha deans make academic decisions every day and this structure will absolutely connect them to the academic leadership of the school. I think, I hope, Carmen, that you are looking forward to working together with Joe and the other deans as we integrate what happens on the third floor and what happens in Dowling Hall.

Finally, Paul Stanton will continue to serve as the Dean of Student Services. His domain will not be changing. I can tell you from the years that I spent there that his steady leadership and his strategic thinking will be of great value to John in his new role, to
Mary Pat, to Scott, and to me and to Jianmin. I benefitted so much from having an office right next door to his, and I’ve learned a lot from him and that will continue. Paul will also become more involved in space and staff issues throughout AS&E, taking some burden off of Scott who has a very, very large enterprise to manage. We’re looking forward to having Paul play a larger role in that area.

There will be some implications to this reorganization, some of which as faculty you will see and some of which you will not see. We are putting some additional resources into this area given the shared amount of risk associated with it, given how student behaviors, and protests, and combinations law, and parent expectations, and so much else has changed. But we’re doing our best to be conservative about the resources given how tight our budgets are. Jianmin and I are grateful to Mary Pat, to John, to Paul, to Carmen for working together with us to put this plan together. I’m going to stop there and see if anybody has any questions to pursue with us.

PROF. GARDULSKI: Anne Gardulski, earth & ocean sciences. Jim, could you talk a little bit about the entrepreneurial role that you’re expecting John Barker to take in terms of international type programs.

DEAN GLASER: There are real opportunities, and we’ve started to experience a lift in international market. We have built over the past couple of years an English prep program for students from China who come here and take English lessons and culture, American culture courses. It actually happens down the street at 200 Boston Avenue, somewhere in that complex. It’s built up over time, but we think that there’s growth potential now. The Confucius Institute will now report to John and the Confucius Institute which had been reporting to Joe is connecting us with Beijing Normal University in China. We think that there are some opportunities to build some things between the two institutions. There are resources that could come from Beijing Normal. In addition, in Japan there’s been some program that Tufts has sponsored and has brought some revenue in. And John Barker was responsible for developing that. As we saw John’s zeal for this area and his desire to do more in this area we thought that this was a way of sort of taking the full benefit of his talents and interests.

PROF. TALIAFERRO: Jeff Taliaferro, political science department. Jim, are you at liberty to say what the implications are for Rob Mack’s role as associate dean for the student’s success and academic advising, the whole pre-major advising operation, and are you also at liberty to say where the programs abroad office will be located?

DEAN GLASER: Let me take the second one first. Sheila Bayne, the Director of Study Abroad, will continue to report to John. I think Sheila does an excellent job. We have a fantastic program. Both of my children participated in their programs abroad and had fantastic experiences there, really first-class experiences. But almost all, like 99.9 % of
the students who participate in our study abroad programs are Tufts students and there is capacity in those programs to come from other universities. Again, this is a way of bringing more revenue into the school if we do it right, do it thoughtfully. So given John’s international portfolio and given John’s revenue enhancing portfolio, Sheila will continue to report to John. And John will have charge of looking at our programs with Sheila and trying to figure out how to take full advantage of them.

Rob Mack will be reporting to Mary Pat. But let me just say this, which is, I’m going to use a word that my friend Paul Stanton uses all the time, which is the word matrix. We have a matrix organization. Rob may report to Mary Pat and Carmen may report to Joe, but they do work together I think on a day-to-day basis, and they will continue to work together on a day-to-day basis.

PROF. RICE: Anne Christine Rice, romance languages. Do you have an organizational chart of who reports to whom and who does what?

DEAN GLASER: Yes. It will be possible. I almost thought about, at risk of my life because I was going to send it to Jillian this morning, and I want to keep Jillian very happy with me. So I thought about sending her the organizational chart. It’s not quite ready because there are a couple of shifts around that haven’t been completely firmed up. But once they are firmed up we will absolutely share it with the faculty.

PROF. TOBIN: I think with that we should close this. I’m sure if there are more questions, I’m sure Jim would be happy to reply by email. Thank you everyone. Thank you to the SMFA.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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