AS&E Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, November 16, 2016

Schedule and Location

Wednesday, November 16, 2016, 12-1:20 PM
Coolidge Room, Ballou Hall
Light lunch, coffee, and water served at 11:30 AM

Agenda

Announcements

Tisch Undergraduate Research Award
   Martha Kelehan, Head of Scholarly Communications & Collections, Tisch Library

Tufts Community Appeal
   Rocco DiRico, Director, Government and Community Relations

New Business

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for Grievance Panel
   Jeff Zabel, Chair, Grievance Panel

Discussion of Proposed Changes to Statement 11*
*To be voted on electronically, prior to the AS&E Faculty Meeting on December 14, 2016
   Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair, T&P Committee

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Changes for T&P Committee
   Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair, T&P Committee

Medford Campus Classroom Upgrades Summer ‘17
   Lois Stanley, Director of Campus Planning; and Paul Stanton, Dean of Student Services

For Reference

Attachments*
   - Agenda
   - Defining the Ombudsperson Role at Tufts
   - Engineering Proposal (Spring 2015) re: Only Full Professors Participating on Promotion Cases
   - Statement 11, Version 20a (with track changes)

*Please print all attachments and bring them with you to the meeting; a limited number of hard copies will be available at the meeting.

Listings of future faculty meetings as well as the agenda and attachments for this meeting are online at http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty/meetings/.

November 16, 2016
Briefings

Announcements

Tisch Undergraduate Research Award
The Tisch Undergraduate Research Award committee is now accepting applications for 2017. The Tisch Undergraduate Research Award recognizes outstanding undergraduate use of the library’s collections, resources, and services in the production of an exemplary research project. A first prize of $500 and a second prize of $250 will be given to projects in each of the following categories:
- First year writing program (ENG 1-4, Philosophy 1, or any course taken to fulfill the college writing requirement)
- 001-099 level courses
- 100-199 level courses
- Independent Research Efforts
Completed applications are due noon on Tuesday, February 21, 2017. For more information, see https://tischlibrary.tufts.edu/about-us/projects-student-awards-and-innovations/undergrad-research-awards.

Tufts Community Appeal
The Tufts Community Appeal (TCA) is well underway this year. It’s an opportunity for our faculty and staff to come together in support of Tufts’ students, our neighbors, and non-profit organizations. Active citizenship is a Tufts trademark and the TCA is a great way for the University to have a positive impact. The TCA has many options to give to: financial aid for our students, support for non-profits in our host communities through the Tufts Neighborhood Service Fund (TNSF), support for non-profit organizations like the United Way or even a direct gift to a charity of your choice. Last year, 574 faculty and staff contributed over $300,000. Our goal for this year is at least 650. Giving is easy to: payroll deduction, check, or even online giving. Enrollment is open until December 31, but we encourage people to give now.

New Business

Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for Grievance Panel
Speaker: Jeff Zabel, Chair, Grievance Panel

Summary: We are proposing 3 bylaw changes for the Grievance Panel:

1. Remove the position of secretary as an officer of the Grievance Panel
2. Extend the term of elected members from 3 to 5 years.
3. Extend the term of the Ombudsperson to three years and extend eligibility to Grievance Panel members in their second year

Proposed Bylaw Changes (in bold):

A Grievance Panel (“the panel”), consisting of nine members of the faculty of professorial rank, elected for five three-year terms, including at least one member from the School of Engineering. No more than...
one member of a single department may be a member of this panel at any one time and no member of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion may be a member of the Grievance Panel.

The officers of the panel shall be a chair, a secretary, and an ombudsperson. The chair will be chosen annually by the panel from its own members. The ombudsperson will hold this position for three years and will be chosen by the panel from its own members. Panel members with one or two years' experience are eligible to be chosen for the ombudsperson position. The chair and the ombudsperson must be designated by the end of each academic year for the following year, and their names should be sent at that time to the Secretary of the Faculty to avoid a hiatus in the panel's functioning. Members of the panel shall be assembled by the chair upon the request of a grievant, or upon the request of a majority of the members of the committee, or whenever, in the judgment of the chair, a meeting is desirable.

**Key Issues:** The ombudsperson position is very weak and we would like to strengthen it. Rationale for the 3 changes noted in the Summary above:

1. This position is obsolete
2. Grievances have been rare in recent years and there is little institutional memory. Longer terms should not be unduly burdensome, since the committee rarely has any business; this would allow members to gain some useful experience over a longer term, and is a necessary context for the third proposed change to the Bylaws.
3. Recent Ombudspersons have become painfully aware of the fact that they are untrained and relatively inadequate for a position of considerable importance and sensitivity. We would like to see the Ombudsperson serve for a longer period so that he/she gains competence from experience. We also recommend that the ombudsperson receive some professional training (if the university will pay for this, which then becomes another argument for a longer term).

**Action Required:** Discuss proposed bylaw changes on 11/16/16 and vote on the proposed bylaw changes on 12/14/16. Two of the proposed bylaws set the ground work for strengthening the ombudsperson position.


**Discussion of Proposed Changes to Statement 11**
**Speaker:** Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair T&P

**Summary:** Discuss proposed changes to Statement #11. These proposed changes will be voted on electronically prior to the AS&E Faculty Meeting on December 14, 2016.

**For Faculty Discussion:**
The School of Engineering took the following vote in spring 2015:

*Do you support having only full Professors deliberate on cases of promotion to full Professor?*
Yes (only full Professors deliberate on promotion cases): 33 votes (58%)
No (both full Professors and Assoc. Professors deliberate): 24 votes (42%)
In light of this vote by the faculty of the School of Engineering, the members of the T&P Committee would like to open a discussion by the full faculty of AS&E about the participation of associate professors in promotion-only cases.

**Key Issues:**

**Pro:**
1. Faculty already at the rank of professor are better able to judge the criteria for promotion compared to faculty who may have just earned tenure.
2. Eliminates potential conflict of interest: full professors do not have to worry about retaliation or consequences when reviewing a case. A tenured Associate Professor who is close to being considered for promotion, may not be in a position to provide an unbiased opinion on a departmental colleague who will soon be an evaluator for his/her own case for promotion. Associate professors could feel pressure to vote in a certain way by their senior colleagues and/or feel intimidated about expressing their views on the case. Having no associate professors removes this kind of collegial pressure.
3. Given 2 the department vote recorded may not be in fact an accurate reflection of the views of the faculty.
4. If there should not be any distinction between Associate and Full Professors, then why we not abolishing the rank of Associate Professor?

**Con:**
1. Faculty are considered "full members" of the department upon the awarding of tenure. This change would disenfranchise a significant portion of the faculty.
2. Recently minted associate professors are among our best scholar/teachers, and have much to contribute to promotion discussions. The opinions of experienced Associate Professors can be very valuable and they would be lost in promotion cases.
3. Being tenured they have a strong interest in the direction of the department.
4. Presents challenges to implementation in small departments with only a handful of full professors.

**Action required:** Vote for a change of wording in Statement #11, marked in red and blue, to restrict participation in deliberations for tenure and/or promotion to a specific rank limited to members of the department whose rank equals or exceeds that rank. Faculty members who meet this criterion are designated as “eligible” in the draft of Statement 11. *This vote will take place by electronic ballot, as recommended by the AS&E Executive Committee.*

*For Additional Information:* The modifications to Statement 11, needed in order to implement the restriction that allows only tenured faculty at the rank of professor to participate in promotion-only cases to the rank of full professor, are marked in red in the attached document (Statement 11, 20a). Also attached is the proposal that the School of Engineering distributed in Spring 2015 re: only full professors participating in promotion cases.

**Discussion of Proposed Changes to Bylaws in 2017-18**

**Speaker:** Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair T&P

**Proposed Change #1 Summary:** Proposal to require only full professors to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Change of Bylaws of AS&E (marked in blue)

November 16, 2016
c) **A Committee on Tenure and Promotion**, consisting of eight tenured members of this faculty at the rank of professor elected by the entire voting faculty, and the provost, without vote. At all times, the committee membership shall include at least two members of the Faculty of the School of Engineering and four members from the Faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences. At least one member shall represent each of the following areas in School of Arts and Sciences: the humanities and arts; the social sciences; the natural sciences and mathematics. No more than one member of a single department may be a member of this committee at any one time.

**Key Issues:** The proposal would simply codify the existing practice, as every efforts have been made to elect only full professors as members of the T&P Committee. This requires a change of AS&E Bylaws.

**Action required:** Vote for a change of the AS&E Bylaws, to be taken at the next meeting of the AS&E faculty on December 14, 2016.

**Proposed Change #2 Summary:** If the proposal to require only full professors to participate in promotion cases to the rank of full professor is approved by the faculty of AS&E, the AS&E Bylaws need to be modified to reflect the result of the vote.

Change of AS&E Bylaws (excerpt below; proposed changes marked in bold and blue) to reflect changes of policy allowing only full professors to deliberate at promotion cases to the rank of professor.

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

This committee shall review the qualifications of all individuals who are proposed for consideration for a tenured position or who are proposed for promotion above the rank of assistant professor, or who request such consideration. **It is the intent of these procedures that participation in deliberations for tenure and/or promotion to a specific rank be limited to members of the department whose rank equals or exceeds that rank. In the text that follows, faculty members who meet this criterion are designated as “eligible.”** It shall requisition and consider all evidence that has a bearing on the individual under consideration. This shall include a departmental statement, and a privately submitted evaluation and recommendation to the Chair of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion from each tenured eligible member of the candidate's department(s); nontenured members of the department who were not eligible to participate in the discussion and vote are invited to submit evaluations and recommendations but are not required to do so. After review of the confidential letters by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, the committee will forward these letters along with the rest of the candidate's dossier to the administration, unless the case is tabled. Confidential letters will be kept secure by the Secretary of the Faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering for three years from the date of official action by the Board of Trustees on the candidate's application, at which time the letters will be destroyed, unless the administration has been legally enjoined from doing so.

The departmental statement shall reflect the full range of opinion of department members who vote on the application, record the numerical vote, and be signed by all voting eligible members. When department members cannot agree on a single statement, a signed minority statement shall be submitted. The statement(s), including a list of members who voted, shall be made available to
the candidate who has the option to submit a timely written response to the department statement. When pertinent, the views of colleagues, both tenured and nontenured, in other departments, and of individuals from outside the university shall be obtained. The committee may ask any of the above persons, or the candidate, to appear in person. Each department will maintain records of student opinion of faculty members, from which information about a candidate will be made available to the committee when appropriate.

For each candidate under consideration for tenure, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall create an external subcommittee. Each External Subcommittee shall consist of: (a) two members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, one of whom shall serve as chair; (b) two members of the department(s) concerned, elected by the tenured eligible member(s) of the department; and (c) one member, hereafter referred to as the outside expert, selected by the tenured members of the department(s) concerned. This outside expert should be from the same discipline as the candidate, or a related field.

**Key Issues:** A change of Bylaws required if the proposal to require only full professors to participate in promotion cases to the rank of full Professor is approved by the faculty of AS&E.

**Action required:** Vote for a change of AS&E Bylaws, to be taken at the next meeting of the AS&E faculty on December 14, 2016.

**Medford Campus Classroom Upgrades Summer ‘17**

**Speakers:** Lois Stanley, Director of Campus Planning; and Paul Stanton, Dean of Student Services

**Summary:** Briefing to the AS&E faculty on a capital project called “Summer ’17 Learning Spaces Upgrades” on the agenda for a November AS&E faculty meeting. We’d like to give the faculty a heads up about the 10-20 classrooms that are proposed for upgrade in summer 2017, for which faculty input is needed. This is the second year of a new process around upgrading classrooms with the long-term goals of creating learning spaces that are flexible enough to accommodate multiple teaching styles and co-curricular uses as well. This year, we will be seeking input for each proposed classroom on how faculty would like to teach and how students would like to learn. A website has been set up to collect feedback, signs with the website link will be posted in each of the proposed classrooms, and work sessions with the architect have been scheduled for the week after Thanksgiving.

**Key Issues:**
1. Identifying proposed classrooms for summer upgrades
2. Communication process for teaching faculty involvement in work sessions with the design team

**Action required:** No action required

**Further Information:** No further information