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PROF. GONZALEZ: Hello. So I’m Fulton Gonzalez, co-chair of the Executive Committee with Roger Tobin. And before we proceed with our agenda – so this is a business meeting, so most of the meeting will be devoted to the business on the agenda. But before we do that, it’s pretty clear that many of us are still trying to process what’s been happening over the last week or so, and there are lots of things going on on campus. So I’d first of all like to call on President Monaco to say something.

PRESIDENT MONACO: Thank you, Fulton. I don’t have to tell this group that it’s a critical moment for our country. And at this critical juncture, I think it’s essential that we reaffirm our shared values as a community. We’ve seen profoundly troubling incidents across campuses in this country, and even at our own SFMA there was hate graffiti the day before the election.

I shared my own reflections on these troubling issues and also tried to talk about this moment of great uncertainty in my message to the community over the weekend. There are a lot of issues of concern post-election. One of them that is of special interest to this community is about our undocumented and DACA students. So I just want to be absolutely clear that protecting our students is one of our highest priorities.

For the past year and a half, a group of faculty, staff, and students have been working with our DACA and undocumented students to insure that they have the support and resources they need to flourish and be successful at Tufts. I’ve been fully briefed on the work of this group. I met with members over the summer. So I ask any of you who have questions about the details of what support and resources we’re giving to those students, please contact Mary Pat McMahon or Rob Mack. And those efforts will continue.

I also want to be absolutely clear that we are fully committed to our current admissions policy and financial aid policy with regard to these students. I also want to be clear that we will support our DACA and undocumented students because it is our moral responsibility to protect the safety and well-being of all students at Tufts, regardless of their citizenship status or personal identity.

Therefore, we are exploring what it means to be a sanctuary campus, and there are many implications. There could be implications for those students, and there certainly are implications for us as an institution. But what really is important here is what is best for these students.

It also is important to think what’s best for our university community as we face a lot of potential changes in law and policy. I’m truly proud to see the faculty’s concern for these students, but I’m not surprised. The deans, provost, and I look forward to working with you to ensure that we continue to support them and to discuss the many vital issues that are facing our country and our community raised by the election and any potential
policy changes.

During the election, it was important for me, particularly as president, to uphold the university’s non-partisan status and to insure that we had a climate of robust and informed debate about the election on this campus. And I want to thank the many faculty members who took part in that process both inside and outside the classroom. I want to thank David Harris, Mark Brimhall-Vargas, and Tisch College for the wonderful events they put on so that we could have that kind of informed discussion.

But now that the election is passed, I do feel that it is my obligation to speak out on issues and policies, particularly as they affect higher education and Tufts University in particular, and I look forward to working with you as faculty members to continuing these discussions on our campus. Thank you very much.

PROF. GONZALEZ: I’d like to call on Mary Pat McMahon who is going to make an announcement.

DEAN McMAHON: Thank you. I wanted to mention that every week, we send out the Jumbo Digest on Sundays to all AS&E students. And Joe Auner and I were talking this morning, and we’re aware that many different departments are offering post-election discussions and opportunities for students to engage around specific topics, around specific discourse, any number of things. If your department is hosting something that would be open to all AS&E students in the next few weeks, just a reminder that if you write to my office, Mickey Toogood is organizing everything into the Jumbo Digest.

Jillian will send a reminder out this afternoon. The Group of Six and different student bases in departments will do the same, just to make sure the students are aware of resources, opportunities to engage, chances for people to connect and come together. So thank you.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Is there anybody else who would like to make a brief announcement?

DEAN GLASER: Jim Glaser, Dean of Arts and Sciences. I sent out an email on Monday afternoon announcing that we would be using the staff town hall meeting that took place yesterday to have a conversation about the election and its implications for the school and to announce that we would use the November 30th faculty meeting, the Arts and Sciences faculty meeting, to have a similar conversation. The conversation we had yesterday I think was very productive and meaningful for people, not just to hear from me, as it was my meeting, but to hear from each other and have a conversation. So I send these emails out there, and I’m not sure if people read them, but I wanted to put an exclamation point on the planned meeting. Thank you.
PROF. LITVAK: Joe Litvak, English department. I’d just like to announce a very extraordinary event tomorrow. The French philosopher Alain Badiou will be coming to Tufts. He will be speaking on the election of Trump. His lecture is entitled “Reflections on the Election of Trump.” It will begin tomorrow night at 8:00 PM in the Cabot ASEAN auditorium. I encourage all of you to attend.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Further announcements? So if demand exists, the Executive Committee may schedule a faculty forum on the first day of reading period, so watch out for that. Also, we are planning to put additional information on the Executive Committee Trunk site. There are other places where you can find information as well, but our site will pertain mainly to events and other issues pertaining to the faculty in relation to the current election.

So let’s go on with the business of agenda. So I’d like to call on Martha Kelehan to talk about the Tisch Undergraduate Research Award.

**Tisch Undergraduate Research Award**

Martha Kelehan, Head of Scholarly Communications & Collections, Tisch Library

MS. KELEHAN: Hi. I’m Martha Kelehan from Tisch Library, and I just wanted to let you know that the allocation period for the Tisch Undergraduate Research Award is now open. We will be accepting applications through Tuesday, February 21st. This award celebrates and recognizes outstanding undergraduate use of the library’s collections, resources, and services in connection of (inaudible) research project. We offer cash prizes in the four different categories. The fourth category, and this is the second year we’re offering it, is for independent research efforts. So that is research projects and projects that happen outside of the course credit system. If you have any questions, there’s more information on the Tisch Library website, and of course you can always ask a librarian. Thank you.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Next, I’d like to call on Rocco DiRico to talk about the Tufts Community Appeal.

**Tufts Community Appeal**

Rocco DiRico, Director, Government and Community Relations

MR. DiRICO: So good afternoon, everyone, and thank you very much for making time for me to just make some brief remarks about the Tufts Community Appeal with Barbara Rubel, and I’m also joined by Alana Fusco today, who’s in our office. And our office, along with advancement and TSS, manages the Tufts Community Appeal.
So the Tufts Community Appeal has been around for almost three decades. Each year, our faculty and staff come together to support our students, our neighbors, and non-profit organizations in our host communities. Last year, we had 574 faculty and staff making gifts or pledges that amounted to over $300,000, and this year we want to beat that. We want to increase that number to at least 650, and we’re well on our way. We have over 200 people who already signed up or pledged for next year.

The program is already underway. It started. You should have all received a letter from President Monaco in October, and you have until December 31 of this year to sign up. And you also probably have been receiving periodic emails from us as well.

We tried to make the process as easy as possible and give you so many different options and ways to give. You can fill out the form and send it back to us. You can sign up using eServe. You can make a gift online using giving@tufts.edu. And there are many different options for you to give to as well. The one that’s nearest and dearest to our heart in community relations is the Tufts Neighborhood Service Fund.

So with money from that program, what we do is any non-profit organization that has Tufts students or Tufts faculty volunteering, they are eligible to apply for one-time grants to support their projects. And it obviously has a huge impact in our host communities and buys us a lot of goodwill in the communities that we serve, and there’s also a connection because they also have Tufts volunteers, whether they be from Tisch or whether they be from faculty or whether they be students themselves.

Another thing that you can give to as part of the program is Tufts financial aid to give to students who are in tremendous need. And then there’s a whole series of non-profit organizations that you can give to: Community Health Charities, Community Works, Earth Share New England, United Way, etcetera. And then also, you can even just give to the charity of your choice. And the way you do that is you just send us a check, fill out the form, and then we’ll send it out to the non-profit of your choice, and they’ll acknowledge your gift and send the information directly back to you. But again, it’s just a way to show folks that Tufts cares and Tufts gives to the community.

If you do enroll in payroll deductions, as opposed to doing a check or a credit card, those start on January 1, and that automatically gets rolled into your check so you don’t have to worry about it, and it makes it very easy come tax time next year to make a deduction. If you do give, you’ll get a really cool Jumbo pin. So I know that’s highly motivating for everybody to get one.

And in addition is another incentive we try to provide. As soon as you give, you’re entered into a weekly raffle to get a $50.00 gift card. And what we’re trying to do this year is buy gift cards to local establishments here in our host communities, again, just as
another way to encourage you to give and also to have a positive impact on our neighbors here in Medford, Somerville, Boston, and Grafton.

I’m happy to take any questions now, but I know that time is of the essence, so I’d also be happy to speak to folks at any time during, after the meeting, or at any time, you can always call us in the Office of Community Relations or email me or email Alana with your questions, and we’d be happy to answer them.

**Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Change for Grievance Panel**

Jeff Zabel, Chair, Grievance Panel

PROF. GONZALEZ: So the next item will be a proposed bylaw change for the Grievance Panel. So today, we’ll have a discussion, and the vote on this proposed change will take place during our next AS&E meeting on the 14th of December. So I’d like to call on Jeff Zabel, chair of the Grievance Panel, to have a discussion.

PROF. ZABEL: So we’re proposing three bylaw changes. One is to remove the position of secretary as an officer of the Grievance Panel because it doesn’t mean anything anymore to have a secretary. I’m the secretary. And then the two substantive ones, to extend the term of the elected members from three to five years, and to extend the term of the ombudsperson to three years and extend eligibility to Grievance Panel members in their second year.

So currently, the bylaw states the following: “A faculty ombudsperson chosen annually by the Grievance Panel from among its members in their third year shall have the power to hear faculty grievances informally and confidentially.” What this means is that the ombudsperson is really a one-year position. And what we’ve experienced with previous ombudspersons is that they felt particularly inadequate and untrained to do an adequate job in serving the faculty as the ombudsperson.

And what we’d like to do is by extending the term on the Grievance Panel to five years, allow the ombudsperson to serve for three years so they can actually get some experience and hopefully get some formal training. There are ombudspersons institutes that formally give training to ombudspersons, and we suggest that our ombudsperson get this kind of training.

And these bylaws were supported unanimously by the members of the Grievance Panel. Most of these members have agreed, if need be, to extend their terms from three to five years. I believe, Mary, our current ombudsperson has also agreed to extend her term to three years, if necessary.

So it says there something about confidentiality, but really, that’s not clear what that
means, and we’ve been investigating legal terms with Tufts legal counsel about this and how we can strengthen that. And we’ve also kind of been investigating different forms that the ombudsperson position can take; for example, having a retired faculty member who can devote their time to this.

I actually have an ombudsperson board or – and actually maybe even hiring an official, professional ombudsperson to not only serve potentially Arts, Sciences and Engineering, but all campuses. In fact, there really is no other campus that has effectively used an ombudsperson.

The other group of people on this campus who don’t have a formal ombudsperson are graduate students, and they may need it even more than the faculty. So we’d like to think about what we can do in terms of extending some type of ombudsperson service to the graduate students. There is an informal process right now in the graduate school, but we’d like to do something more formally about that.

And we’re going to meet with the Executive Committee next month to kind of talk about what our next course of action can be and redefining this position and strengthening this position to better serve and effectively serve our faculty. Any questions?

PROF. ROSENBERG: Joel Rosenberg. Having chaired the initial meetings that led to this proposal, I’m very glad someone proposed this.

PROF. ZABEL: Appreciate that.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. I had thought that we actually had an ombudsperson already in this position. I thought that that was part of Sinaia’s job description.

PROF. ZABEL: First of all, it’s an informal position, and if Sinaia leaves us, who’s the next person to do that? She has the skills to do this, but who knows who will follow her. And we’d like some kind of a formal process, potentially set up for graduate students. That’s just a process.

PROF. TICKLE-DEGNEN: Could we also consider post-doctoral fellows as being covered by that as well?

PROF. ZABEL: Yes. Certainly, we would consider that as well. Thank you.

PROF. RAMSEY: Norman Ramsey, computer science. Could you just give us an idea of roughly how many cases the Grievance Panel ombudsperson has handled over the last five years?
PROF. ZABEL: About two to three a year. So just to clarify, if a faculty member feels they’ve grieved in some way, the first step is to informally meet with the ombudsperson, who can kind of inform them about their options, and potentially to help mitigate the problem in an informal way. The next step after that is to file a formal grievance, and then there’s a formal grievance process that that person can go through. If it comes to that stage, we’re hoping that the ombudsperson can resolve things so it doesn’t get to that point. Okay, thank you.

Discussion of Proposed Changes to Statement 11 and Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Changes for T&P Committee

Krzysztof Sliwa, Chair, T&P Committee

PROF. GONZALEZ: So the next item is a discussion of proposed changes to Statement 11 and also a proposed bylaw change. So actually, there are two proposed bylaw changes, and these have to be voted on in person at the next faculty meeting on December 14th. The change to Statement 11 will be voted on electronically sometime in the next few weeks. So there will be a window of a few days by which you can vote. So the idea is to ensure as much participation as possible. So I would like to call on Krzysztof Sliwa to conduct a discussion on this.

PROF. SLIWA: So this was introduced briefly at our last meeting. So we are proposing changes to Statement 11. It is basically in the aftermath of the vote which was taken by the School of Engineering of the question, “Do you support having only full professors deliberate on cases of promotion to full professor?”

They took a vote in 2015, and the vote was positive. And in light of this vote, we feel that this should be brought for discussion and voted by the entire faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering. This is why it’s being done. And in order for you to vote, we have to have proposals. So we have a proposal to make changes in the text on which we spent some time.

I have an outline on the next two slides. It’s a selection of arguments for and against. Arguments, Pro: 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. And then, eliminates potential conflict of interest: full professors don’t have to worry about retaliation or consequences when reviewing a case, and so on. And it may have some consequences on their treatment, whether the vote by faculty decide to do it and so on.

And the last one is if there should not be any distinction between associate and full professors, then why not abolish the rank of associate professor?
So arguments against it. Faculty are considered full members of the department upon the awarding of tenure. This change would potentially disenfranchise a significant portion of the faculty.

Another, recently minted associate professors are among our best scholars and teachers. And one may have a point of view that they should contribute to promotion discussions. And the opinions of experienced associate professors can be very valuable.

Another point is that, or could be, that being tenured, they may have a strong interest in the direction of the department. And it may present challenges to implementation in small departments with only a handful of full professors.

So there’s a long list of proposed changes. We’ve actually attached a complete new version of Statement 11. The proposed changes are in green. We went through several iterations. The last one is prepared by Mark, the previous chairman. He made changes in the way which may sound a little bit legal (inaudible), and maybe it’s easier to use in any future situations which might appear. So we decided to go with it. They are in green.

So this actually requires a vote, and the vote will be online, as always, we’ll be taking it later on but before the next meeting. So that’s the number one for full discussion.

And then we are proposing changes to bylaws. And this will be voted on at the next meeting. The first one is completely independent of the Statement 11 changes. It is we are proposing to require only full professors to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committee. And the reason is quite simply in practice, in the past, it has always been the case. And it’s a kind of unwritten rule, so we decided to make it official.

And the action required is a change to the bylaw. So the change is a working change. It’s listed in the documents.

The other change to the bylaws is actually related to the vote that you’re going to take electronically. If you vote the proposal no, nothing will happen. If the vote is yes, then there have to be changes made to the bylaws. So we made changes to the bylaws, and this part depends on your vote. So now I open the floor for discussion.

PROF. SOMMERS: Sam Sommers, psychology department. When I first heard about this, the logic of it appeals to me in the sense that having to vote for the (inaudible) to which we are considering a vote makes a lot of sense, so logically, there’s consistency. The more I think about this, the question I have is to make a change in this: what is the problem we’re trying to remedy, because the more I think about it, the more I can’t figure out what the actual problem would be?
And in thinking that through, we are going to disenfranchise people from making a vote and having the right to vote. And I think missing from the list of cons is not just a smaller voting pool, but my guess, given the demographics of this faculty, it probably also means an older voting pool and probably also a male and a whiter voting pool. So I’m curious what benefit we are accruing to merit sort of those costs?

PROF. SLIWA: Look, as I tried to be careful at the very beginning, the reason it’s up for a discussion and a vote is that there are at this moment common rules for the Schools of Engineering and Arts and Sciences. We have one Tenure and Promotion Committee. The School of Engineering took a vote on the question that they posed among themselves, and that vote was positive. In view of that, Tenure and Promotion thinks that the only fair way is to bring it for discussion for the full faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, and that’s what we are doing. We are bringing the same question for the same discussion and a vote, and we will see what happens.

PROF. SOMMERS: Can I just follow up? I understand that. My question is I would like someone to make an argument for other than “because Engineering said” so why we would want to do this.

PROF. SLIWA: I listed some arguments, but of course, this is why we’re discussing it.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson, Russian program, International Literary and Cultural Studies. I would like to hear from the Engineering School both the pros and the cons, how they saw it, because they discuss not in a larger forum where they could hear the arguments pro or con by the larger faculty of AS&E. And so since they discussed it only within their own forum, I think it behooves them to explain to us what the pros and the cons were as they saw them, and maybe explain the vote.

PROF. SLIWA: I’m just a messenger.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Mark Cronin-Golomb, biomedical engineering. There is a short document in the materials that was sent out explaining the rationale behind the proceedings that went on in the School of Engineering.

PROF. WINN: Peter Winn in history. The silence is deafening. I don’t hear anybody advocating these changes. And I agree with Sam that there are certainly costs in terms of suffrage, in terms of democratic practices in this university, and I for one, unless I hear powerful arguments for this, would vote this down.

PROF. SLIWA: We discussed it a little bit, and we felt that actually since not all the faculty are present at this meeting that it would be better to make it an online vote.
PROF. ROMERO: I am Michael Romero in the biology department. I also don’t like the trend line of this. When I first came to Tufts, assistant professors were allowed to sit in the tenure decision, and it was a very valuable thing for a lot of the assistant professors to see how the process worked, and we made a vote a number of years ago, which I didn’t agree with, to restrict assistant professors to no longer participate in the tenure decision. And now we’re talking about restricting associates for the same thing. I guess I worry about the trend line here. Pretty soon, full professors won’t be allowed to.

PROF. TOBIN: This is Roger Tobin, physics and astronomy. I’m opposed to that proposal, partly for Sam’s reason. I don’t see what the problem is being solved if we’re already succeeding in staffing the committee with full professors, then I don’t see that there’s a problem. But in my experience with T&P, the most important thing is to have the very best people on the committee, have people who are really dedicated, really committed, really open-minded, really hard-working.

And it has not been my experience that those qualities are confined to full professors. And I feel the more constraints you put on the membership in that committee, the higher the probability that you will get people who are not the optimum people. And again, I don’t see the problem that it’s solving. So I would prefer that we keep it as it is.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. One of the issues that was brought up in favor of the change to the deliberations on full professor was that an associate professor close to the promotion process might feel compelled to vote one way or another. I think that that’s sort of a strong end, because we all write confidential letters for all of these cases, and I think that if the committee were to see a discrepancy between votes and confidential letters, that that would become an obvious red flag. So I’m not sure that really supports this change.

PROF. RAMSEY: Norman Ramsey, computer science. One of the other criteria put forward is that if we don’t institute this distinction, why have a rank of full professor at all, or rather associate professor at all? And that strikes me as a very disingenuous view of the many distinctions between associate professors and full professors. And I find myself reluctant to align myself with that kind of thinking. It strikes me that if that’s a part of the case, then the case is not very well thought out.

PROF. KRIMSKY: Shelly Krimsky in UEP. So this applies both to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and to the departments, I assume, is that correct?

PROF. SLIWA: This proposal is about who can participate in the department meetings for the promotion cases only.

PROF. KRIMSKY: For the department, and only for the department meetings, is that
correct?

PROF. SLIWA: This has to do with tenure and promotion process.

PROF. KRIMSKY: But there are associate professors on the Tenure and Promotion Committee. So does this also imply that –

PROF. SLIWA: There are none at this moment, and as far as I remember, there’s an effort made to have only full professors to serve –

PROF. KRIMSKY: Only full professors. So it would apply both to the departments and to the T&P Committee.

PROF. SLIWA: With T&P already, the membership basically, although without it being written as law, as far as I know, every effort has been made to have only full professors to serve on Tenure and Promotion Committee.

PROF. KRIMSKY: Can somebody validate that?

VICE PROVOST DUNN: I was on it just a few years ago as an associate professor, and I know many have been.

PROF. SLIWA: But he was an exception.

PROF. KRIMSKY: So I just want to say that there are a couple of benefits to having associate professors in a department participate fully in a promotion case to full professor, and one of those is that the associate professor gets to see what it’s like through that promotion process and what is expected of that person in the department, and that’s a very valuable lesson that associate professors can go through in the department.

As far as T&P, I don’t know if anyone here is from the Committee on Committees, but sometimes it’s difficult to fill the Tenure and Promotion Committee with only full professors when there are some excellent associate professors who will also do the job. So it will have implications in terms of filling the slots on those committees. Those are just two points.

PROF. ART: David Art, political science. Since no one has spoken up for why this makes sense or would pass in engineering, but just offer a few thoughts. And I guess they’re just consistent of how I came to Tufts and what I did there. I did not like being put in the position as an associate professor of deciding on the cases of full professor. And when I asked my colleagues at other places, I found out that this was very much a
Tufts-specific practice.

I did not like being put in the position of having these conflicts of interest at a point in my career when I didn’t feel like I could necessarily have a lot to say. So from the very first moment that I was confronted with this, having played no role in this whatsoever, I didn’t like it. And for people who want to talk about why I didn’t like it, I’m happy to. That’s just my own personal view. Thanks.

PROF. MANZ: Beatrice Manz, history. I want to back up what Roger and Shelly have said. I’m yet another one of those people who’s chaired T&P. First of all, it is sometimes remarkably hard to get people, and we now have an eight-person committee. And both years that I was on recently, we had Kevin one year and Eric Rosenberg another year, both extremely valuable members of the committee, so two associate professors.

And I’m also concerned in general with, I think, an overdone attempt to keep associate professors from having to do service. The minute I was associate professor, actually I was on T&P within two years. And you learn a lot by doing that.

I also think it’s a burden on the full professors. We get to a point where there’s no one else allowed in on the important committees, on T&P, as chair of the department, and we also still want to do our work, our research. There’s a lot of pressure now on full professors. And I think that this trend is not a good one and would just as soon see – at least there’s exception – but see associate professors still occasionally at least on T&P.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: Mark Cronin-Golomb. I’d like to offer a possible response to David’s concern, and that is you might want to consider allowing associate professors to recuse themselves from cases in which they feel uncomfortable to participate.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson again. I just want to ask how many faculty members from engineering do we have here, could you please raise your hands? Two, four. I’m more concerned about lack of a forum where we actually discuss this with our colleagues in engineering. It’s nice to present a paper, but as we all know, we get convinced of a lot of things and think through a lot of things on the floor of this faculty.

And I want to speak from my recent experience of being on the committee that worked through successfully, and now all the schools have approved it, for faculty senate. It was very clear that we had so many misconceptions about each other, suspicions of each other, etcetera, and then putting representatives all together in one room where we went back and forth, we came up with a solution.

I don’t see how we can take a vote when the School of Engineering doesn’t show up to
the meeting where we’re supposed to discuss this. And I think what that points out to me is that the School of Engineering really wants as much separation as possible between Arts, Sciences and Engineering.

So I see if we vote this down – and I too am against it – then what will happen is that they will have to take another vote and perhaps separate out and have their own T&P Committee. But I just don’t see how we can have a discussion when the people aren’t here to discuss, so maybe somebody can say something about why so few – look at how many of us are here from arts and sciences, spending our valuable time to discuss an issue that was raised by the School of Engineering.

I would think it would only be polite – and I’m sorry, but I often speak what half the people here are thinking – it would only be polite and fair to come and present their points of view and not let poor Mark, who is on T&P and my good friend, have the responsibility of having to explain.

PROF. HESCOTT: Ben Hescott, stepchild of both arts and sciences and engineering. I’m in computer science, and we luckily straddle both schools very nicely. First, I want to say I got the email. So did all of my colleagues. We make choices when we come to these meetings. We make choices when we actually speak up for what we want. The lack of voice that you’re hearing here is that many of us did not actually vote for this proposal, probably.

So I don’t think that we’re going to secede from the nation, as it were. There was no discussion – I was involved, and I was present at the engineering meeting. There was no discussion of a separate T&P at all. Doug is there, he’s nodding his head. That’s great.

PROF. MATSON: I was on leave.

PROF. HESCOTT: Even better. We did not discuss having our own T&P Committee. That’s not what we’re interested in doing. There was feeling from a few vocal members that this should come up for a vote. It went for an electronic vote in Engineering. This is how it went down. But I don’t know if it necessarily reflects this great need. Yes, it was 58 percent, but I don’t necessarily think that this is something – if it went to an electronic vote, Engineering will get to vote again. It’s not something that – I think the lack of conversation you’re hearing here is that there are many people here in engineering who don’t support it.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: If I remember correctly, there was some discussion about having a separate School of Engineering T&P.

PROF. HESCOTT: We got rid of that quickly.
PROF. SOMMERS: Sam Sommers again, to follow up Jefferson Davis here. Just kidding. So I guess my question to Ben’s point, if we then – I’m not sure why we’re doing this electronically. If we do this electronically, our colleagues would be – to be fair, the same choice not to show up for arts and sciences will vote on something that (inaudible) discussion points for in favor and against, and it could be a lot of people who didn’t hear this discussion who might say, “Sure, that’s logical, I vote yes.” Is there a reason we’re doing this electronically for everyone as opposed to only the people who are here for a discussion on it?

PROF. SLIWA: I thought that the idea was to actually give a chance to everybody to vote. And I know that there are faculty who couldn’t come here who are against this proposal as well.

PROF. HOFKOSH: Sonia Hofkosh, English. I would just like for a point of clarity to understand are we voting on or are we discussing whether T&P should be made up of only full professors, or whether departments are only going to involve full professors in the promotion business?

PROF. SLIWA: I know it’s maybe difficult, but there are actually three proposals. One is to follow up the School of Engineering vote. It is about participation of only full professors in promotion-only cases. That’s at the department level, this change to Statement 11 and how the tenure and promotion process is being done at the level of the departments. At the same time, there are two proposals for bylaws change. One is to allow only full professors to serve on T&P. This is unrelated to this. The other one is completely related to it. It requires changes to the bylaws, should you vote yes for the proposal which is on the table.

PROF. PENVENNE: Jeanne Penvenne, history. I would like to know – well, usually we do our votes here. We do our business here, and we raise something, and we vote on it, the people who are here vote on it. And what is the criterion for having an electronic, as opposed to the usual vote, and who makes that decision?

PROF. GONZALEZ: So I’d like to partly answer that question. So any bylaw change has to be voted upon in person at a faculty meeting. And so the two bylaw changes discussed will have to be voted on December 14th. Other changes, such as to Statement 11, can be voted upon electronically at the discretion of the Executive Committee. And so in consultation with T&P, we as the Executive Committee decided to vote an electronic vote on the Statement 11 changes. Part of the rationale was that we wanted as much participation as possible. We are a rather distinct minority here of the AS&E faculty members.
PROF. ART: Is there a possibility of adding some sort of amendment to the language the right to recuse associate professors in the case of full professors? That’s the point that I’m really most concerned about. Is there a possibility of writing that in at this point? And just to the particular cases of discussion over the cases of full professor.

PROF. SLIWA: I think this is a different proposal. I believe that I would like to have this proposal first to be dealt with. Look, each thing is time pressure. To make changes to Statement 11, they have to be approved before the end of the year. So that’s what we prepared. I totally sympathize with you. Your proposal may be actually a very good one. I’m afraid there’s not enough time to be put for the next year changes.

PROF. JOHNSON: Vida Johnson again. So we are supposed to have a bylaw vote on whether to require only full professors to serve on T&P, and that vote is to take place in this faculty, correct?

PROF. SLIWA: No, at the December meeting.

PROF. JOHNSON: At the December meeting of the faculty?

PROF. SLIWA: Yes.

PROF. JOHNSON: And then we’re being asked to vote electronically for something that should come after the bylaw vote?

PROF. SLIWA: No. There are two independent bylaw changes. One change of the bylaws regards participation of only full professors on Tenure and Promotion. This is independent of anything else, and this is one vote on December 14th. The other one is the proposal for change to Statement 11, and then if the vote is yes, this requires additional changes to bylaws, and that’s another vote. Voted bylaws have to be done in December. It cannot be done now. The vote for changes for Statement 11 can be done sometime in between today and December 14th electronically.

PROF. JOHNSON: Where’s Mark? Okay, Mark is here. Is there anything that precludes us at this faculty meeting proposing that the vote for the changes to Statement 11 be taken in person rather than electronically? Can this be proposed? This is a very important vote.

PROF. DEVOTO: As far as I know, it depends on what the bylaws say. I don’t think there’s any impediment to –

MS. DUBMAN: When the Executive Committee passed that change last year about electronic voting, there was a stipulation in there. I have to go back and look what the
stipulation was, but – it could be overturned by the faculty. It was written into the – Judith, do you remember what the condition was if the faculty could vote to change it?

PROF. HABER: I don’t remember offhand.

PROF. DEVOTO: As far as I know, there’s no impediment to raising the question even for a vote at this meeting.

PROF. JOHNSON: I move that we vote at this meeting that the changes to Statement 11 be taken with an in-person vote at the next appropriate faculty meeting.

SEVERAL SPEAKERS: Second.

PROF. GONZALEZ: After a second, should there be discussion or a vote? So let’s open it for discussion. And in particular, I would like to hear the rationale for doing it this way instead of electronically.

PROF. JOHNSON: I think you heard the rationale. Put it in the room, and let’s vote. I think that everyone voting electronically will just not have the benefit of coming and showing up and raising their hands, and if need be, making a case.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: I think part of the reason the electronic vote was suggested was that there was a problem, maybe some people in the room might be intimidated from voting in the way they wanted to if they had to do it in person.

PROF. SLIWA: And I think the other issue is that if you look at how many of us there are here, it’s not full faculty. And I think it’s a very important vote, and yes, it’s a burden, but I think it’s better to have even a very decisive vote now, but to have it done by full faculty of the School of Arts and Sciences and Engineering. It’s very simple in my mind.

PROF. MONTEZ: Noe Montez, drama and dance. So given the temperature of the room, I’m wondering if it might be possible when we move to electronic vote to express the sort of temperature that we would not like this measure passed – maybe to conduct a straw poll in the room, and then to have that reflected within the text of the issue that we’re voting on itself.

PROF. GONZALEZ: That, I suppose is possible. In other words, the question that’s going to be put electronically, we could sort of have the information that was discussed during this meeting. I don’t know the mechanics of doing that, but presumably they exist and can be done in a timely manner.
PROF. RAMSEY: Norman Ramsey, computer science. I just agree with Vida that the deliberative process has an enormous value here. And all of us receive a great many emails and a great many requests to do things electronically, and it’s not necessarily going to get 20, 30, 40 minutes of thought and discussion. So I don’t wish to consider an electronic vote necessarily is the best way of making what is indeed a very important decision. I’m sympathetic to the idea that people might be uncomfortable voting their consciences. I’m sure that this faculty has provisions for making a vote by secret ballot.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Let me interject a little bit. Jillian just gave me some rather useful information here. So according to the bylaws, the decision to use remote voting may be reversed by vote of the faculty in such a case. In-person vote on the proposal may not take place before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the AS&E faculty. Which means that any changes to sort of the way we vote have to be voted upon at the next meeting.

MS. DUBMAN: No. If we vote right now, this proposal cannot be voted on until the next meeting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Fulton, I have one question. Who would vote electronically, the professorial faculty, all of us?

PROF. JOHNSON: All, including untenured faculty.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not lecturers?

MS. DUBMAN: All full-time voting eligible faculty members, including non-tenure-track faculty members, yes.

PROF. CRONIN-GOLOMB: There is one other reason that the engineers may not have shown up, and that is because the published procedure is for electronic voting, and perhaps the School of Engineering intends to make its voice heard by electronic vote.

PROF. PENVENNE: With regard to the framing issues, the point about – I think some of us have had our lines changed here, but we opened up with Sam’s question of what this is going to solve. But the way that it’s been framed in our handouts, there were a lot of problems with the way we saw the framing in the slides and the handouts, and the people who are going to electronically vote only have those materials, instead of having the benefit of what’s been raised today. That seems to me to be an incomplete – either there should be no framing materials, or the framing materials should be expanded to take into account I think the very excellent points that have been raised here today.

PROF. WINN: Peter Winn, history. I’d like to propose what I hope Vida would consider
to be a friendly amendment, which is that the vote should be by secret ballot. I think that would take care of the issue of people feeling intimidated. It would have the benefits of everyone being present, can have discussion with their colleagues, and it would also have the benefit of a vote that if people did feel intimidated that they would not have to be concerned. I hope you will accept that.

PROF. JOHNSON: Yes.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Would there be enough time for a secret ballot?

MS. DUBMAN: It would be at the next meeting.

PROF. GONZALEZ: So we’ll hold the vote.

PROF. DEVOTO: Is there further discussion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Someone just called the question.

PROF. DEVOTO: Is there any objection to calling the question? Vote.

PROF. GONZALEZ: The amendment is that the vote on the change to Statement 11 take place during the next faculty meeting by secret ballot. So all in favor? All opposed? So the ayes have it.

PROF. DEVOTO: You have to ask for abstentions.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Abstentions? Okay, so it passes. I guess that closes the discussion.

**Medford Campus Classroom Upgrades Summer ‘17**

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

PROF. GONZALEZ: So the last item on the agenda is a discussion about the Medford campus classroom updates in the summer ‘17 by Lois Stanley.

MS. STANLEY: Hi, everybody. I’m Lois Stanley. I’m Director of Campus Planning. I’m joined here by Paul Stanton, who you all know, and I’m talking for the second time in front of this group. I’m actually quite pleased to be speaking to you about our next round of learning spaces upgrades, classroom upgrades.

Last February, I was here to give you an overview of a new process around upgrades to classrooms on this campus, one that was informed by a comprehensive planning study around our classrooms, and one that integrates planned upgrades related to teaching
technology finishes and of course furniture. This past summer, 24 classrooms were upgraded on this campus for a total of nearly $3 million. There were two major standalone projects, one in Pearson 204 and one in Eaton 212, but there were also 22 classrooms upgraded through this process located in Aidekman, Braker, Miner, and Cabot. You can find images and a scope of work for each of those classrooms on a Trunk site where we’re maintaining something of an archive related to this new process, and that Trunk site is called “Learning Spaces, Planning and Upgrades.”

So today, I want to talk about the next summer. So we have the Learning Spaces Working Group, and Paul and I are members of that, as are representatives of CELT. Alicia was here earlier, TTS, the registrar, and I’m sure others that I’m not thinking of, Fletcher, and of course facilities.

We have come up with a list of 20 rooms targeted for upgrades in the next summer and possibly into – this summer, following that, summers of ’17 and ’18 – basically depending on funding and what we can do all in one summer. And those targeted classrooms are in Anderson – four classrooms targeted in Anderson – two in Halligan, the Crane Room in Paige Hall, the Jackson multipurpose room, three rooms in Sci Tech, and three in Tisch Library. And just a reminder, there’s a major renovation of Robinson 253, the auditorium, that will wrap up this summer, along with the SEC construction.

Also, we have hired ICON. This is an architect who specializes in higher education classrooms who will be part of this year’s process. There are two significant changes in this year’s process, and ultimately, this is a learning experience as well, how we continue with our upgrades.

And the two significant differences are that I’m here a lot earlier. This is November, and I was in front of you last year in February. So that’s one difference I’ll get into the detail on. And then the other difference is that we will be seeking, and we need your help in getting broader input on the potential for upgrades.

We’re starting earlier this year because even before, frankly, we have a sense of the AS&E budget for the new spaces upgrades, but we need to start earlier in order to, frankly, get into the queue for summer construction. The climate in this region is great for the contractors, not so great for us, the owners, and we want to have a contractor on board with competitive pricing by February. So that has us out in front of you this early. And I think this will be a good thing overall.

We’re also casting a wider net for input on what potential upgrades are needed or just general thoughts about our classrooms, and we’ll be doing that in a number of different ways. Our outreach will start with – in a couple of weeks, the week after Thanksgiving, we’ll have a series of work sessions per building, as in there will be a work session all
around the Tisch Library classrooms, another work session focused on the Crane Room.

We’re scheduling these now and reaching out – for those buildings that have host apartments, I’m reaching out to the chairs of those departments. And for the other buildings, invitations will go out to the primary or the permanent teaching faculty that teach in the classrooms in these buildings.

We’ll also post in *Tufts Announcements* about these work sessions. And in each of the classrooms themselves, we’re going to have a poster identifying when there will be a work session. And what I mean by a work session really is with ICON, where they will listen to hopefully the faculty who teach in the classroom, hopefully students, administrators who are involved in these various classrooms, and just listen to thoughts about the future for the classroom, to the issues with the classroom as it exists. ICON is experienced enough that we expect during the work sessions for them to provide feedback on possible solutions for steps going forward. The step after that will be for them to produce the design documents that we hope to have back to the teaching faculty for review either in additional work sessions or as likely online in January.

Speaking of online, TTS communications is developing a website for interaction to basically get the input from a much broader sense of the community. Those who cannot come to the work sessions, we’d love just to get your thoughts. We did this a few years back with the Learning Spaces Planning Study, and actually we got quite a bit of interesting input, and we’d like to get that specific to the classrooms on this year’s agenda, on the next two years’ agenda.

That website will again also be posted in *Tufts Announcements* and will be on this poster made to the classrooms. And then lastly, in January, the designs, the proposed designs, will be out there for review, and again, we hope to get feedback so that by February we’re out to bid. So maybe I went too quickly, but I know that you all probably want to leave, and I want to allow time for questions.

PROF. ROSENBERG: Joel Rosenberg again, ILCS and Judaic Studies. Several years ago in Olin Center, they put in a change in the audio-visual setup, which prior to that, it worked brilliantly. I loved it. And everything could be done with the wall controls. And my most recent attempt to use it, which is already now about a year ago, was just – I’m even calling one of the members of the department who were tech savvy, because we were unable to get a three-minute clip from a video shown. So I would say if improvements go in, please be aware that you might be doing something that is retrograde rather than going forward.

I also teach in Room 310, Tisch. Since you mentioned Tisch, I wanted to put in a plea. The room there, I call it now the screening room from hell. In any case, there are a lot of
problems, outmoded equipment and just inability to get the parts of the system talking to one another. Anyway, I just wanted to urge that that be given very careful consideration.

MS. STANLEY: Is that Olin 007 you were referring to, the first one?

PROF. ROSENBERG: No, it’s 310, Olin. Officially, it’s slated for a group of 20 people or less.

MS. STANLEY: One of the upper floor classrooms, okay.

PROF. ROSENBERG: Yeah. I would love to teach in 314 or 315, which I’ve done in the past, but it wasn’t available this time around. Anyway, I just wanted to put in that complaint.

PROF. GARDULSKI: Anne Gardulski from earth and ocean sciences. I’m pleased to hear about all the inputs you’re planning for this, but I’m just wondering to what extent the Faculty Campus Planning and Development Committee gets involved in all of this. It seems like a natural group to be an ongoing partner with this.

MS. STANLEY: Right, and actually, a few of the faculty committees are aware, or should be aware of this list of classrooms targeted for next summer, the summer after that. I provided a memo to the CPDC. Normally, I’m in front of them as well. So in that memo, I believe it was late October, mid-October – if you’ll help me Juliet – so they’re aware of the list of classrooms, and we did get feedback on last year’s process. Frankly, the adjustments to this year’s process are in good part due to the feedback that we received from the CPDC on lessons learned.

DEAN STANTON: And I’m reminding you that a year ago, we voted on a change in the charge to the faculty IT Committee, and so now the IT Committee has responsibility for oversight for classrooms. And there is overlap with the membership of the Learning Spaces Committee and that IT Committee – Paul Bergen serves on both – so that information can flow freely back and forth. So that’s part of their charge as well.

PROF. SCHWARTZBERG: Sharon Schwartzberg, occupational therapy. Thank you, Lois, for your report. I have a practical question regarding 574 Boston Ave. about parking and where will all these construction vehicles park when they’re about to do their work, because we have a severe problem with parking, for guest speakers. We have summer school programs going on. And it’s getting extremely difficult to be a good citizen and park in staff parking.

MS. STANLEY: My office is in your neck of the woods, too, so I’m aware of the parking issues there. We haven’t thought that far. That’s part of execution. So now that
we’re aware, I can let the project manager know. I can tell you that the SEC will be wrapped up by the time these classroom upgrades begin, so it could be a switch of trucks, but it’s nowhere near, nowhere near the amount of trades will be involved in the classroom upgrades that have been involved in SEC. That has been an extraordinary project in terms of additional folks on campus. I envision relief for you in the next few months, I would hope, by March, April.

PROF. FUHRMAN: Juliet Fuhrman, biology. Thanks for all this information and for this incredibly important work. I just want to make one point. Most of these renovations have resulted in a lower capacity for each of the rooms. When you’re reaching out for faculty input, if you could make that targeted size available, you’ll get I think a more robust response. People will understand what the new purpose of each room would be, and I think it will help people to envision whether they can fit their classes in there or not.

MS. STANLEY: So I’m glad you brought that up, but actually, that’s not true. Most of these classroom upgrades have not resulted in fewer seats, to be frank. You’re referring to right-sizing, and part of the study suggested that Tufts square footage per seat in a class was extraordinarily low compared to the industry or the higher education standards which are trying to get 25 to 30 square feet per seat today to enable flexibility for different ways of teaching, whereas we are as low as 10 square feet per seat.

So you can imagine on a winter day how difficult that is to get between seats. So the study did recommend right-sizing, Juliet, absolutely. But in execution, we have found that to be a very tricky wicket. So what we’ve been doing in these work sessions is putting that targeted number out there. And actually, I’m not even sure that we did that. In the case of Braker, for example, last year, no change in the number of seats.

But in the case of Miner, we have worked with the philosophy faculty, and I believe we had representatives from history and from English as well, and two out of the five classroom upgrades in Miner with the support I would say of philosophy, in particular, the host department, did get right-sized; not all the way down to 25 square feet per seat, but to fewer seats. And that was to enable that flexibility, which in the work session was brought up by the faculty, in my opinion, as something that was desired.

So we’re not at the point where we’re shoving that down your throats. I would love to see right-sizing everything, but that’s just simply not happening. But we will be very clear about what that looks like.

PROF. ROMERO: Michael Romero in biology. Just as you’re reaching out to faculty, I don’t know how you’re identifying which faculty are using which classrooms, but I know that the classroom I get assigned changes every year, and so I may not be in the
classroom that you’re renovating this semester, but next semester, I might be.

And so if you could look back over maybe five or six years of who has used any classroom, or find people to reach out to and ask is there a good chance I might be in there in the future.

MS. STANLEY: So I looked over the past two years to see who had taught two or more classes in the past two years, so that’s a little more onerous, but I’ll give that a shot. One other way I might do that, though, is there a way to communicate to the faculty outside of Tufts Announcements where I list the work sessions that are taking place so that you’re aware? You may want to attend a work session for a Tisch Library – thank you, Jillian.

PROF. NATHANS: Heather Nathans, drama and dance. So I know we’ll follow up about our discussions on Jackson, but I have a question about whether on this Trunk site it’s possible to post timelines, because it sounds like your timeline is accelerated this year, so that faculty who might want input into this process can also be mindful of when they need to be attentive and sort of the pace at which things are moving. Because as we all know, with construction projects, there can be those silent phases, like in development, where nothing seems to be happening, but things are accelerating. So would it be possible to include that information?

MS. STANLEY: That’s a great idea, and we can do that. We’ll do that on the website that Tufts Communications is putting together. Thanks for that suggestion.

PROF. GONZALEZ: Time for one last question.

MS. STANLEY: Thank you, and as always, I am here for questions about learning spaces.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

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