

**University Faculty Senate
Minutes of Meeting
March 14, 2018**

The University Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, March 14, 2018 in Cabot 702, Medford campus, with remote locations in Boston and Grafton. Present were Gillian Beamer, John Castellot, Toni Chayes, Ginny Chomitz, Brent Cochran, Janet Forrester, Roger Galburt, Fulton Gonzalez, Eulogio Guzman, Andrew Hoffman, Vida Johnson, Nirupa Matthan, Mitch McVey, Ali Muftu, Lynne Pepall, Melissa Mazan, Jeff Hopwood, Chris Swan, Larry Weiss, Will Masters, Jes Salacuse, Larry Weiss, Norbert Wilson, Roman Schumann, and Henry Wortis. Vice Provost Kevin Dunn and Program Administrator Melissa Stevenson were present from the provost's office.

Senators Boris Bacanurschi, Andrew Hoffman, and Lee Sillin were unable to attend.

Senate President Jes Salacuse opened the meeting with a welcome to the senators. The minutes of the February 14, 2018 Senate meeting were approved.

The committees then gave their standing reports.

John Castellot reported for the Committee on Nominations. The committee is forwarding the names of Gillian Beamer, Sarah Folta, and one other faculty member as nominees to serve on the Bridging Differences taskforce. They are waiting to hear back from Provost David Harris as to whether or not he will accept all three nominations.

The committee was approached by Vice President of Human Resources Julien Carter for a nomination to his committee for the review of requests for proposals (RPF). The nominations committee was looking for faculty to serve and asked Arts & Sciences faculty member Melissa McNerney, who agreed to serve on the committee. John Castellot and Lynne Pepall will be the liaison to the Senate for Melissa McNerney who is also happy to come speak with the full Senate about the progress of the RFP committee.

President Tony Monaco reached out to the Senate to ask for representatives on the provost search committee. He requested at least two nominees from each school who are senior faculty members and well known both externally and at the university. These faculty would be ambassadors to the candidates and so he is looking for broad representation across the university. The search committee's faculty representation may skew more heavily towards Arts, Sciences, and Engineering faculty due to the size of the school and its student body. Senators should notify their faculty and let them know that they should solicit nominees. The Executive committee of Arts & Sciences is interested in having one of their members as a nominee and Vida Johnson is working on that. The Cummings School and Dental School have already forwarded their nominees and other Schools should continue to send their recommendations directly to the nominations committee.

There was discussion as to whether or not the names of nominees should be sent directly from each School to the president, as opposed to the Senate's committee on nominations. Senators agreed that the function of this committee going forward will be the mechanism by which faculty

nominations should be given to the administration for faculty representation on university-wide committees. John Castellot's assumption is that Tony Monaco wants the nominations to come from the Senate. The Executive committee meets next week and will forward the list of nominations to the president.

Chris Swan reported on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Affairs who are currently evaluating the formal grievance processes on campus and formulating a statement on how to create one grievance process for the university with the understanding that schools will still be able to have their own process. The committee hopes to have a draft proposal on the April Senate agenda and then the Senate can weigh in and move forward on figuring out how to implement this. The proposal is intended to be accepted as a university grievance policy.

Chris Swan then moved on to discuss the Ombudsperson proposal provided to the senators. He thanked the committee for working on this. The proposal is for a university-wide ombudsperson who would be impartial and act as a source of information and guidance to support the grievance process. Below are the proposed desired characteristics of an ombudsperson.

Ombudsperson Characteristics :

It is desired that Ombudspersons have the following characteristics or experiences, based on their academic history:

1. Former or existing faculty member of Tufts University with at least 10 years of experience as a faculty member, though not all years need to be at Tufts.
2. Committed to remaining as ombudsperson for at least two years, subject to Faculty Senate annual review.
3. Have appropriate experience to serve all Tufts University campuses; e.g., have interacted with faculty; in teaching, research, or service experiences, from three or more schools.
4. Have evidence of university efforts (teaching, scholarship or service) that required interactions with various components of Tufts administration, faculty, or staff; e.g., university-wide committees or taskforce(s)
5. A commitment to undergo training and certification as an Ombudsperson through the International Ombudsman Association.
6. Have office and personnel management experience, especially since they will be managing an Ombuds Office

The recommendation is to move forward to the Provost's office for consideration of this proposal. The committee wants the Senate to be the body that makes a recommendation to the administration.

There was discussion about whether graduate students should be included as a population who would have access to the ombudsperson. If so, graduate student bodies at each of the Schools should be consulted so that they can tell us what their issues and concerns might be. There isn't one general policy at other universities as to whether graduate students are included in the ombudsperson's duties. The unionization of graduate students is also a concern and would need to be considered. Several senators felt that the first iteration of this policy should not include graduate students but that it should be explored in the future. There was additional discussion

about the operational aspects of the ombudsperson hire and suggestions on changes to be made to the proposal, which the committee will incorporate.

Larry Weiss reported on behalf of the Committee on Budget Planning and Development. The committee is having a meeting tomorrow with Vice President for Finance Tom McGurty and Executive Director of the University Budget Jim Hurley to discuss how the university budget operates and how the committee can partner with the administration going forward.

Melissa Mazan reported on behalf of the Educational Affairs committee. The committee appreciates Kevin Dunn's participation and their work is a good example of how the Senate and the administration can effectively work together. The committee has made a lot of progress on their proposal regarding the University College/College of Special Studies and hopes to have a full proposal to present to the Senate at the next meeting. The proposal includes the plan for the University College to oversee different types of programs. Currently there are a number of successful programs running at Tufts that might come under University College including summer programs for pre-university students. The committee is in the midst defining what types of programs will fall under the College, what could be successful and how to delineate what they would want this College to oversee. There are some financial exigencies being placed on the university across the Schools and the committee recognizes that this could be a source of revenue generation but wants to be careful regarding how the governance over academic programs works. The academic mission of the university should be at the forefront of this plan. The proposal will detail how the administrative governance body of the University College would look.

Nirupa Matthan reported on behalf of the Committee on Research and Scholarship, which meets monthly. She thanked the members of the committee for being very engaged. The committee was invited to meet with Dr. Al Robbath, the chair of the AS&E faculty research committee. Professor Robbath talked about issues with RAS system, data warehouse, and the pre- and post awards process. The committee reiterated that they would bring up these issues when they meet with the Vice President of Research Simin Meydani.

The committee had a very productive meeting with Simin Meydani where they discussed having senate representation on the research committees involved with the strategic planning process. Simin expressed concern that there wasn't as much interest from faculty to participate and they agreed that requests for faculty representation on the strategic planning committees should now come from the Senate. As a result of the meeting, Mitch McVey and Ginny Chomitz agreed to serve on a working group to address issues that faculty are having with the research process. The committee hopes to continue their positive partnership with Simin Meydani.

Jes Salacuse then asked the Senate members for feedback regarding Simin Meydani's research strategy presentation at the last full Senate meeting. There is faculty confusion about how the university qualifies for Research one (R1) status, how we keep it, and why we are in danger of losing it. It might be of general interest to faculty to learn more about this through the Committee on Research and Scholarship. Kevin Dunn offered that the Office of Institutional Research has similar data that they will be presenting to the administration. Director of Institutional Research Jessica Sharkness is willing to come talk with the Senate regarding this data. Simin's

presentation gave senators an opportunity to go back to their faculty to keep them informed about important matters effecting the university. Senate President Jes Salacuse stated this is exactly the type of information that should be to the senate.

Senate President Jes Salacuse sent a note out to the Senate regarding elections of new senators, with an indication of whose terms are ending. Officers need to be elected for the next academic year. Senators decided that they will continue to meet on Wednesdays, 8:00am-9:30am. There are some conflicts with schedules for the next semester so those who have classes during that time are free to resign if necessary and the School will have to name a replacement. The first order of business in the fall meeting will be for the Senate to review the meeting times and see if there is a better time slot to meet.

John Castellot brought a motion to the Senate regarding a plan being put in place by the medical school has an impact on tenure and pay for their faculty. One such part of the plan states that faculty must have a 50% full-time equivalency in order to keep lab space and this plan was imposed by the administration last July. Once the plan was in place, faculty grievances began. According to John Castellot, the administration may state that faculty had plenty of input on the plan but he believes that they did not. Brent Cochran agreed with John and added that there was a committee created to propose a new salary plan, which John Castellot chaired. In the end, the committee's recommendations were ignored by administration. Additionally, there is a grievance process in progress but this resolution asks for a moratorium on these changes while the grievance process is being finalized. For those faculty who are in danger of losing their labs it is difficult to reconstitute a lab once it is shut down. John Castellot is asking the Senate to send a resolution to the administration requesting an immediate moratorium on these tenure-altering policies. John does not see this specifically as a medical school issue because tenure exists at five of the Schools. This is an issue regarding the removal of the economic security clause which could have an effect on tenure for people in other schools. He requests that the Senate accepts the resolution that he has presented.

Andrew Hoffman puts forth a motion that the senate recommends a moratorium is put on implementing this policy in order for the Senate to review the conditions and the implications in order to more clearly understand the policy and its impact. After discussion, Andrew Hoffman offers to retract the motion but believes that this is an opportunity for the Senate to state that they want more information because there is enough concern about the degradation of tenure. John Castellot adds that the Friedman School Dean had a similar proposal but withdrew it not because of a possible impact on tenure but because of employment contracts.

The committee on Faculty Affairs offers to dedicate the time to look at this issue and report back. Kevin Dunn cautions that if the Senate votes for this moratorium that they are in effect telling a Dean what he or she can or cannot do. The Provost's office is in favor of reviewing tenure revocation policies and the meaning of tenure. A senator questions whether this is really more of a School budgeting issue and the Senate has agreed not to get involved in School-specific issues. Another senator reminds the group that the motion is to simply pass the resolution for a moratorium until further review can be done, not telling the Dean what he or she can or cannot do. Many senators felt that they do not know enough about this specific situation to pass a resolution.

Full text of the resolution put forward by John Castellot:

I wanted to give you a heads-up on a resolution I have been asked to present to the University Faculty Senate by approximately two dozen tenured faculty at TUSM under “Other Business” tomorrow morning at our meeting. Understanding that a resolution of this import cannot be voted upon at the first meeting at which it is introduced, my colleagues nonetheless wish to initiate an urgent and important discussion of the meaning of tenure across our University. More specifically, they note that a substantial fraction--perhaps 50% or more--of tenured TUSM faculty have been or will be impacted by July 1 of this year, and that a large number of tenured faculty have filed formal grievances against the policies. They are requesting a moratorium on implementing the potentially irreversible policies until these critically important issues have been settled.

Please note that I am not one of the grievants nor am I affected in any way by the recently implements policies at TUSM. I am presenting this as my duty as a Senator representing TUSM. However, I strongly believe that the underlying principle of what tenure means across our University affects all of our Schools, and especially the five Schools (A+S, SoE, TUSM/Sackler, and Friedman) that have active tenure policies.

*Best regards,
John*

Resolution

“That the University Faculty Senate strongly supports the institution of tenure as stated in the Bylaws of the University and its individual Schools, and that tenure exists at several Schools of the University and thus is clearly within the scope of the responsibilities of the University Faculty Senate, and that there are immediate and irreversible consequences of recently implemented Tufts University School of Medicine and Friedman School policies on the ability of tenured faculty to carry out their functions, and that active and formal grievance procedure are currently ongoing regarding the recently imposed salary and research space policies, Be it RESOLVED that The University Faculty Senate requests an immediate moratorium on implementation of current tenure-altering policies until all aspects of said policies have been resolved.”

The Senate did not pass the resolution, opting instead to seek more information and clarification about the situation at the medical school, which they will review in a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Mazan
Secretary of the University Faculty Senate