

**University Faculty Senate
Minutes of Meeting
June 13, 2018**

The University Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, June 13, 2018 in the Room 702 of the Cabot International Center, Medford campus, with remote locations in Boston and Grafton. Present at the meeting were Gillian Beamer (Cummings), John Castellot (TUSM), Ginny Chomitz (PHCM), Misha Eliasziw (PHCM), Roger Galburt (TUSDM), Fulton Gonzalez (A&S), Rob Jacob (A&S), Olympia Karacosta (TUSDM), Anne Mahoney (A&S), Nirupa Matthan (HNRCA), Melissa Mazan (Cummings), Mitch McVey (A&S), Ali Muftu (TUSDM), Lynne Pepall (A&S), Pearl Robinson (A&S), Roman Schumann (TUSM), Lee Sillin (TUSM), Chris Swan (Engineering), Roger Tobin (A&S), and Henry Wortis (TUSM). President Jeswald Salacuse presided over the meeting. *Ex officio* members Interim Provost Deborah Kochevar and Vice Provost Kevin Dunn were also in attendance.

After attendance was called and the senators were welcomed to the meeting, a motion was called to approve the minutes of the May 9, 2018 meeting. The motion was approved.

The standing committees then gave their reports.

John Castellot reported on behalf of the Committee on Nominations. A recommended slate of officers for AY18-19 was distributed with the agenda for this meeting, along with an explanation of how the committee arrived at the recommendation. Additional nominations will be accepted from the floor. Elections will take place at the September meeting, and the newly-elected president will then preside over the rest of that meeting. John reminded the Senate that only one person per school is permitted on the Executive Committee. The Nominations Committee report is appended.

Next, Chris Swan reported on the Committee on Faculty Affairs. They have been examining the tenure policy, and have not yet met to discuss the short-term issue presented by the Provost (see appended letter from Provost ad interim Deborah Kochevar). They have also been discussing the ombudsperson recommendation process, and will be forwarding a proposal to the Provost's office. Chris plans to serve as liaison between the Provost's office and the Senate on this matter, and a letter will be distributed shortly.

The Faculty Affairs committee plans to present a general statement for approval in the Senate regarding a formal grievance process common across all schools. They will recommend general guidelines that schools may fine-tune to their needs, and propose to convene a meeting of chairs and school grievance committees to obtain additional input. The future ombudsperson will be responsible for collecting best practices and will be involved in the creation of the standards that will govern school grievance processes. There is no specific timeline in place for the process. Following a question as to whether the group is considering a university-wide grievance panel, Chris explained that it has been discussed, but such a group would only hear certain kinds of cases. Additional discussion pointed out that the purpose of an ombudsperson is to be independent of other structures and help address issues before they become grievances. The question was also posed as to whether involving the ombudsperson in the development of the grievance process could potentially compromise his/her neutrality. Chris closed his report by mentioning that there is a commitment from the university to create the ombuds office, but the scope is yet to be determined.

Lynne Pepall spoke on behalf of the Committee on Budget Planning and Development. She noted that the TUSM question presented to the Senate (see appended document) will likely be addressed in the fall, since attendance on the committee is now affected by summer absences. The originators present at this Senate meeting agreed to defer the issue to the fall to be taken up with the new committee, which will be appointed in September when the new executive committee makes its committee assignments. Lynne agreed to forward the report to the appropriate administration for consideration.

Next to report was Nirupa Matthan on behalf of the Committee on Research and Scholarship. Nirupa announced that they have a new member, Jette Knudsen, who will be replacing Larry Weiss. At their most recent and upcoming meetings they are reviewing their progress as a committee, as well as updating the website. They feel that they have successfully made themselves known to administration, and now have a committee member on a working group in the Office of the Vice Provost for Research.

The final report was the Committee on Educational Affairs and Policy, presented by Melissa Mazan. One of their primary topics of discussion has been the establishment of a University College, for which a recommendation has been distributed to the Senate (see appended report). The committee is recommending that the UC house programs that fall under two divisions: firstly, a degree-granting academic arm that would maintain the same high standards expected of all Tufts programs; and secondly, a non-degree, revenue-generating arm that would oversee a number of programs that already exist, as well as looking to reach out to new or underserved populations. Oversight of both divisions would rest with a standing committee of elected faculty, led by a dedicated dean.

Kevin Dunn then presented in more detail about the proposed structure of a University College, noting that it will need its own governance structure with its own dean. Interviews are already underway for a Pre-college director. The oversight committee will be reflective of the makeup of the Faculty Senate, and will be responsible for defining a standard faculty who will vote on degrees. One senator mentioned the importance of looking into what sort of accreditation will be required for graduate degrees.

One of the primary questions under discussion is the justification for putting two very different proposed divisions under the single purview of a University College. The Educational Affairs committee has discussed this matter extensively, and concluded that it seems more financially practical to combine them, and to centralize guardianship over resources that will be drawn from various units across the university. The business plan predicts that the UC will be very lucrative for schools; existing Division II programs are already bringing in revenue. Schools will maintain faculty oversight over programs, and they will have the benefit of centralized marketing and ancillary services through the UC. The purpose of the University College is to create an architecture for the future, providing a place to propose cross-discipline programs, fostering entrepreneurship, new ideas, and collaborations, all while maintaining the integrity of new additions.

A question was raised as to whether University College will be an official college of Tufts, and as such, will report to the Senate and have representation in Senate membership. It will be helpful to look at similar structures at other institutions such as Harvard Extension, Brown, Columbia, University of Chicago, though these institutions grant more generalized degrees. The governance structure should be the focus of the Senate, while the administrative structure has not yet been determined.

The Educational Affairs and Policy committee will have one more meeting to distill the feedback from the Senate. They asked for the approval of the Senate to move forward, and Senate membership showed strong consensus. The committee will flesh out the structure of faculty governance and report back to the Senate early in the next academic year.

In other business, there was a suggestion that in the minutes each senator's name should be appended with the appropriate school. President Jes Salacuse expressed his pleasure at having served as the Senate President for the past year.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 am.

Hi All,

The Nominations Committee would like to propose the following slate:

President: Melissa Mazan (Vet)
Vice Prez: Vida Johnson (A+S)
Secretary: Will Masters (Friedman)
At-Large: Chris Swan (SoE) and John Castellot (Med)

A prerequisite for the slate was being a current member of the Senate. Brief rationale for these choices:

Both Jes and Lynne are leaving ExecCom, and NomCom feels that retaining the other 3 current members is useful for continuity, especially during these first few years of the Senate.

Melissa represents an excellent, experienced choice for President. Not being from A+S is also a plus as it will reinforce the concept that the Senate is about all the Tufts Schools. Our thought is that after this year, this consideration would no longer be important.

Having just mentioned A+S, NomCom also felt it was important for the Senate itself and for the large A+S faculty to have someone from A+S on ExecCom—in fact, it is hard to imagine a time in the future when no one from A+S would sit on ExecCom. I personally nominated Vida because of her long involvement in faculty governance (including membership on the committee that set up the Senate) and her willingness to evolve from an A+S-centric to a University-wide point of view. A small plus is that she also would be the first arts/humanities member of ExecCom, which by its very nature will always be heavily science- and social science-weighted.

Will Masters reluctantly agreed to serve as Secretary—we tried to get Norbert Wilson from Friedman to do it but he declined. Will's reluctance had mostly to do with the fact that 3 members of the slate are also members of NomCom, which may not be the best optics but is readily explicable. Will straddles the Boston and Medford campuses and brings another school into the ExecCom. The plan is to add Dental and/or Sackler next year so that all schools will have members of this committee within the first 2 or at most 3 years.

Please let me know your comments and thoughts!

Best,
John



Dear Professor Salacuse,

Thank you and the other members of the Faculty Senate for your thoughtfully-worded Recommendation received in your letter of May 25, 2018.

I understand that it is recommended that “no major changes in policy and practices that substantially affect the ability for tenured faculty to carry out their responsibilities at any of the individual Schools be made” before the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate has considered the meaning and role of tenure at the university. I look forward to taking part in these discussions. I strongly support our Academic Freedom, Tenure and Retirement policy and understand the importance of tenure for maintaining a strong and independent faculty.

The Provost’s office has planned for the past few months to put before the Senate policies on program discontinuance, tenure revocation for cause, and consensual relations. We will provide these draft policies to you in the next few weeks and ask that these be placed on the Senate agenda for consideration.

I cannot, however, take steps to delay the implementation of the two plans already moving forward at the School of Medicine. These plans, long in development, are part of an individual school’s effort to handle serious financial difficulties, and it is the dean’s responsibility to ensure the financial health of his or her school.

I take very seriously the Senate’s decision to make this recommendation, and I am dedicated to working with it on the larger questions surrounding the institution of tenure at the university.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Deborah T. Kochevar".

Deborah T. Kochevar, DVM, PhD, DACVCP
Provost and Senior Vice President *ad interim*
Tufts University

Response to the Budget Committee Report of 3-23-18

We, the basic science senators from TUSM and the Sackler school, feel compelled to respond to the recent budget committee report. In the report, the administration assigns the main share of the blame for the deficit at the Medical School to the basic science faculty. For instance, "One major element has been a decline in the productivity of faculty research, funding, and teaching". We find the report misleading, inaccurate and lacking appropriate context.

First, we will address the issue of faculty productivity. While the assertion that 23% of the tenured faculty have no funding is accurate, this has to be judged against the overall 18.7% grant success rate for NIH grants currently (The funding rate per application cycle is considerably worse -- typically <10%). From this point of view, the faculty are considerably overperforming. Moreover, we believe that the unfunded faculty number does not include grants from foundations and research contracts with companies, so the unfunded number is really much lower. An additional consideration is that our core facilities are much less robust than most of our competitors. Nevertheless, actual research dollars brought in by the faculty has remained remarkably constant over the last decade given the funding environment, although there has been a 20-25% erosion of purchasing power due to inflation.

During this time, however, the number of students taught by basic science faculty has more than doubled, from 160 in 2008 to 330 in 2018. This is because the basic science faculty created and are the primary teachers in two new master's programs (Masters of Biomedical Science and Masters of Pharmacology) which generate a profit of approximately \$ 5 million/yr. This new income makes up entirely for any loss of salary support during this period and has increased the teaching and administrative workload of the basic science faculty substantially. Several basic science faculty also teach in the newly created Physician Assistant program as well. Note that the 70+ basic science tenure track faculty have the same teaching and administrative burden as medical schools with three- to four-fold larger faculties.

The claim that 90% of the Medical School teaching is done by the clinical faculty is also misleading. The course directors and lecturers from the basic science faculty make up over 50% of these responsibilities during the first two (non-clinical) years medical school. A key point is the way that TUSM calculates this number. It makes every hour equivalent. Thus, a clinician who has a single student sit in on a patient visit is credited with one hour, and a basic scientist who prepares and delivers a one-hour lecture for 200 students is also credited with one hour. Thus, by this faulty rubric, clinicians are said to do 90% of the teaching.

Faculty salaries are not the main source of the deficit. There are in reality multiple causes of the deficit that are much greater in magnitude. One is the loss of income for the foreign medical graduate placement program which had brought in about \$10 million/year. As the result of a national decision, these foreign graduates must now go through the Residency Match which has largely replaced private placement programs such as that offered by TUSM. This drastically reduced this income. (Nevertheless, the long-time head of this TUSM office was recruited to Boston University and created new lucrative programs.). Second, the accreditation

agencies have put pressure on us to limit tuition increases and reduce student debt. Historically, TUSM has been the most expensive medical school in the country. The mandated change has been quite costly. In addition, the defection of Baystate Medical Center to Boston University Medical School as a clinical training site has led to the medical school to increase payments to clinical affiliates to replace and retain these training sites. As with the loss of the foreign residents program, this loss was foreseeable years in advance. Finally, in calculating the “costs” of resources that are the responsibility of the research faculty, TUSM includes the costs of recruiting new faculty. Note that typical bookkeeping would consider these as investments, not operating costs that are the responsibility of the existing faculty. The above are the major sources of the current deficient, not faculty salaries.

At the Medical School, we have had budget presentations from the Dean, the Execution Assistant Dean, and the financial officers of the University in the last year and do not believe that they would dispute our numbers.

Finally, it should be noted that the Dean has refused to allow representatives from the TUSM Faculty Senate to serve on the committees set up to address the deficit. Thus, taken together, we believe the basic science faculty rather than being the principle source of the deficit, have contributed substantially to solving the problem while simultaneously undergoing disruptive department reorganizations, salary cuts, and loss of lab space.

Brent Cochran
Henry Wortis
John Castellot

For the Faculty Senate Meeting of Wednesday, June 13, 2018

Members of the Educational Affairs and Policy Committee

Chair: Melissa Mazan
Janet Forrester
Eulogio Guzman
Pearl Robinson
Henry Wortis

Ad hoc committee members

Sergio Fantini
Mary Davis
Kevin Dunn

The Educational Affairs and Policy Committee, with *ad hoc* members Mary Davis and Sergio Fantini, and Vice-Provost Kevin Dunn, has met multiple times to discuss the establishment of a University College. After plentiful discussion, we decided to put forward the following statement for the Faculty Senate Meeting:

As the EAP committee, we recommend the establishment of a University College to operate, administer and govern university programs which will fall under two divisions – the first a degree-granting entity that will provide a means for establishment and maintenance of academic programs spanning more than two schools and which do not naturally reside in one school, and the second a non-degree-granting entity as an umbrella for programs that offer the opportunity to reach new and under-served populations of learners and to generate revenue. Many of these programs already exist on the main campus, including English language learning for foreigners, pre-K-8 outreach ‘summer programs’, pre-college summer programs, executive education, and credit-bearing courses that are not associated with a degree-granting program. While the main purview of the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large is the maintenance of the high standards that are expected of a Tufts University degree through the first division for university-wide, cross-disciplinary programs of study, the non-degree-granting division would still be the interest of, and under the academic domain of the faculty.

We recommend further that oversight of both programs and associated faculty would rest with a standing committee of faculty; membership in this committee would be decided by election at each of the schools, would be representative of each school, and would assure academic integrity and quality control. We also recommend that the overall governing structure of such a University College be led by a Dean who is of appropriate academic standing. It is beyond the current scope of the EAP committee to draw up extensive bylaws at this time. Nonetheless, while both the degree-granting and non-degree-granting programs might reasonably include faculty, courses and other resources from existing departmental programs, it seems clear to us that the autonomy, resources and revenue belonging to each

School and department should remain with them; this implies that new programs would be obliged to work through each faculty's Chair at other university schools to ensure equitable use of resources, including faculty.