

Meeting of the University Faculty Senate
Wednesday, May 8, 2019, 8:00 am
Medford – Coolidge Room (Host Site)
Boston – MEB (Sackler) 802
Grafton - Dean’s Conference Room

The University Faculty Senate met at 8:00 am on Wednesday, May 8, 2019 in the Coolidge Room Ballou Hall, Medford campus, with remote locations in Boston and Grafton. Present at the meeting were John Castellot (TUSM), Brent Cochran (TUSM), Misha Eliasziw (PHCM), Janet Forrester (TUSM), Roger Galburt (Dental), Fulton Gonzalez (A&S), Eulogio Guzman (SMFA), Vida Johnson (A&S), Olympia Karacosta (TUSDM), Anne Mahoney (A&S), Will Masters (Friedman), Douglas Matson (Engineering), Nirupa Matthan (HNRCA), Mitch McVey (A&S), Ali Muftu (TUSDM), Dominique Penninck (Cummings), Pearl Robinson (A&S), Mary Jane Shultz (A&S), Chris Swan (Engineering), Roger Tobin (A&S), Norbert Wilson (Friedman), and Henry Wortis (TUSM). *Ex officio* member Vice Provost Kevin Dunn was also present. President Melissa Mazan presided over the meeting. Guest Simin Meydani, Vice Provost for Research, was also in attendance to present to the Senate.

Regrets: Jenny Aker (Fletcher), Gillian Beamer (Cummings), Leila Fawaz (Fletcher), Rob Jacob (Engineering), Jette Knudsen (Fletcher), Lee Sillin (TUSM), Maher Tabba (TUSM), and Provost ad interim Deborah Kochevar.

1. Roll call and approval of minutes from April 10
 - a. Motion and second; passes unanimously
2. OVPR response to Research & Scholarship Committee recommendations – Simin Meydani, Vice Provost for Research
 - a. Presentation overview (see appended slides)
 - b. Discussion
 - i. How will updates on progress be distributed?
 1. Announcements, website, happy to return to Senate for progress report
 2. Slide presentation can be forwarded to faculty and posted to website as
 - ii. Suggestion to provide funding assistance for preliminary work necessary for obtaining grants
3. Committee on Educational Affairs and Policy - Henry Wortis
 - a. Consensual relations policy (see appended draft)
 - i. Recommended suggestions will go to administration for finalization, will be voted by academic council
 - ii. Question about definition of student employees
 - iii. Suggestion to examine “enter into” language – does this intentionally exclude preexisting relationships?
 - iv. Concern expressed over rushing proposal through too quickly
 1. Kevin will look into guidelines released by OEO which address this issue
 2. New proposal does not speak specifically to enforcement
 3. Senate would like to see proposal in final form before it goes to Academic Council
 4. Vote will be taken at June meeting
 - b. Contracts with 3rd party vendors – discussion postponed to June meeting
4. Nominations Committee – John Castellot
 - a. Officer slate will be ready in about a week, in preparation for vote at June meeting
 - b. Call for volunteers for Nominations Committee so that it may operate with only one representative from the Executive Committee
 - i. Suggestion to have committee chairs serve as Nom Comm
 - ii. Vida Johnson is willing to serve as NomComm chair

- c. For discussion: presidency terms – single year or multiple years?
 - i. Institute President-elect/Past-President roles?
 - ii. Email John with opinions
- d. Suggestion to hold discussions in the next academic year regarding governing structure for following year

5. Faculty Affairs – Chris Swan

- a. Overview of the initial draft document on conditions of employment for tenured faculty:
<https://wikis.uit.tufts.edu/confluence/display/FacultySenate/Meaning+of++Tenure+Documents>
(Currently only accessible to Senate members.)
- b. This discussion will be ongoing into the next academic year
- c. "Meaning of tenure" review arose in response to changes in employment and space allocations to tenured faculty in TUSM.
- d. Goal is to define the responsibilities, rights and obligations of all institution stakeholders.
 - i. In the TUSM case, the Dean introduced and the Provost and President accepted a plan to reduce tenured faculty employment to part time at lower salaries.
 - 1. Raised questions about the clarity of the TUSM policy, relative to the university and Trustee policy, especially regarding the meaning of "economic security" or "financial exigency", and hence alignment between School and University policies.
- e. For future discussions, input is needed from the senate regarding:
 - i. Possibly inviting Paul Hattis, who as past chair of the TUSM grievance committee has experience dealing with these issues, to participate in a future UFS meeting;
 - ii. Requesting a summary from the administration of their response to the TUSM case, and other documents that would help clarify the meaning of economic security and financial exigency as they affect the terms of employment for tenured faculty at Tufts;
 - iii. Whether the documents on tenure made available to the Senate would be made available to the faculty at large.
- f. This item will be on the June agenda.

6. Adjourn at 9:34