

Preliminary Report of the Faculty Governance Working Group

This report sets down the initial findings and recommendations of the Faculty Governance Working Group on the creation of a University Faculty Senate at Tufts University. After further consultations with the Provost and faculties of the individual Schools, the Working Group will submit a Final Report.

I. Background

Toward the end of the 2014-15 academic year, Provost David Harris set in motion a process to establish a Working Group on Faculty Governance consisting of two representatives from each of faculties of the University's eight schools on the three campuses. The Working Group's members were selected by the individual faculties of the Universities eight schools. The mission of the Working Group was to consider the nature and advisability of establishing a university-wide body of faculty to participate in University governance. Three considerations appear to have prompted this initiative: 1) Unlike most large research universities, Tufts has no university-wide deliberative body of faculty to consider and advise on issues that transcends the concerns of individual school and in this respect seems an outlier among US institutions of higher education; 2) the lack of such a faculty deliberative body complicates and makes difficult for the administration to obtain the views of the faculty on matters of university-wide concern; and 3) the absence of a comparable deliberative body makes it difficult, if not impossible for faculty, to formulate and communicate its views and concerns to the University administration.

II. Working Group Operations

Following their election by School faculties, the Working Group members held an initial meeting in May and then it conducted an all-day retreat in August, where both the President and the Provost had an opportunity to express their views. Thereafter, the Working Group held semi-monthly meetings that rotated among the Universities' three campuses, while all members also had the opportunity to participate in meetings by teleconference and phone. Vice Provost Kevin Dunn attended all meetings, principally in a support capacity. The Working Group also chose one of its members as chair. The work of the Group generally fell into three phases of unequal length. The first phase consisted of an intensive study of faculty deliberative bodies at other universities. Among those given special attention were Georgetown, Brown, Cornell, Duke and Northwestern. In a second phase, the Working Group familiarized itself with the governance system of the individual schools at Tufts. Having unanimously agreed that Tufts University should create a university faculty senate of its own, the third and longest phase of the Group's work was the elaboration of an appropriate Senate structure and organization for Tufts, with an accompany set of draft bylaws. The draft laws are attached as an appendix to this Preliminary Report. The remainder of this Report describes the nature and structure of the Faculty Senate proposed by the Working Group.

III. The Purposes of the Proposed University Faculty Senate

The Working Group agrees that the lack of university-wide deliberative body is an obstacle to effective faculty governance at Tufts. The existence of a Senate would improve that situation. Specifically, as stated in the draft bylaws, a Senate at Tufts would have as a general objective "...to facilitate and enhance the effectiveness of the governance of Tufts University and further develop a shared sense of community among its members..." One of the challenges of governance at Tufts is that the University functions on three widely separated, self-sufficient

campuses. The creation of a faculty Senate would help to create a bridge among the Boston, Medford, and Grafton campuses.

In addition to these two general purposes, the Senate would have the following eight specific purposes: 1) contributing to the formulation of University wide-plans and policies; 2) reviewing existing University-wide policies and recommending appropriate changes; 3) expressing the views, needs, and concerns of the faculty with respect to University governance and administrative practices, while respecting the autonomy of the individual Schools; 4) exchanging information and facilitating collaboration and cooperation among and between the Schools of the University, particularly but not exclusively, with respect to administrative, pedagogical, research, and other relevant matters of common concern; 5) overseeing communications and publications made in the name of the University Faculty, subject to guidelines agreed by the Senate; 6) bringing to the attention of the University governing authorities all matters that the Senate judges appropriate; 7) providing advice and counsel to University governing authorities, either in response to a request from them or on the Senate's own initiative, for carrying out their responsibilities; and 8) performing such other functions as the University Trustees, the President, or the Provost may request in matters affecting the governance of the University.

IV. The Structure and Composition of the University Faculty Senate

The Working Group devoted a significant portion of its deliberations to articulating an appropriate structure and composition for the proposed University Faculty Senate. Similar institutions tend to follow one of two basic models: 1) the US Senate model, by which each sub-unit represented has an equal number of representatives, in which case each of the eight schools

would have an equal number of representatives in the Tufts Senate, and 2) the US House of Representatives model, by which representatives would represent an equal number of persons, in which case each Tufts Senate member would represent an equal number of faculty. The strict application of the House of Representatives posed serious problems for at least two reasons. First Tufts Schools have varying definitions of who is a faculty member. For example, are the 4000 clinical faculty of the Medical School to be each to be counted a faculty members for purposes of determining the representation of the Medical School? Second, each of the University's eight schools has a strong sense of autonomy and is influenced by specific and differing disciplinary and professional cultures. It was felt that those factors have contributed to the University strength and should be respect. Ultimately, the Working Group decided upon a "blended model" on which to base the Senate, a model that would give each school a minimum number of representatives (two) and then upwardly increase that number to take account of disparities in faculty size among school. Thus it is proposed that Faculty Senate representatives be allocated among Tufts Schools as follows:

The Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine: 3
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy: 3
The Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy: 3
The Sackler School of Biomedical Sciences: 2
The School of Arts & Sciences: 7
The School of Dental Medicine: 3
The School of Engineering: 3
The School of Medicine: 5

Each Senate Representative from a particular School would be elected according to that Schools' rules. The total number of elected Senate Faculty representatives would be twenty-nine, in addition to the President and Provost who would serve as members *ex officio*. Senators

would serve staggered terms of three years each. In designing a Senate for Tufts, the Working Group sought the model of a “working Senate,” a Senate is not too large to be cumbersome yet large enough to be representative. With this goal in mind, it is proposed that the Senate meet at least once a month. The Senate would elect its own officers, who would consist of the President, Vice President, and Senate Secretary. The Senate president would not only preside over the Senate but he or she would also be the Senate’s primary representative to the University Trustees, the President, and the Provost.

V. Senate Powers

With certain exceptions, the powers of the Senate are to a large extent consultative, Consultative powers, if used wisely, can nonetheless be effective tools of governance. In exercising its powers the Senate is to respect to autonomy of the individual schools. Numerous specific power are granted to it. In addition to deciding in own rules and procedures, these specific powers include: 1) reviewing and evaluating matters of University educational and research policy and university-wide faculty issues; 2) participating in the search for and the appointment of the University President, Provost, and deans of the schools; 3) evaluating senior central university administrators; 4) evaluating, pronouncing upon, and making recommendations to the appropriate University authority on the quality and effectiveness University administrative services; 5) participating in decisions to create new schools, campuses, inter-school degree programs, and major reorganizations of the University; 6) participating meaningfully in the development of University budget and resource allocation priorities; and 7) nominating faculty representatives to University-wide committees and task forces and Trustee committees. In addition, the Senate has residual power to “ ... study,

investigate, and make recommendations to the President or the Provost on any matter of faculty concern.”

VI. Next Steps

After submitting this Preliminary Report to the Provost, the Faculty Governance Working Group envisions the following next steps:

1. Meeting with the Provost to obtain his view on the proposed University Faculty Senate.
2. Consultation by individual Working Group members with their respective faculties to obtain their views on the proposed Senate.
3. Consultation with legal counsel concerning the draft bylaws.
4. Preparation of a Final Report and submission for submission to the Provost.
5. Eventual submission of the Final Report and Bylaws to the University Trust for adoption of the Faculty Senate Bylaws
6. First election of Senate Representatives by each of the Schools

Respectively submitted,

Faculty Governance Working Group

Jeswald W. Salacuse, Chair

Elizabeth Byrnes

John Castellot

Brent Cochran

Carolyn Cottrell

Leila Fawaz

Maria Flytzani-Stephanopoulos

Janet Forrester

Jeffrey Hopwood

Karen Jacobsen

Vida Johnson

Nirupa Matthan

Melissa Mazan

David Paul

Lynn Pepall

Lelan Sillin