

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)  
Meeting**

**February 24, 2009**

**3:00-5:00 p.m.**

**Corporation Room, University Hall**

**Minutes**

Present: James Dreier, Chair; Gerald Diebold, Vice-chair; Ruth Colwill, Past Chair; Cynthia Garcia Coll, William Rakowski, Geoffrey Russom, Gabriel Taubin, Nicolas Wey-Gomez

Guests: Clyde Briant, Jan Hesthaven, Regina White

Professor James Dreier called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Vice-President Clyde Briant and Regina White were invited to discuss proposed changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy (COI). They emphasized this is a draft document being circulated to various faculty and administrative bodies such as the department chairs, Corporation and faculty for feedback and comment. This is the first significant change since 2002. This document is restricted to campus-based faculty. Hospital-based faculty IRB issues will be addressed in a separate document but is expected to be similar to the campus policy. Some guidelines are new such as no human research project costing under \$10k needs reporting. Conflict of interest is carefully delineated and encouraged lively discussion. Major highlights included no faculty involvement with student-owned businesses, no interest in businesses directly tied to research, and all encapsulated in a form for faculty to sign as part of the research process. The FEC questioned who sees these forms, will personal financial disclosures be visible to colleagues in the same department, who will administer the forms, faculty or staff, and where did the burden of disclosure most likely affect? It is estimated the 150-200 faculty will be directly affected by the policy, mostly in the life and physical sciences. Further discussion focused upon wording in the policy: "tenured and non-tenure track faculty" occasioned remarks on its meaning. Mr. Briant replied the document was a draft and not yet in its final form. Further discussion revolved around penalties for non-compliance. This too is not entirely formulated. Beverly Ledbetter will be consulted on the final draft of the Policy after which it will be forwarded once again to the FEC. The plan is to present the final draft of the COI Policy at the April 7 faculty meeting.

Professor Jan Hesthaven, Vice-chair of the University Resources Committee (URC), joined the FEC for discussion about the URC's annual report. Major costs to the University include financial aid, salaries, and facilities. The URC recommended a balanced budget in these areas for next fiscal year. There will be only a 2.9% tuition increase, the lowest in over 40 years. There will be no salary raises for administration, staff or faculty. Providing modest increases for faculty at the lower level salaries while

not giving raises to faculty with higher salaries was considered by the URC. It was determined it cannot be done in AY 2009-2010, but it may be considered for AY 2011-2012 if the economy improves. Capital projects that are now fully-funded will move forward while those not funded with gifts will be put on hold. Staff layoffs are expected at various levels and departments will need to absorb budget cuts. It will be the departments' responsibility to figure out a way to stay within their budget guidelines. On a more positive note, Brown plans to maintain its financial aid assistance in order to limit the stress on families of the students and to continue advancing toward its goals for academic enrichment. We must somehow balance this. There will be a modest 1% increase in research funding. There is a strong recommendation for \$3.5M in budget increases for the science center, travel funds for graduate students, dormitory renovations, and purchase of furniture, books and computer software. Four on-going faculty searches will continue while new searches will be postponed. Between now and 2014, it is anticipated there will need to be an \$80-\$90M reduction in costs in order to keep the University healthy. Professor Rakowski asked if there is any discussion on the table for reducing the University's contribution to retirement funds. There is not. When asked if faculty committee members had much influence on URC's decision-making, Prof. Hesthaven responded "very much so, as did students and staff who provided very valuable information". He added that the faculty salary freeze was a suggestion made by the faculty members of the URC. Professor Hesthaven will present the URC's annual report at the March 3 faculty meeting.

Minutes of the February 10, 2009 meeting were approved.

Professor Dreier gave a chair's report. Do we want to have junior faculty round table sessions again this year? The two sessions held last year were very successful. Junior faculty seemed to enjoy themselves and spoke openly about issues they had been dealing with. Two sessions will be planned for this semester.

A minor grammatical change was made to the TPAC motion at yesterday's faculty agenda meeting so as not to imply that TPAC's operation had not been in compliance with Faculty Rules. TPAC decided to make some additional minor changes to their proposal which they will need to present as a friendly amendment since the proposal has already been distributed to the Faculty.

Professor Dreier drafted a proposal to revise the Research Advisory Board's (RAB) charge to include the additional responsibility of reviewing all proposed changes to policies regulating or affecting research that require Faculty's signature. The RAB would be required to post the changes and rationale for them on the OVPR's web site for faculty input and then review the proposal in light of the comments. The RAB would also be charged with conducting periodic reviews of the policies. Professor Diebold voiced concern that the FEC is not mentioned in the proposal and feels they should play an active role in reviewing such policies. Faculty's feedback should come back to the FEC as well as the RAB. Does the FEC really want to be reviewing changes to all existing policies as well as proposals for new ones and bringing them to the Faculty for a vote? Professor Dreier thought the Corporation would not be interested in a change that would

give the faculty the power to hold up policies or revisions that might be mandated by federal law. Proposals for change to the Conflict of Interest Policy seem to be going well, and the FEC has been consulted. Procedurally, Professor Dreier is happy with the way the RAB is handling things so far. The FEC's consensus was that that revising the RAB's charge is the way to go. Should "forms" requiring faculty signature be considered part of a policy? Yes, and it is mentioned in Professor Dreier's proposed language for change to the RAB's charge.

The FEC reviewed proposed changes to the rationale for the Columbus Day motion and approved them for presentation at the March 3 faculty meeting. The students presenting the proposal will be notified of the change.

Discussion of the revised dismissal procedure and proposed revisions from the Provost to the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 academic year calendars was postponed until March 10.

The meeting was called to Executive Session at 4:55 p.m. to discuss the Rosenberger Medal of Honor nominations.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau  
Secretary