

Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting

April 11, 2006

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Corporation Room, University Hall

Minutes

Present: Bob Pelcovits, Chair; Ann Dill, Vice Chair; Michel-André Bossy, Past Chair; Albert Dahlberg, Svetlana Evdokimova, Marida Hollos, James Padbury, William Rakowski, and Esther Whitfield.

Guests: Pat Arant, Charles Carpenter, Tim Flanagan, Steven Hamburg, Robert Hurt, Lewis Lipsitt, Ken Mayer, Peter Richardson, Merwin Sibulkin, Richard Spies

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. Minutes of the 3/21 FEC meeting were approved as submitted.

Professor Pelcovits began his Chair's report by congratulating Professor Esther Whitfield for being awarded the Wriston Fellowship. He then reported on the progress of the Nominations Committee ballot and additional names for the humanities slate were discussed. Professor Spoehr would appreciate the FEC's advice on candidates for the vice-chair slate for the FEC ballot. The FEC offered some suggestions and if any other names come to mind after the meeting, they will pass them on to Professor Pelcovits.

The FEC officers will meet with President Simmons tomorrow at which time they should learn more about the selection for the Provost Selection Committee. The FEC officers met with Provost Zimmer last Friday, and he referred them to the President for a progress report on the organization of task forces on undergraduate education. When asked if he thought the Science Cohort should be under the purview of the new Dean of the College, he agreed.

The MFEC approved final revisions to its charge and membership at their meeting yesterday and will present it to the FEC on 4/25. A motion will be presented for a vote at the October faculty meeting. Professor Rakowski mentioned that the MFEC also discussed hospital access to University-based software and why they cannot download items the way campus-based faculty can.

Professors Pat Arant, Lewis Lipsitt, Peter Richardson and Merwin Sibulkin were invited to discuss a proposal from the Society of the Elderbears for a motion to create a Committee on Retired and Retiring Faculty. The rationale, proposed charge and membership were distributed with the FEC agenda.

The Elderbears met with the FEC last year and voiced several concerns of retired faculty about relationships with departments, the desire for space on campus, medical benefits, and other issues. The FEC suggested they consider proposing the creation of a faculty committee for retirees for their consideration. The committee's charge will be to promote the welfare of retired faculty and facilitate the transition of faculty to retirement. The Elderbears will continue to

function and will be consulted by this committee. Discussion ensued with regard to the many activities of the Elderbears, how retired faculty could remain active at Brown, and what issues could be vetted through the new retirement committee.

The FEC suggested the proposed charge be expanded to include the last sentence of the rationale about retirees offering their experience and wisdom for the benefit of the University. They also recommended the election process be clearly stated under membership and the proposed name of the committee be changed to “Committee on Faculty Retirement Issues”. When asked if the Committee would interact with other groups such as the Faculty Affairs Committee, Professor Richardson (Parliamentarian) replied “Yes, but it is not necessary to write it into the Faculty Rules and Regulations”. The motion will be revised to reflect changes discussed today and brought back to the FEC for more discussion at a later date. It should be ready in time for a vote at the October faculty meeting.

Professor Steve Hamburg, vice-chair of the Campus Planning Advisory Board (CPAB) and Vice President Spies, chair, were invited to discuss the CPAB annual report distributed with the agenda. Highlights of the report included the CPAB’s role as advisor to the administration in its development of the latest Institutional Master Plan, which is required every five years by the City of Providence. The CPAB provided valuable input on the content of the plan and how to best present it. A blueprint outlining the Institution’s major building and renovation projects is submitted to the City to which Brown must adhere. Four meetings were held last year to discuss the latest design ideas for major capital projects including The Walk, Sidney Frank Hall, Nelson Fitness Center, and Pembroke Hall. The CPAB expects to tour the campus this month to exchange ideas on various aspects of future major projects.

Discussion ensued with regard how well the Board has been functioning. The CPAB’s range of perspectives is excellent because students, faculty and staff members provide valuable input about different sides of the issues. The preservation of Brown’s ambiance as renovations progress and the proposal for a Campus Center were also discussed. The Center is not a priority at this time because it became a much larger project than was originally anticipated. The CPAB annual report will be presented at the May 2 faculty meeting.

Professor Pelcovits then led a discussion concerning benefits for research faculty. There are approximately 80 research faculty of which 50 are in BioMed (and those faculty are primarily in Community Health). The BioMed research faculty are concerned primarily about a sabbatical benefit. They contribute to the sabbatical fund via their grants but do not receive the benefit. It is not clear if the non-BioMed faculty share this concern. Discussion on this issue will resume at the 4/25 FEC meeting.

Professor Robert Hurt, vice-chair of the Research Advisory Board (RAB), gave a brief summary of the written report submitted with the agenda. He noted significant changes in the structure of Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR), the newest addition being Pamela O’Neil (Assistant Vice-President, Research Initiatives). The RAB met five times in the past year discussing a wide range of topics including how to continue and expand the research capability of Brown, review of intellectual property status, suggested composition of the standing appeals committee for intellectual property disputes, review of the new OVPR web site, Pam O’Neil’s work on research initiatives, and patent support. RAB members are actively researching the role of grantsmanship in tenure and promotion cases. The OVPR has grown and plays a more significant role on campus with its seed funds, proposal support services, IP management, oversight of compliance and Office of Sponsored Programs.

Discussion ensued regarding funding for NIH grants and how they are awarded. There are many complaints by faculty about this. Lack of support for graduate students in BioMed is a real problem especially for assistant professors. Perhaps the RAB could research these issues.

In closing, Professor Hurt noted that as faculty vice-chair, he plays an active role in setting the agendas, and the administration encourages CPAB faculty members to be more active. He will be presenting the RAB annual report at the May 2 faculty meeting.

Professor Charles Carpenter was invited to discuss a proposal for a Brown University AIDS Center (BAC) to be established as an academic entity at Brown University. The proposal was recently approved by the Academic Priorities Committee (APC). Although the Center has existed since 1986 and operated as if it were a Brown Center, it never was designated as such. Major funding for the Center will continue to come from the NIH-supported CFAR with substantial additional funding from other federal agencies. The BAC will include faculty from all Brown affiliated medical institutions as well as the University campus. It is designed to meet University guidelines for formalized interdisciplinary activities. The primary objectives of the proposed Center are to develop means of preventing HIV infection and to realize more effective approaches to the treatment and management of HIV/AIDS. The Vision of the proposed Center is to stimulate outstanding cross-disciplinary research, education and clinical activities related to HIV/AIDS throughout the greater Brown University community. The BAC reports to Dean Adashi.

There was some discussion about the Center vs. Program distinction. Since Centers deal mainly with research and Programs with instruction, the AIDS proposal should be for a Center because its main focus is on research.

A motion by the Faculty will be presented at the May 2 faculty meeting recommending to the President and the Board of Fellows the establishment of the BAC, the Corporation making the final decision. Professor Pelcovits asked that Professor Carpenter provide a condensed version of the proposal for inclusion in the May 2 faculty meeting agenda packet. The APC will provide a memo of approval which will also be included in the packet.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary