

Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting

September 25, 2007
3:00-5:00 p.m.
Corporation Room, University Hall

Minutes

Present: Ruth Colwill, Chair; James Dreier, Vice-chair; Ann Dill, Past Chair; Albert Dahlberg, Svetlana Evdokimova, Chad Jenkins, Geoffrey Russom, Robert Smith

Guests: Tom Banchoff, Rod Clifton, Elizabeth Doherty, Laurie Heller, John Savage, Michael Steinberg, Shelley Stephenson

Professor Ruth Colwill called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Professor John Savage, Chair of the ad hoc Faculty Committee for the Campaign (FCC) and Professor Rod Clifton, Past Chair, reported on the Committee's activities last year. The FCC's role is to communicate with and engage faculty in the Campaign, encouraging them to make contributions. At their first meeting, the FCC planned a strategy for how they would work. Letters were mailed to all Brown Faculty.

Some concerns were expressed by Faculty when asked to contribute to the Campaign for Academic Enrichment. Is it appropriate to ask untenured faculty? Is it appropriate to solicit faculty whose salaries are considerably less than others? Professor Clifton found that most faculty regardless of their financial situation wanted to contribute something. The average gift last year was \$1300. Cash contributions increased dramatically from the year before but there was only a modest rise in the relatively small percentage of faculty making cash contributions.

Professor Savage spoke about challenges the FCC faces. What is the real role of the Committee? How can we be helpful? This question has not been completely answered yet. There has been a low level of involvement with departments. The FCC needs a clearer role on how to engage departments with the FCC in the Campaign and how to better communicate with the Faculty. They are supposed to be identifying speakers for fundraising events. The Development office does not do a huge number of events. Alumni organizations have been very successful with engaging alums. A huge celebration is planned to which all of the Brown Community is invited to celebrate progress in the Campaign so far. How do we keep faculty engaged after that?

The FEC suggested that faculty could host visitors at Brown. They also suggested looking for opportunities for faculty to take potential donors to the Faculty Club. There are many faculty, including junior faculty, who can give interesting talks. The FCC should point out that the value of the number of the faculty making contributions, even just \$5 or \$10 gifts, can make a difference. It is the percentage of the University that donates that will attract contributors from outside the University. These ideas could be discussed with the Faculty at the celebration. The FEC will be happy to think about how they can help and will be in touch.

Minutes of the September 11, 2007 meeting were approved as submitted.

The FEC officers met with President Simmons on September 12 and discussed awards for committee service, establishment of terms for faculty serving on the University Disciplinary Council, and the FEC's review of the Ombuds position. They also discussed TPAC and a proposal to shift the culture of tenure and promotion at Brown to be more in line with that of their Ivy League peers. President Simmons is open to more ideas from the FEC. The criteria for promotion from associate to full professor were discussed and will be the focus of a future Talk Back Monday discussion.

The FEC officers also met with Provost Kertzer on the 12th and discussed the Faculty Travel Fund budget and Faculty Rules with regard to appointments to the University Resources Committee and the Academic Priorities Committee.

The FEC's charge states that it must report annually to the Faculty on the composition by protected groups of faculty members serving on Faculty committees and administrative advisory boards. An excel spreadsheet is currently being prepared on the composition of all faculty committees since the inception of the new faculty governance system.

Beth Doherty, Associate Dean of the Faculty, was invited to report on a survey she conducted on enhanced leaves for senior lecturers. Data gathered from other institutions revealed that Brown is unusual in offering lecturers and senior lecturers leave policies. Paid leaves are not routine in most of the institutions that she surveyed including Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Penn, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale. She found that some liberal arts colleges award paid leave to senior lecturers, but again it is not a common practice. Professor Colwill asked how the percentage of senior lecturers in the universities she researched compared to Brown's. Dean Doherty made a note to look into this. There was a sense that Brown is unusual in having people in senior lecturer/lecturer ranks for a much longer period of time than peer institutions. This might affect a leave policy. There might also be special arrangements for senior lecturers after a long time in rank at other institutions that are not made public. Dean Doherty added this to her list for follow up.

Discussion ensued with regard to the additional schools Dean Doherty might study and how the position of senior lecturer is defined at Brown and other institutions. It seems we need to clarify the difference between senior lecturers and tenured faculty. What criteria do department chairs use at Brown when considering promotion of lecturers to senior lecturers? TPAC conducted a review of departmental standards and criteria about two years ago to determine how departments reviewed progress or accomplishments of their faculty when promoting them. Are the demands and expectations of senior lecturers similar enough to what is expected of tenured faculty to warrant equitable benefits? FEC discussed who would be best able to adjudicate this issue.

It was noted that senior lecturers themselves are not really pursuing this issue. It is other faculty in their departments seeking equity for senior lecturers. It was decided that it would be in Brown's best interest to assess the needs here first. Dean Doherty will ask department chairs to provide a summary of the costs and benefits of an enhanced scholarly leave program for senior lecturers in their departments. She will also review the post-leave reports from senior lecturers that her office has on file to assess the value of a leave for senior lecturers. Dean Doherty will continue researching other institutions and will be invited to report again to the FEC when she is ready.

There will be a Faculty Forum on Internationalization October 18 to address the report by the Internationalization Committee. Professor Banchoff, Chair of the Faculty Forum, described how

he plans to organize the forum to maximize effectiveness. The discussion will be recorded by the Secretary, Laurie Heller, who will prepare a report for distribution at the November faculty meeting. Michael Steinberg, Director of the Cogut Center for the Humanities and Chair of the Internationalization Committee, and members of his committee and working groups are invited to attend. It's an appropriate time and place to introduce the new VP for International Programs whose identity will be made public on October 8. There was discussion about when the introduction should take place, immediately before or after the Forum. Issues that could be raised at the Forum were mentioned.

The FEC is planning to have a meet and greet reception for all Faculty and new and continuing administrators immediately after the forum at the Faculty Club.

Professor Colwill resumed her Chair's report. The non-voting faculty motion was pulled from the October 2 faculty meeting agenda for further discussion and review per the President's request. There are now three options under consideration for changing the Faculty Rules regarding non-voting members of the Faculty: (1) creating a separate section for administrators; (2) going ahead as originally planned and add all the new titles into the existing text; or (3) creating a category where the President and Provost designate a certain number of administrators to attend faculty meetings. She asked the FEC to think about this for discussion at the next FEC meeting.

The FEC reviewed a proposal by the College Curriculum Council (CCC) executive committee for a revision to its current committee structure and approval process for course proposals. Concerns were raised about adding another administrator to its membership. The FEC decided to revisit this issue and that of the failure of the University Curriculum Committee to meet last year.

Professor Colwill resumed discussion of her findings to date on faculty committee composition for the 2006-07 academic year. The data for faculty committees were broken down by rank, gender and ethnicity. There were 196 slots on faculty committees and advisory boards last year, **62% were filled by males and 38% by females.** Of the faculty filling these slots, 87.8% were White, 4.1 % Black, 1.5% Hispanic, and 6.1% Asian. Professor Colwill plans to report on this at the October 2 faculty meeting. The FEC discussed several reasons why the representation of minorities in faculty governance was lower than their representation on the faculty. Tracking who gets asked to serve on committees might be important for the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary