

**FACULTY BULLETIN
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

DECEMBER 2004

	PAGE
Editorial	2
Peter Wegner and Peter Richardson, Editors	
On the Matter of Standards in Tenure and Promotion.....	3
Ruth Simmons, President	
Faculty Hiring: Recent Standards and Future Plans.....	9
Rajiv Vohra, Dean of the Faculty	
Access to Knowledge: Libraries of Today and Tomorrow.....	12
Maurice Glicksman, Division of Engineering	
Conflict, Controversy, and Constants: The Flux of American Medicine	14
Andrew Brem, Division of Pediatric Nephrology, RI Hospital	
Big and Little Ethics Violations in Journalism.....	17
Rhett Jones, Departments of History and Africana Studies	
The History of Child Psychology at Brown University	19
Lewis Lipsitt, Department of Psychology	
Literature and Criticism in an International Frame.....	23
Olakunle George, Department of English	

EDITORIAL

Peter Wegner and Peter Richardson
Editors

We are pleased to present the fall edition of the *Faculty Bulletin*. The President and the Dean of the Faculty have provided important statements about our faculty, our enduring efforts to have clear and high yet attainable standards for promotion and tenure, and our hiring processes which accelerated so notably in the past couple of years. Former Provost Maurice Glicksman reflects on the changes in the most widely-shared support entity for our academic teaching and research, the Library and the means of access which we wish to promote.

Changes sweeping our environment include the management structures arising in the reorganizations of the provision of medical services, and Dr. Brem offers interesting thoughts on these and their impact on academic medicine.

Journalism and ethics in its practice are before us yet again with the issue of confidentiality provided to sources. Previously, at a different end of the ethical spectrum, there had been the case of Jayson Blair and stories fabricated for printing in the *New York Times*. Rhett Jones has written an essay on Ethics violations in journalism we should all find interesting and topical.

Child psychology, a subject needed so strongly in these days of No Child Left Behind, of judicial decisions on custody and visitations in marital cases, and so forth, as well as in determining optimum conditions for human development, has a long history at Brown, and we are indebted to Lewis Lipsitt for providing us with a condensed view of this, while we look forward to his completion of a longer description.

George Olakunle of the English Department explores his teaching and scholarship on post-colonial African-American literature. African writers explore new histories and cultures that differ from those of British and American writers, but relate to questions raised in all cultures. The recent independence of African and other colonial nations and the broader goals of US literature have contributed to the international growth of new writers that contribute to our understanding of the world.

We hope that our faculty members will read all these essays, and seriously consider adding their own contributions to this publication in future issues.

We hope to publish the next issue in April or May of 2005, and will request contributions from faculty and administrators in March.

On the Matter of Standards in Tenure and Promotion

Ruth J. Simmons
President

Brown's faculty has a distinguished history. Known for excellence in teaching and mentorship, scholarship on an ever-advancing frontier, a collaborative approach to both teaching and research, and an admirable dedication to the mission of the university, the hundreds of talented men and women who make up Brown's faculty have, over time, been collectively responsible for the reputation of Brown as one of a small number of great universities in the history of the United States. This is no small accomplishment. The current health of the university has been purchased through the ongoing commitment of the faculty to continuous renewal, even at times of significant fiscal and physical constraints. In spite of limitations, departments and programs have frequently continued to excel, choosing novel paths that uniquely accommodate particular constraints. This is a sign not only of exceptional endurance but of also of estimable ingenuity.

The Brown faculty has adopted, as times have changed and demands have shifted, programmatic goals and academic criteria in keeping with the opportunities and the constraints of any given time. It is much the same in all institutions, whether public or private, for-profit or not-for-profit. When opportunity abounds, we take advantage of this window for innovation, growth and overall improvement.

At the current point in time, we have chosen to undertake a course of academic enrichment that, I believe, rightly insists on ambitious goals across every dimension of university life. The various initiatives we have set forth for faculty growth, facility renewal, financial aid, and other areas are intensely demanding with respect to capital and human resources, time, effort and energy. That the faculty, administration and Corporation have chosen this challenging path is entirely laudable and correct for, if we were not to seek improvement in periods of relative prosperity, we might well miss an important chance to advance our mission. Not surprisingly, though, these positive efforts can cause strains. Yet, I believe that these strains are entirely manageable.

Let me say that I am not at all fearful of questions as to whether we are considering adequately during this period the value of what has come before. Any new leadership would be wise to avoid the pitfall of assuming that only that which is new is good. I certainly hope we do not make that mistake. Yet, there is an obvious and unavoidable tension between our efforts to take full advantage of the opportunities available to us in this period and our commitment to do so in a way that respects what is currently in place. We should pay heed to that tension by engaging this topic very openly and directly. We should also be certain, as a community of scholars, to resist the temptation to focus our attention – and our laurels – on only that which is new. As I noted above, the strength of this university is the product of the faculty who have served here with great distinction over the past years and decades. The colleagues who are joining us in this period of

growth are doing so because of the collegial environment of excellence in scholarship and teaching created at Brown many years before.

Amidst the changes inherent in this time of transition and growth, one specific question that has arisen for some is whether the criteria for faculty appointment, promotion and tenure have become more demanding, creating an inequitable and unfair situation for those already in the tenure and promotion pipeline. They ask where we are headed with respect to such standards, and on what basis candidates are to be considered for promotion and tenure in the coming years.

When it comes to the all-important question of who should be given a permanent place on the faculty, a decision that is a decades-long commitment of university resources and, at the same time, a decades-long limitation on the flexibility of a department's teaching and scholarly agenda, the answer is extremely important with extraordinary implications for the long-term health of the University. However, this has always been so. The fact is that neither standards nor rules for tenure and promotion at Brown have changed recently.

The rules of all faculties provide that candidates on tenure-track have the opportunity to demonstrate over a protracted probationary period (usually, six or seven years) that they are fit for tenure. This protracted probationary period allows the candidate adequate time to strengthen his or her teaching, to take part in university life, and to develop and produce appropriate scholarly output that overwhelmingly indicates that this individual will, over a lifetime appointment, continue to be an excellent teacher and scholar.

At Brown, all three dimensions of faculty performance are especially important. As a university with a stated mission that incorporates teaching as a principal aspect of excellence in its faculty, Brown requires its assistant professors to build a portfolio of courses and evaluations of their teaching effectiveness that can help tenure committees predict the probability of a long term commitment and success as a teacher. Many may be asked to excel in courses that provide limited opportunity for student enthusiasm. Yet, in spite of this, faculty find appealing avenues to engage student interest, invoke a commitment to learning the subject and make the subject come alive in ways important to the general preservation and advancement of knowledge and the intellectual growth of the individual student. A very significant dimension of learning rests on the shoulders of those who devote time to making different fields of compelling interest to successive cohorts of students.

Service to the university is an important indicator of whether candidates are likely, over the long term of a career, to be contributing members of the academic community. There is always a risk that individuals may become in the maturity of their careers, focused more on their own professional goals than on the broader demands and needs of the university, their students and their profession. While one wants to believe that only the high minded select a career in university life, there is much in university life to appeal to the self-interested: the independence of much of scholarly pursuit, the seduction of the contemplative life, the intellectual stimulation that comes with association with scholars of similar bent, and so much more. However, hundreds of iconoclasts, acting solely in

their own interest, do not a faculty make. It is on the collective activity of faculty that the direction and quality of a university rests. On their ability to make sound judgments. On their commitment to be fair, open-minded, and collegial. On their capacity to be disciplined and yet innovative in their teaching and scholarship. On their commitment to prepare future cohorts of scholars equally committed to the advancement of knowledge. Without excellence in service, a long term tenure might yield but a small percentage of what it could mean to the life of the university.

Scholarship is the most important dimension of the tenure decision in a research university. Without its full measure of advanced scholarship, a university is a modest extension of an excellent secondary school where teaching and service are robust. Without the requisite high standards for scholarship, we fail in our mission even if we achieve well in the areas of teaching and service. Today, it is scholarship that most indelibly marks a university's long term health. Faculty given lifetime tenure at Brown are expected to produce scholarship of the sort that, because of its innovation, originality, utility, and importance adds significantly to what Brown is able to accomplish as a university. Outstanding scholarship enhances the profile of individual programs and departments, making it possible for them to attract able students, garner excellent resources, recruit outstanding colleagues, and have a significant impact on the field. Since the reputation of a research university arises principally from the scholarship of its faculty, Brown's insistence on preserving and enhancing that reputation through continued emphasis on excellence in scholarship is not only entirely appropriate but necessary.

Many would say, of course, that scholarship takes many forms and that we should be mindful that formulaic approaches to the assessment of scholarship could result in unfortunate errors. Naturally, in any tenure system where a central committee is asked to recommend on tenure decisions, it is important that members have a sense of what meaningful and legitimate standards one should apply when considering so many different fields, from the medical sciences to the arts. It remains for the experts in a field to determine and explicate why any work in any format is original, important and useful, but it is for the Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee (TPAC) to determine whether the experts have actually made a compelling case that such work is evidence of readiness for tenure. I believe that this process is appropriately rigorous at Brown today, incorporating levels of review that achieve fairness for the candidate and excellent oversight for the university.

Even though we often blend the various aspects of the tenure and promotion process, in reality and by mandate of the Faculty Rules & Regulations, each is distinctive, with a particular perspective intended to consider carefully and fairly each candidacy for tenure and promotion. We begin with a departmental committee that examines fully, based on a candidate's input as well as that of outside experts, whether an individual has satisfied the standards for tenure and promotion at Brown. A department then votes on a case, based on the in-depth assessment by the committee but with input from others in the department who are knowledgeable about the field in which the candidate is working. The candidate's dossier, along with the department's vote and analysis of the case, is

forwarded to the Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee that must independently examine all the evidence available and determine whether the department's recommendation is consistent with the evidence presented in the dossier. The Committee determines whether to second the department's judgment and, in the event that the Committee judges that the dossier does not support the departmental recommendation, it may recommend a different action. TPAC's recommendation goes to the dean of the faculty or the dean of medicine & biological sciences, as appropriate, and the provost, with the dean then providing his own recommendation on the case. The provost, the chief academic officer of the University who is responsible for the overall academic quality and integrity of the academic program at Brown, considers the recommendations and decides whether it should be accepted. If the provost finds that questions remain as to the suitability of the candidate for tenure, he is obligated to seek clarification through additional relevant input. The candidate's dossier and all evidence used by TPAC in its review is the foundation of the provost's review.

If the departmental recommendation was in favor of promotion and/or tenure and if, after review by the Committee, the Provost approved it, notice is given to the faculty member that, subject to the approval of the President and the Brown Corporation, the promotion and/or tenure has been awarded. If the departmental recommendation was for promotion and/or tenure and if, after review by the Committee, the Provost's decision is negative, notice is given to the faculty member and the Subcommittee on Diversity in Hiring (SDH) that the promotion has been denied and/or that tenure has not been recommended. The SDH has responsibility for reviewing denials of promotion, tenure, and re-appointment for adherence to the Corporation Statement on Nondiscrimination and must submit findings, in writing, to the TPA and the Provost. The president considers the decision of the provost and passes a final recommendation to the Corporation, which acts on the case.

These manifold perspectives are, I believe, important to the process, assuring decisions that help to maintain a strong, productive faculty. At each stage in the process, we have an opportunity to determine whether the weight of evidence in a case supports tenure and promotion. Each stage is distinctive and meaningful. Notwithstanding the fact that many see a department's recommendation as final and the rest of the process as essentially a rubber stamp, each level involves a serious process that separates interests and perspectives in a useful way. The Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee must examine carefully the work of the department to determine whether the case they present is based on the evidence at hand. The Committee also has the opportunity to examine whether the department's treatment of the candidate is consistent with other applicable university guidelines and practices and whether the candidate meets university standards of excellence.

The provost has the responsibility to consider recommendations with an eye to whether all of the questions with regard to the candidate's performance have been answered satisfactorily. Where questions remain, he is obliged to put them to rest by seeking additional opinions or asking for assistance in that examination from others, and he must carefully document those consultations and his findings for the record. He may also wish

to question whether institutional needs and interests are being appropriately served as well as whether TPAC has considered these questions adequately. In any event, the provost is not a mere seconder for the TPAC recommendation. His decision is meant to be independent. If the provost's decision is negative with regard to promotion, tenure and/or reappointment, there is a further provision for review by a faculty committee (the Subcommittee on Diversity in Hiring) for assurance of adherence to the Corporation Statement on Nondiscrimination.

The president, after receiving the decision of the provost, generally undertakes no independent examination of the merits of the case submitted. If, upon learning of a negative decision by the provost, a candidate wishes to appeal such a recommendation, the president hears the appeal before advancing a recommendation to the Corporation. In such appeals, the president generally considers evidence of irregularities of procedure, discrimination, or departures from policy and procedure, and determines whether they may have inappropriately influenced the decision. While appropriately limited in scope to these areas of inquiry, this review must be done with care and precision. As a result, it takes some time. Upon reaching a decision on the appeal, the president informs the candidate of her decision and forwards the case to the Corporation for final disposition.

This extensive review is warranted by the seriousness of the awarding of lifetime tenure. The dean of the faculty or the dean of medicine & biological sciences, responsible, along with the Department, for assuring that candidates are informed about the process and standards for tenure and promotion, provides timely information to faculty as to the review process. We must make every effort during the probationary period to ensure that candidates are aware of the process as well as the various stages in the review. The Rules and Procedures are readily available to candidates on the Dean of the Faculty and FEC web sites.

As to the question of whether standards are currently undergoing change, as I said at the outset, every university judges candidates for appointment based on the opportunities they have in a particular window. However, once a candidate is appointed and given assurances of what they must do to be successful in the tenure track, our decisions should be informed by those representations. No individual department may unilaterally change those standards on the eve of tenure. Of course, a department may change the demands on a candidate after hiring if those demands can be reasonably met by the time that the tenure decision is to be made. Given the partnership between the department and the dean of the faculty or the dean of medicine & biological sciences in such matters, it is always better for the candidate and the department for changes to occur in consultation with the appropriate dean.

Standards will always, I hope, be moving upward. Brown could not continue to be in the first ranks of universities if that were to cease being the case. Yet, however much we enjoy the opportunity to improve, we must never do so unfairly for our reputation as a fair employer is vital to our being a great university. Of course, we may not wish to grant tenure in areas where there is no need or demand. But in more usual circumstances, the duality of responsibility that we bear should prevent us from errors. The first

responsibility is on the department to incorporate clearly in the employment and assessment process an objective evaluation of a candidate's success in meeting the department's needs and standards. The second is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that he or she is well-informed about and responsive to the department's guidance. Those we place on the tenure track should expect that we will hold to the assurances given them when they were hired, adjusted based on department needs and assessment of the candidate's performance. They should also feel confident that they will be examined on the terms, conditions and standards we set for them. Such standards may be reasonably amended if done in an expeditious fashion, giving the candidate a fair chance to address the change in requirements by the time of the tenure decision.

The dean of the faculty and the dean of medicine & biological sciences are both available to help the department and the candidate meet their responsibilities. They will provide information to departments as to the suitability of the guidance given probationary candidates in each department and program. The deans' offices will also provide guidance to junior candidates as to their rights and opportunities during the probationary period. Both departments and candidates are encouraged to seek information of the appropriate dean at any point in the process that an aspect of the tenure review process becomes unclear.

There is no more important task for a faculty than to choose the faculty well, to train new faculty in their duties and, when the time comes, to assess those same faculty objectively against the standards the department and the university have set for their performance. The assessment of peers is a great burden but the health of the university depends on the faculty's commitment to this crucial process.

**Faculty Hiring:
Recent Progress and Future Plans**

**Rajiv Vohra
Dean of the Faculty**

Our recent success in faculty hiring has been astonishing by any measure. We have welcomed over 50 new faculty colleagues this year, remarkable scholars and teachers who will enhance our core academic strengths. The roster of regular faculty now stands at an all time high of 628, representing an expansion of 9% in just three years; we now have more minorities and more women faculty than ever before, in absolute numbers as well as in percentages. Some of the relevant data is included below. But the real story lies in the people we have hired and I invite you all to see the short bios of our newest colleagues that have been posted on the dean of the faculty website.

As you all know, increasing faculty size by 100 is a central element in the University's Plan for Academic Enrichment, initiated by President Simmons. This is a rare opportunity for Brown, and we all bear a tremendous responsibility in making sure that we make the most of it. To put it simply, we must exercise the utmost care in choosing the future directions for growth and in choosing our future colleagues. While our success in faculty recruitment thus far has been gratifying, much remains to be done in implementing the plan.

The deliberate and thoughtful process through which we have made decisions about incremental positions has served us well. Our colleagues on the Academic Priorities Committee (APC) have played a crucial role in this process by assessing the intellectual merit of various proposals for new initiatives, and weighing these in the context of our institutional needs. Provost Zimmer in a recent letter to the faculty has outlined the basic principles that have guided, and will continue to guide, the work of the APC. Recall that the APC's existing multi-year plan for new positions is still in the process of being implemented. Naturally, in light of the hiring we have already done, and the on-going commitments, future allocations from the APC will proceed at a somewhat slower pace, and will lead to searches in 2005-06 and beyond. And as we get closer to allocating all the incremental positions, the task of making hard choices will become harder still.

We shall also continue to make use of the targets-of-opportunity program, which has been so successful in the recruitment of outstanding faculty while simultaneously increasing faculty diversity. It's important to keep in mind that most of these positions are intended to be absorbed into the regular roster eventually. Obviously, our ability to successfully continue to rely on this mechanism depends to a large extent on how well we manage this replenishment process.

This year we expect to conduct about 50 searches for regular faculty positions, roughly equally divided between incremental positions and replacement positions. Due to the uncertainties in the number of departures and in the success rate of the searches it is difficult to predict the net change. However, our expectation is that there will be some modest growth in faculty size, though not at the rate we have just witnessed.

In order to better manage our growth and to ensure that it yields the maximum returns in terms of our academic objectives, there are a couple of things that will require special attention.

Each department should view all faculty hiring, incremental or replacement, as part of one strategic plan designed to enrich its intellectual capital. In order to better manage this process, especially in dealing with the unpredictability of replacement searches, I expect to work closely with department chairs in assessing the current department rosters and future plans. In general, the expectation is that when a department loses a faculty member (due to resignation, retirement, etc.) at least a year will elapse before a regular replacement is in place; only in rare cases will we begin a search in anticipation of a departure.

Since a faculty hiring decision is likely to affect the university's future for 30, 40 or more years it cannot be taken lightly. We must apply the highest standards in hiring faculty who are not only superb scholars but also have, in the best traditions of Brown, a deep and abiding commitment to teaching. Of course, successful recruiting requires hard work and sound judgment. Often it also calls for patience. When a particular search fails to yield an outstanding candidate we must resist the temptation to settle for one who is merely good. Keep in mind that a position once authorized will not be eliminated simply because it is not immediately filled.

The Plan for Academic Enrichment has moved beyond the planning stage and is now beginning to produce tangible results; we are well on our way to expanding the faculty by 20%. We have a rare opportunity to lift Brown to an even higher level of excellence, and if our recent success in faculty hiring is a sign of what's to come, there is every reason for us to be optimistic.

	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	3 Year Total
Incremental and Targets	2	13	20	35
Replacements	33	25	29	87
Departures	(24)	(27)	(20)	(71)
Net Change	11	11	29	51 (8.8%)
Total Regular Faculty	588	599	628	

Changes in Roster of Regular Faculty, as of September 2004

	Incremental Faculty Allocations	% of Total Incremental Allocations	% of Current Faculty by Division
Humanities	19	29%	29%
Life Sciences	21	32%	19%
Physical Sciences	11	17%	27%
Social Sciences	14	22%	25%
Total	65	100%	100%

Planned Distribution of Incremental Faculty Across Divisions, as of September 2004

	1999-2000		2001-2002		2004-2005	
Women	157	28%	167	29%	190	30%
Minorities	78	14%	85	15%	99	16%
Minority Women	28	5%	30	5%	30	5%
Total Regular Faculty	563		573		628	

Composition of Regular Faculty

	Incremental/Target Faculty	% of Incremental/Target Faculty	% of Current Regular Faculty
Women	14	34%	30%
Minorities	11	27%	16%
Minority Women	4	10%	5%
Women or Minorities	21	51%	41%

Women and Minorities: Incremental and Target Hires, 2002-03 – 2004-05

**Access to Knowledge:
Libraries of Today and Tomorrow (?)**

**Maurice Glicksman
Division of Engineering**

Today's libraries face a rapidly changing communications environment and a demanding public wishing to have access to knowledge right where they are, at any time. A continuing extrapolation of past practice will not satisfy these users. The valuable skills the librarian profession has developed, in organizing and validating the material collected, are also in danger of being ignored and hence lost to the user, whether scholar, student or curious layperson.

Universities have as their goal the discovery, imparting, sharing and storing of knowledge. The storage became feasible when humankind learned how to represent knowledge in a form which could be preserved. The library became the location of many of those preservable objects. These objects came to be seen as representing the knowledge.

But the objects are not what must be preserved and transmitted to others: it is their content which is the fabric of knowledge. Whatever the method of storage (print, electronic, etc.) or the material (paper, film, magnetic tape, disks, etc.), the user needs to "read" and understand the content in order to access the knowledge. And libraries contain the same content in multiple formats: for example, the New York Times is available in newsprint, microfiche, and digital formats. It is also available in the library and on the Internet.

The digital age is transforming the University's operation in many ways, with digital communication playing a key role. This year, there are about 1.1 billion domestic letters handled daily by the post offices of the world; there are estimated to be 22 billion emails sent each day (not including a comparable volume of SPAM advertising which inundates email users). By 2009, the emails are estimated to be double this year's numbers, while the "snail" mail will have decreased about twenty percent.

Globally, about 2 billion short text messages are sent each day and there are currently almost 3 million blogs (a Web page of frequently updated, chronological entries on a particular topic) in active use. Contrast that with the close to 60,000 interlibrary loans processed each day in the United States. The traffic in electronic information flow far exceeds that in the print format.

People are not being limited by their computers, desktop or portable: they are migrating to smartphones around the world, able to access Web pages, pictures in real time, etc. As one sign of this change, Duke University provided Apple iPods to each of its freshmen this year. They are preloaded with orientation and academic schedules (and Duke's fight song) and Duke will make lectures, audio books and class-related content available from a Web site for downloading to the devices. Other universities are experimenting with services which bring information products directly to their users.

Today's user wants to access knowledge at any time of day or night, and at any location convenient to her. She would benefit from having a library professional available to assist and assure the validity of the information she gets, but she is often reluctant to go somewhere or wait to have that aid. For the University library, it is essential that she get that aid so that the user is properly served with the best available information.

What does this mean for libraries, and especially for Brown's Libraries? Whether or not the iPod or a new advanced smartphone is the right tool, the idea of making such devices available is a sound one. We need to provide tools and guidance to allow students, staff and faculty a means of accessing the knowledge units they need for their education, their work and also their enjoyment. This could mean accelerating the wireless environments available around the campus. It does mean working with the users of our services to provide them with the best service.

In making the whole community the location of the library's service delivery, the library must maintain or assure access to scholarly information from the past as well as the present. Libraries are networked with other organizations to take advantage of the sharing of access to knowledge essential to the scholarly enterprise. What is occurring is the move to dependence on one major resource, the World Wide Web and Internet, for the communication of much of the world's information. Libraries themselves will be accessed through the Web, and this is desirable to encourage the student to "Library it" on the Web, rather than "Google it." The former should be just as easy and provide a more reliable and useful result, if the library is to succeed in having its expertise used.

The challenge to the Libraries is to make use of the commercial Web resources to provide the best results for its users. With Brown expecting a new library leader this year, we have an exciting opportunity to help Brown succeed in making the Libraries an ubiquitous campus resource, of value to its users and providing them with access to the content they need, wherever it is and in whatever format it is imbedded.

I thank the resource, OCLC's *The 2004 Five-Year Information Format Trends Report*, which can be found in updated form at www.oclc.org/info/2004trends, for much of the data contained in this essay.

Conflicts, Controversies, and Constants: The Flux of American Medicine

Andrew S. Brem
Division of Pediatric Nephrology
Rhode Island Hospital

Change has been the watchword of this generation and much of that change has been in technology and health care. Medicine has evolved to a complex high-rise corporate structure from a simple cottage industry. A sophisticated but arcane physician-insurer-patient-employer alliance has replaced the straightforward physician-patient relationship of the past. Government and corporate insurers each dictate their own mix of conditions, limits, and exclusions. Some fifty years ago when my father practiced pediatrics, medicine adhered to the concepts of a free market. The physician provided certain services and a fair market bill was rendered to the patient for those services. The physician essentially determined the value of the service. As employer based insurance came into play, the physician continued set the price for service but a reasonable reimbursement for that service now came from the insurer instead of directly from the patient. With advent of managed care, the concept of free market service was replaced by a controlled market structure. Physicians would receive from the insurer a set fee per patient per month given independent of the amount of health care provided. Alternately, doctors could bill on a fee for service basis but would only receive a discounted percentage of the bill from the insurer. The discount was part of an unspoken physician-insurer understanding that the number of patient visits would increase and offset the lost income. In high volume practices, the conflict that resulted was a reduction in patient contact-time. Doctors with low volume, high intensity practices faced a decrease in income. These doctors attempted to compensate for the lost income by boosting billings for patient related procedures. In both cases there is a perceived (or real) threat to the constancy of the doctor-patient bond and a conflict between finances and patient care.

Physicians have sought to respond to the conflict between finances and patient care by organizing into structured relationships through professional societies, independent physician associations (IPA's), and with hospitals in physician-hospital organizations (PSO's). Traditionally, physicians have had some difficulty in organizing effectively because of their independent streak (a holdover from the cottage industry days), personal self-interest, and the limitations set by national anti-trust laws. Despite these factors, doctors increasingly are organizing through professional societies or in some other fashion to have their voices heard.

With the evolution to corporate medicine, current trends in management thinking are being woven into the fabric of medical practice. Concepts like "Continuous Quality Improvement" and "Six Sigma" (the quest for standardization with concomitant improvement in quality and reduction in production error) have been embraced by the corporate world and are being directly applied to the process of practice. The recognition that patients and referring doctors are "customers" with basic needs and definable interests is an accepted concept. For patient "customers", the needs might include ease of scheduling an appointment or being seen expeditiously. For a primary care doctor

“customer”, it may mean getting a call or letter back from the consultant in a timely fashion.

The controversies in adopting these business concepts lie not in the process of medicine but in the practice of medicine. Standardization in such things as patient scheduling, billing practice, and referral procedures undoubtedly improves patient satisfaction and access to appropriate care. However, patients and diseases possess inherent bio-variability; each patient is unique and the expression of their illness can vary tremendously. To assume that each should be treated the same standard way in all circumstances is unreasonable. That is not to say reduction in error can not be achieved; it may require a way other than the “one size fits all” approach.

In business and manufacturing, standardization and reproducibility result in a better error free product. There is also a controversial assumption among the public and insurers that all physicians with similar training are interchangeable and can provide reproducible service. Like patients and diseases, physicians exhibit considerable bio-variability. Even with similar training, there can be profound differences in experience, knowledge, technical skill, and motivation. Thus if the patients, the diseases, and the doctors are all varying in an unpredictable fashion, it may be difficult to apply these selected business practices to patient care. Accepting the fact that all doctors are not interchangeable is critical to health care planning.

Some physicians are listening to their prime customer, the patient. Patients want a caring, knowledgeable, compassionate doctor who treats them as individuals and not disease states running down an assembly line. Rejecting the bureaucratic entanglements of business, some clinicians have experimented with reestablishing the anachronism of fee-for-service medicine. They provide the absolute in individual attention including house calls for a yearly retainer plus fee for each service. Giving people this type of care may be admirable but it is impractical and costly.

What then constitutes quality medical care? To a patient, quality care may mean a compassionate physician who really takes the time to listen to his or her complaint. To an insurer, quality care is providing diagnostic and therapeutic services in a timely and cost efficient manner. To a health policy researcher, quality care could be a treatment that improves clinical outcome for a population of patients with a certain disease. Most, if not all, physicians are truly interested in advancing quality but the controversy lies in its definition.

In discussing quality care, insurers frequently refer to compliance with clinical standards. Standards in this case are generally accepted baseline actions, which have been shown to improve clinical outcome. An example of a standard of care might be to ensure that all children receive immunizations since immunizations reduce the incidence of certain infectious diseases. An index of quality would be the percentage of children immunized in a given population.

Guidelines are suggested interventions that could produce a favorable outcome however alternative practices may also produce similar outcomes. A certain guideline for

treatment may be suggested as one way to achieve a desired end but other treatments may also be effective. Moreover medication side effects may preclude the use of the preferred treatment in some patients. Controversies often exist when insurers, the public and some doctors confuse baseline standards (almost all patients benefit) with guidelines (this way probably helps but other ways may also work).

In trying to establish clinical standards and guidelines for patient management, physicians look to science for the evidence. The established “gold standard” of evidence has been the double blind randomized controlled clinical trial. By showing improvements in outcome, such trials have provided the data to support changes in routine clinical practice. The process is evolutionary; as new information becomes available, clinical standards and guidelines are revised or developed. Unfortunately, the types of trials necessary for evidence-based decision making are difficult to perform, expensive to conduct and the trials are relatively few in numbers. Hence, many clinicians are often forced to rely on less methodologically optimal studies and case reports drawn from the medical literature to guide them in prescribing treatment. The controversy here lies in how and when should less than perfect evidence lead to the development of new clinical standards (baseline care) and guidelines (suggested care). This is an important issue because little treatment would be given if we as physicians only acted on “best evidence practice” provided from randomized controlled clinical trials.

Lastly, in practicing medicine, physicians face more potential direct and indirect conflicts of interest than ever before. For example, conflict exists when a clinician approves an expensive therapy for a patient insured under a managed care “risk” contract. If the treatment is approved, the doctor may not receive his or her “withhold” payment that is part of the contract with the insurer. If the treatment is denied even for scientific reasons, the doctor can be accused of callously limiting the care provided to a sick patient. Other conflicts may be more subtle and could include physician referrals and/or laboratory testing driven by legal or financial interests rather than medical need. Thus, decision-making can be held hostage to financial pressure.

We live in complex times. The controversies and conflicts presented here have no quick solutions or easy answers. The key is to be willing to participate in the health care debate; join with others to identify and characterize the problems so that solutions can be found. Only then can we start toward resolutions, which reflect reality and that can be aligned to the reasons we chose medicine as a profession.

Big and Little Ethics Violations in Journalism

Rhett S. Jones

Departments of History and Africana Studies

Let me begin by admitting I have not asked the two philosophers I know best (and admire most) to vet and review this essay. Both have proved themselves to be strong, supportive friends who have seen me through some difficult personal and professional times. I thank them. But neither John Ladd nor Lewis Gordon (who recently left Brown for a Chair at Temple) got a chance to look at this short statement, nor to quiz me on my distinction between “Big” and “Little” Ethics Violations. This is probably just as well as I am not clear on where I would draw the line between the two. Still, to modify for my purposes, a statement made by a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, I know a Little Ethics Violation in journalism when I see it.

The spring 2003 flap over Jayson Blair, the black reporter at *The New York Times* who falsified interviews, made up quotes, and pretended to be where he was not, falls into a violation of Little Ethics. To be sure, Blair’s actions have had big consequences as high heads at the *Times* rolled, foes of affirmative action happily chomped on Blair, spit him out then chewed him up again, and reporters sunk to a new low in writing of the Blair affair. All this adds up to is a failure in Little Ethics.

Failures in Big Ethics are to be found in the still shameful numbers of black reporters in America’s newsrooms. According to the annual (2002) employment survey conducted by the American Society of Newspaper Editors only slightly more than five percent of our nation’s newsrooms are black. The figures for other peoples of color are even smaller. Failures in Big Ethics are also to be found in the reluctance of the print media to explore, examine, or even report the strong opposition of black Americans to the Iraq War. Shortly after the Invasion of Iraq, seventy percent of white Americans supported the War, seventy percent of black Americans opposed it but, to my knowledge, the best exploration of the reasons for this difference appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald*. For those who temporarily misplace their atlas, Sydney is located in Australia, not in the United States. I have found few serious discussions of the meaning of this racial difference in the American press. To be fair though, the U.S. press paid lots of attention to the differences in white and black opinion on the O.J. Simpson acquittal. Simpson and Interracial sex in Los Angeles were seemingly more important than war and death in Iraq.

It is not my intention to lay Big Ethics failures in Journalism off onto white folk. Our local black newspaper, *The Providence American*—for which if I am not to commit an Ethics violation myself, I ought to admit I have frequently written—has recently taken to publishing op-ed pieces by the black right wing New Visions Institute. In an editorial, Eddie Huff of the Institute chastised black Americans for failing to line up with white Americans in support of the Iraq War. According to Huff’s headline by failing to agree with whites on the war blacks are “Painting Themselves Into a Corner of Irrelevancy.” Whites and “other minorities,” writes Huff, overwhelmingly supported the War and as

the latter “overtake blacks in population and as they integrate and diversify their voices within society (black) clout will diminish.” Leaving aside the fact that Huff does not indicate just who these “other minorities” might be, his argument that Afro-Americans ought to have supported the War on the peoples of Iraq simply because whites and “other minorities” did so is a failure of Big Ethics in journalism. As David Walker argued (1829) in his *Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in particular, and very expressly, to those in the United States of America*, Afro-Americans make the best choices when they follow their commitment to the democratic ideals on which our nation rests, rather than seeking to appease Euro-Americans. Black folk opposed the war for reasons of consciences and commonsense, so it is not very likely they will change their minds simply to please white folk. After all, blacks are accustomed to disagreeing with white Americans, even when it is dangerous. Many did so over slavery.

Concern for Big Ethics in journalism is coming in the work of Brown graduates. In June 2003 Kia Hayes completed an Honors Thesis, *Black Publications at Brown and Their Representation of the Black Community*, under my direction. At Commencement she introduced me to her family, all of whom raved about how much I had contributed to her thesis. Kia politely said much the same thing, but she knows better. As Brown Humanities faculty well know, what we really do with our Honors candidates is to regularly meet with them, discuss research strategies and writing, critique outlines, query choice of sources, provide them with written comments on various drafts, and then jump the hell out of their damn smart, super bright way. That’s what I did with Kia as she examined race relations at Brown as reflected in Brown black student publications since the early-1970s. She supplemented her careful reading of the black undergraduate publications *Right on!*, *Uwezo*, and *The African Sun*, with additional research and with interviews with Brown black alumni. Kia writes well and so seamlessly pulled all this together into a compelling, smooth readable narrative.

Kia Hayes was prior to graduation (with Honors), editor of *The African Sun*, Brown’s current black undergraduate publication, but one would never guess this by reading her thesis. She took impartial journalistic distance from what she studied and wrote as she tackled difficult issues of class, gender, race solidarity, sexuality, politics (in and outside Brown) and how these changed over time. Kia has won a fellowship for graduate study in one of our nation’s leading schools of journalism. The future of Big Ethics in journalism is therefore going to be in some very good hands.

**From Coghill to Hunter and Beyond:
Brief History of Child Psychology at Brown University**

**Lewis P. Lipsitt
Department of Psychology**

A young undergraduate classics and theology scholar at Brown University, George E. Coghill, received his B.A. in 1896. He could not have known that he was to be, arguably, the first developmental psychologist at Brown – arguably, because the Baptist minister Francis Wayland, president of Brown University (1827-1855), may be seen as the child psychologist of his day, a half-century earlier. But Wayland was not a behavior and development scientist.

Pres. Wayland respected the logic of inference from observations, and arrived at what he regarded as verities of human behavior during childhood. His interventions were grounded in religious principles, and he had lots of advice to offer parents, whom he implored to correct the “sinful willfulness” of children, even infants. In an article co-authored with the late Bill McLoughlin of our History Department, I questioned a disciplinary technique Wayland used with his son.

Notwithstanding Wayland’s earlier fame for his moral philosophy books and as parents’ advisor, George Coghill was the first scientifically based scholar of human development at Brown. In the first (1946) edition of the *Manual of Child Psychology*, edited by Brown’s own Leonard Carmichael, Coghill was referred to 29 times, more than Ivan Pavlov and Jean Piaget, Myrtle McGraw (known for studies of the method of co-twin control), G. Stanley Hall (first president of Clark University and of the American Psychological Association), William James (the Harvard philosopher/psychologist), and Alfred Binet (the originator of IQ tests). John B. Watson (“father” of American behaviorism) and Sigmund Freud did out-reference Coghill.

Coghill joined Brown’s Biology Department as a graduate student to earn one of the earliest PhD degrees, in 1902, with his now-classic dissertation, “The cranial nerves of *Amblystoma tigrinum*,” published in the *Journal of Comparative Neurology*. When in 1929 Coghill published his seminal work, organized as lectures given at University College London, under the title *Anatomy and the Problem of Behavior* (NY: Macmillan), these were his opening lines:

“My earliest scientific interests were aroused by an introductory collegiate course in psychology under Professor E.B. Delabarre. This course of instruction left me in an inquiring state of mind concerning what seemed to me to be the fundamental principles of psychology – the nature and interrelation of sensation, perception and thought. Eventually this attitude ripened into a decision to enter upon graduate study in psychology. But before an opportunity came for me to carry out this decision I became aware that the natural approach to the kind of psychological information I wanted lay through the physiology of the nervous system.”

George Coghill was well known for his lectures on embryology and the “elementary principles of development of human behavior.” From Edmund Delabarre’s influence on Coghill (before there was a Psychology Department) to the present, developmental psychology has had a prominent presence at Brown. Coghill’s teacher, Delabarre, became the first chair of Brown’s Psychology Department, in 1891-92. Coghill died in 1942 at the age of 69.

When George Coghill returned to Brown in 1934 to receive an honorary Doctor of Science degree, his citation read in part:

“...(for)his many publications contributing to a sound foundation for the study of behavior and as such receiving the acclaim and gratitude of neurologists, psychologists, and psych-biologists around the world...”.

The Carmichael period

Initially known for his studies of amblystoma and the differential effects of constitutional and experiential factors on development, Leonard Carmichael went on to study and publish (with colleagues Coronios and Schlosberg, in 1928) the development of behavior in the fetal cat. Theirs was a classic study, the first to make behavioral observations of mammalian embryos with intact circulation, and one of the earliest to employ motion pictures to aid the analysis of behavior. Similar studies continued on rodents until 1936, when Carmichael and several colleagues went to the University of Rochester. During this period, Carmichael wrote his important chapter for the Handbook of Child Psychology, edited by Carl Murchison, and established the position he later consolidated by editing “the Manual,” as it was called by graduate students in child development and behavior, but formally the Manual of Child Psychology, the first edition of which appeared in 1946, the second in 1954. Much-enlarged and multi-volume editions appear to this day under other editorships.

Over three decades, Brown psychologists maintained contact with the Emma Pendleton Bradley Home, established for the psychiatric and psychological care of children with problems and now known as the Bradley Hospital. Herbert Jasper began his important studies of development through a joint appointment between Brown and Bradley. He continued his career as a renowned neuropsychologist and neurologist at McGill. Many of our students did research at Bradley, where the so-called hyperkinetic impulse disorder, now called attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity, was first described and treated.

The first electroencephalographic studies in this country were reported simultaneously from Bradley and Massachusetts General Hospital. After Jasper left, this research was continued by physiological psychologist Donald Lindsley, a young scientist who pioneered, at Bradley and Brown, the first longitudinal studies of brain-wave changes in babies and young children, including his own son. Lindsley became an internationally noted physiological psychologist, and co-director of the UCLA Neurosciences Institute and chair of UCLA’s Psychology Department.

The Hunter period

Leonard Carmichael's successor as chair of the Psychology Department, Walter S. Hunter, had a career-long interest in what would eventually be called experimental child psychology. Hunter's work with children was motivated by a fondness for comparative psychology (the study of differences among species), and particularly for the behavioral study of symbolic processes in humans, quite a departure from the non-mentalistic behaviorism of his training. He did pioneering research on delayed reaction and on double alternation learning in children of different ages. His contributions to behavior and learning theory, and his studies of overt behavior mediated by thought processes, which are relevant to cognitive psychology today, left a "tradition" that continues within Brown's Psychology Department, as well as the Department of Cognitive and Linguistic Studies.

Around 1938, J. McVicker Hunt joined Psychology's faculty and helped continue the "tradition." Hunt, Schlosberg, Frank Finger, Richard Solomon, and Eliot Stellar (each to become a "star" in the field) worked in the area of developmental and comparative psychology. For example, they tried to set up experimental neuroses in rats through conflict-induction procedures, conditions that might have been predicted from Freudian theory. As the great Harold Schlosberg (he hired me and my affection endures) later said: "It produced interesting results, but no neuroses."

More successful were studies of infantile feeding frustration as a determiner of adult hoarding behavior, resulting in a classic paper still regarded as offering strong support of the life-long importance of very early experience. Unfortunately, this research program was a victim of World War II. Hunt (whose two daughters graduated from Pembroke, one a psychologist today, the other an accomplished flutist) found time at Brown to do his classic *Personality and the Behavior Disorders*.

The Schlosberg influence

With changes in personnel after the war, the Department's ties with Bradley were tenuous for a time. The two fields, learning, and sensory processes became ascendant in the Department. Ties were renewed with Bradley, however, when Anthony Davids, once a Brown undergraduate who had worked with Carl Pfaffmann and by 1955 a recent Ph.D. from Harvard, assumed the old dual appointment previously held by Jasper and Lindsley.

In 1956, with Schlosberg chair of the psychology department, it was decided to develop experimental child psychology as a third specialty, parallel to the fields of sensory and learning studies. The University approved this, and offered to support an additional faculty member. Before the appointment could be made in 1957, Psychology received additional support from the University's newly arranged affiliation with the National Collaborative Perinatal Project then being planned by the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness. The story from this point forward is long for this space, and becomes contemporary rather than history rather quickly – and then history again. Child psychologist Judy F. Rosenblith and I were hired, each with joint

appointments in the new Institute and the Psychology Department, our salaries being paid half by each. A developmental psychology program grew from this, a Child Study Center (now the Center for the Study of Human Development) was founded with myself as director, and several young scholars in child behavior and development began or enhanced their careers through this transformation of the Psychology Department executed principally by Harold Schlosberg. Among these individuals were Peter Eimas, Einar Siqueland, Bryan Shepp, Rochel Gelman, Alexander Bartoshuk, Paul Weisberg, Gerald Levin, and Eleanor Rosch Heider. Many fine researchers and teachers in the field of child behavior and development received their Ph.D. degree in experimental child psychology, among them Carolyn Rovee Collier, a premier researcher of infant memory who last year won the Howard Crosby Warren Medal, the highest honor of the Society of Experimental Psychologists.

The 4,000 newborns and their mothers, recruited between 1959 and 1966 for the Collaborative Project, are still being studied. These individuals are of great continuing interest scientifically and to the National Institutes of Health, especially because we have data regarding their development from before birth, through the first year of life, then on to numerous touch-points through their childhoods, to middle age. Many undergraduate Honors and graduate student dissertations were generated through this project and ancillary studies.

The Brown Medical School is regarded by some as a “spin-off” from the Collaborative Project begun in 1957. Its director, Glidden Brooks, was a physician who came to Brown from the executive director position of the United Cerebral Palsy Association. He was, in 1957, the only physician at Brown except for the head of the University’s health services. It was Brooks who told the then President Barnaby Keeney, in effect: “You could have a medical school here; the town doctors and the Brown gowns are working superbly together on this Child Development Study, in which obstetricians, pediatricians, geneticists, psychologists, sociologists, nurses, and biologists are all involved.” Brooks then organized the feasibility committee that led to the implementation of Brown’s 6-year Medical Program.

Vestiges of the collaborative project continue to this day at Brown. A very productive collaboration now exists between Brown and Harvard, and closely involving Miriam Hospital’s Center for Behavioral and Preventive Medicine. This owes much to the foresight and ingenuity of a Brown undergraduate, Steve Buka, who had worked with me in my infant laboratory at Women and Infants Hospital and is now a professor in Harvard’s School of Public Health. This program has great promise of continuity in perpetuity. There exist very few inter-generational psychological and epidemiological studies like this, especially involving prenatal and birth variables, and we are now examining third-generation participants.

Brown University’s first developmentalist, George Coghill, would probably be pleased, for he had a profound understanding of intergenerational stabilities -- and transmigrations.

Literature and Criticism in an International Frame

Olakunle George
Department of English

Those writings that have come to be categorized as “literature” work by means of a recognizably self-conscious use of language. They also often carry principles that attentive readers may follow in order to understand and enjoy them. That is, they often give us clues that we can use to interpret them with profit. And of course, they invariably tell us things about politics, society and inter-subjective interactions. Fiction and drama, in particular, put before us a range of human choices under stressful conditions. They thereby offer imaginative scenarios, wherein a range of characters or points of view invite readers to relate to each one attentively. In this way, literature offers us opportunities to inhabit or consider positions we may otherwise not care much about.

The foregoing remarks are truisms that deserve constant reiteration and extension. My own teaching and scholarship focus primarily on postcolonial African writing. I thus work in a field that is, along with others like African-American and Ethnic-American literatures, relatively young in the history of the discipline of literary criticism, and recent in terms of recognition within literature departments. The challenge of studying and teaching African literature, then, is that of highlighting the specific histories and cultures that the writers choose to explore, while also showing how these cultures are fundamentally and familiarly human. Literary and cultural theorists have over the years shown that when we deeply reflect upon what is particular in any given culture or cultural product, we will encounter therein what is universally shared by all cultures. I am persuaded by this view, and try to explore its implications in my scholarly work, as well as in the classroom.

I am reminded here of a scene from Chinua Achebe’s Things Fall Apart, perhaps the most widely read novel by a black African. In the scene, some characters are reacting to rumors about the incursion of Europeans into a neighboring clan. According to one of the characters, many in the small Nigerian village where the scene takes place during the 1890s do not believe the stories to be true. An old man named Uchendu contributes to the discussion by offering the strange claim that “there is no story that is not true.” On the terms of the novel, the old man’s statement asks to be interpreted. He is neither simply confirming the particular stories (or rumors) at issue, nor simply granting the truth of all stories. Rather, he is suggesting that in every story is a basic truth about human beings and what we can get up to. The full implication of Uchendu’s claim is that even lies carry within them a different kind of truth -- namely, that some datable human passion must exist as the motivation behind every story, even a lie. Now, motivations can be diverse and multiply layered, but can also be reduced to binaries of good and evil, us and them, and so forth. This, I think, is where the pleasure of teaching and writing about literature – African and otherwise -- becomes a challenge. The challenge is that of going beyond easy binaries in order to draw out the wide range and multiple layers of human passions and aspirations.

The years after World War II witnessed the achievement of formal independence by non-Western societies that had hitherto been under European colonial rule. Those years also witnessed heroic struggles for dignity and equal opportunities for disenfranchised and marginalized groups in the United States. These struggles testify to the resilience of collective will, the importance of unwavering hope and vision in human affairs. Because literature “happens” whenever social upheavals and realignments take place, the post-World War II era has yielded very exciting writing, a good portion of which comes from postcolonial writers. From Wole Soyinka to Derek Walcott, Assia Djebar to Toni Morrison, J. M. Coetzee to Amitav Ghosh, writers from diverse national and racial backgrounds have explored for us the human angle -- the interior landscape, so to speak -- that spurs and anchors such epochal developments as we have seen in the last half-century. As we say these days, the world we live in is thoroughly inter-connected. Likewise, the imaginative literature with which we are being blessed even as I write is richly international: nurtured within nations, yet reaching beyond them in power and relevance. In this trend lies the universality-in-particularity I touched upon earlier. And there, to my mind, resides the challenge and excitement of literature and criticism at the present time.

