

Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED)
Annual Report
September 2008-June 2009

CFED represents a new faculty committee that is a merger of three older committees: The Committee on the Status of Women, the Committee on Diversity in Hiring and the Faculty Affairs Committee. CFED is composed of nine faculty members and four *ex officio* members so scheduling meetings in the first year was logistically challenging. This being the first year of the committee there was some confusion about the duration of appointments and who would serve as vice-chair. Professor Marida Hollos agreed to serve as vice-chair. The committee met a total of seven times during the academic year.

The initial meeting was devoted to discussion of the rather large charge to the committee: recommendations on policy related to faculty salaries, benefits and leaves; assess the diversity of the faculty: assess and promote University policies relating to diversity and non-discrimination: review the status of women and minority members of the faculty; monitor the process of pre-selects and finally review negative recommendations for tenure, promotion or reappointment. We reviewed the annual reports of the three preceding committees and identified areas of concern.

During the course of the year CFED became aware of two other committees with which it is supposed to have liaison, the Committee on Faculty Retirement and the Human Resource Advisory Board. These liaisons are described in the charge of each of these committees but not in the CFED charge which should be modified to be consistent. We had two meetings with members of CFR and designated a CFED member to serve on HRAB and to report back to CFED.

We received a report from associate provost Allen regarding open searches during our meeting in December. Provost Allen noted that she felt that there was some improvement regarding the diversity of the faculty. Associate provost Allen gave updates at the next three meetings on the status of faculty searches although the committee never received a final report.

Dean Vorha provided CFED with copies of an external report on faculty salaries and the committee devoted an entire meeting to discussing the report. Overall it was felt that Brown had made some progress relative to our peer institutions regarding faculty salaries, especially at the professorial rank. There was some discussion of salaries at the associate professor level and it was observed that this represents a heterogeneous group. Some represent "stars" that rapidly traverse this rank while others have remained in rank for extended period without promotion. Andrew Foster, the chair of Economics participated in the discussion to explain the regression analysis used in the report. It was felt that there should be some communication to the general faculty regarding the results of the survey. It was further noted that if the zero increase policy continues Brown is in jeopardy of loosing the gains it has made over the recent past.

CFED was made aware of another consultant (Barbara Butterfield) retained to examine the Brown faculty retirement program. Some members of CFED and CFR met with the consultant. Unfortunately the report was not made available until May and although circulated to CFED it was not reviewed during the academic year. This report needs to be discussed next year.

With regard to benefits CFED received a report from Drew Cummings comparing faculty benefits at several comparable universities. Unfortunately time did not permit scheduling a meeting to discuss this report.

CFED was informed by associate provost Allen of three negative TPAC recommendations that were sustained by the provost. Two actions were for promotion to associate professor with tenure and one was for promotion to full professor. The CFED chair contacted each faculty member by email informing them of the existence and charge of CFED and enquiring whether they wished to appear before CFED. The two assistant professors expressed interest in appearing before the committee. In one case CFED met with the department chair and other representatives, the candidate and another interested faculty member. In the second case CFED met *via* conference call with the candidate. In both cases CFED reviewed the TPAC dossier and communications from both Dean Vorha and Provost Kertzer relating to the candidate and material provided by the candidates. In both cases there was unanimous consensus on CFED regarding the review. In one case CFED found no procedural issues while in the other case thought that the case should be returned to TPAC. In both cases the chair communicated with the President concerning the CFED deliberations.

CFED felt that one of the cases revealed a flaw in the TPAC process relating to recusals. It was the strong feeling of CFED that the equal distribution of TPAC members across the four academic disciplines should be maintained for the deliberations. Recusals, particularly multiple recusals, have the possibility biasing the review of individual cases. This concern was expressed in the communication with the President.

In discussing the overall review process CFED had several suggestions for improvement. It was strongly felt that CFED should have access TPAC minutes and votes. These items were not available to CFED last year. In considering when CFED should begin its review it was thought that placing CFED after the Provost creates a significant timing problem. TPAC votes, especially involving tenure often happen in mid April and the Provost has a 30-day period to review each case. This timing means CFED review often does not start until mid May or in some cases even later. This timing presents problems both for scheduling meetings and a quorum. One possible solution would be for CFED to initiate its review after a TPAC decision and before the final Provost evaluation. This might make more work for the committee if the Provost overturns a negative TPAC but this is a relatively rare event.

Two issues came up during last year where CFED did not follow its charge. According to its charge CFED reports its findings to TPAC, the Provost and the President (as appropriate). This year the reporting to the Provost and TPAC was not done in a timely

manner because these reporting lines were not recognized by the chair until this fall. CFED felt that there should be a report back to the candidate and to the appropriate Dean of the recommendation of the committee. This report should be added to the CFED charge. The second issue came up last year because CFED only reviewed denials if the candidate wished to pursue the case. This was most likely a continuation of the CFD policy yet violates the CFED charge that states, "It shall review denials...". A case can be made for either policy but the intent of the FEC should be clarified.

A detailed reading of the CFED charge revealed a question of FEC intent regarding recusals. The charge states "Members of the Committee must recuse themselves from reviews of faculty members in an academic unit in which they hold an appointment." Particularly in light of the concerns about recusals from TPAC the intent of this statement needs to be clarified.

Peter Shank, Chair Microbiology and Immunology

Marida Hollos, Vice Chair Anthropology

Michael Kosterlitz, Physics

Alex Zaslavsky, Engineering

Kenneth Wong, Education

Luiz Valente, Portuguese and Brazilian Studies and Comparative Literature

Rhacel Parrenas American Civilization

Shadi Bartsch, Classics

Conrad Johanson, Clinical Neuroscience