

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Faculty Meeting—April 4, 2006

President Simmons called the meeting to order at about 4:03 PM. The usual motion to end at 6:00 PM was made, seconded, and approved. The minutes from the March 7, 2006 meeting were approved—a minor clarification will be made.

President Simmons addressed the Faculty. She said some of her time would be allocated to a report by Dean Vohra on faculty recruiting and part on a report on the bookstore review by Vice President Huidekoper. She commented on the appointment of Bob Zimmer as the next president of the University of Chicago and noted a senior person at the University of Chicago had thanked her for “warehousing” Bob. She further commented that she suspects we will be noticing more and more in the coming years his legacy at Brown. She asked the Faculty to joyfully congratulate him—which was done with much applause.

She stated that she believes an internal candidate for Provost will best serve Brown at this juncture and hopes to have a person in place well before the end of June. She has consulted with department chairs, the FEC, and other stakeholders and will invite a group of faculty and administrators to assist in developing a list of possible candidates. She thanked people who have sent her nominations/comments and hopes people will continue to send these. A committee has been formed to identify the next Dean of the College and has been actively soliciting the views of various campus groups. The committee has been principally focused on identifying internal candidates—tenured members of the Brown faculty. The position is described on the Provost’s web site. The search committee for the Vice President of Research has recently submitted its recommendation and the President hopes to be able to announce an appointment before the next Faculty Meeting. The search for the next director of the Watson Institute is entering its final phase.

Campaign kickoff events were held in Boston and New York. The Boston one attracted approximately 400 people and the New York one about 1400. The number of dollars pledged now exceeds \$635 million. The hope is to reach the halfway mark by Commencement. Prof. Rod Clifton will chair the faculty committee on the campaign and Becky More will be Vice Chair.

The President commented on Commencement plans. A survey of the senior class indicated a strong preference for keeping the class together and holding a meaningful portion of the ceremony on the Meeting House grounds. The seniors therefore will process to the Meeting House as in past years and gather on the lawn facing the Meeting House. Part of the ceremony will be held there. The seniors will then return to the College Green where the senior orations will be held.

Prof. Silverman asked if an effort was being made to increase the percentage of alumni giving to Brown. The President said one focus has been identifying alumni who will give during their whole lifetime. Neil Steinberg commented that about 38% of Brown alumni contribute—he hopes to raise this percentage to the low forties. Participation is very important; for one thing rating agencies are interested.

Dean Vohra reported that we have hired 30 new faculty so far this year and hope to hire a total of 50. Of the 30, 15 are women; in the physical sciences twelve new hires have been made—half are women. More appointments at the assistant professor level were made this year than in the recent past.

Beppie Huidekoper described the Bookstore review. She discussed the process and identified the committee. She presented what the committee has learned. The committee favors at present an outside vendor to manage the bookstore and will certainly explore that option. If the Bookstore continues to be independent, sustained management expertise will be needed. She emphasized that the decision has not been made and feedback is continuing to be received. Many meetings, including two fora, will be held this spring. The bookstore staff is being kept involved in the process.

Prof. Dahlberg spoke to the issue. He drew the Faculty's attention to two pieces of literature that had been distributed outside the meeting. He said the Brown Bookstore had been very highly ranked by external groups. He pointed out that the bookstore is staffed by 40 full time employees of the University. If the bookstore is operated by an outside vendor these people would lose their Brown benefits. These are loyal members of the Brown community and give good service. Their positions would be vulnerable a year after the bookstore is taken over by an outside vendor. Prof. Keach asked the faculty to consider this possible change very carefully. He has taught at Rutgers and his wife teaches at Tufts. At both institutions hiring an outside vendor has caused difficulties for employees and has decreased the academic experience for the faculty. Michael Pesta, Registrar, noted that he had been in charge of the textbook department at one time. The primary focus in the discussion must be securing textbooks for students—the Bookstore has a good record in that regard, which should not be threatened. Beppie said her committee would weigh the pros and cons, basing the decision on data.

Provost Zimmer spoke next. He said he was gratified by Dean Vohra's report, especially by the number of women faculty members joining physical science departments. This had been a concern for several years and he appreciated the work of department chairs in making a special effort to locate new women faculty members. He commented that we hope to secure a faculty development grant, which has an emphasis on women and minority faculty members.

The Provost said he plans to focus on matters that can be wrapped up before he leaves. One of these issues is certificates to be awarded by Continuing Education. The matter has been looked at by the APC and will go to the FEC. Concerns existed about appropriate faculty and departmental oversight but these have been resolved. This has been an experimental year in terms of departmental budgets—in particular with regard to rolling over non-salary items from year to year. The experiment will continue. The Provost commented that the right level of financial advice must be made available to Department Chairs. The question of charging graduate student tuition to grants is still worth considering. The proposed Integrated Science and Engineering Program (science cohort) should not go forward until the issue of student housing is worked out, as much of the concern dealt with the stress created by a larger class size. He believes much value exists in the courses proposed for the program and plans to set up a structure this spring to discuss such courses.

Prof. Bossy asked if the mechanism for giving financial advice to Department Chairs might proceed on the cluster model—the Provost is still actively searching for a model. Prof. Hermance asked if the work on the Integrated Science program courses would focus on upper level courses—the Provost thought it best to focus on early level courses. Prof. Wegner asked if salaries offered to new faculty members were more competitive than those offered last year. Dean Vohra commented that two mechanisms exist: we need to pay competitive salaries to attract new people and we have made great progress in improving the general level of salaries at Brown.

Prof. Pelcovits, Chair of the FEC, started his remarks by saying he would again begin by talking about the ombudsperson position. A short list has been created. He commented about the Forum on the Integrated Science and Engineering Program. The minutes of the Forum had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. His impression was many people at the Forum thought we had much in place in terms of strong science programs that we need to get the word out. He thanked Prof. Tennenhouse for leading the two recent Faculty Fora and Prof. Seifert for taking the minutes. Prof. Pelcovits described the faculty committee on the campaign, which will communicate with the faculty about the campaign, identify faculty to talk to alumni groups, identify faculty to host potential donors visiting the campus, raise money from faculty, and identify possible donors. The matter of benefits for research faculty, which Prof. Hermance had asked the FEC to look at and to report back to the Faculty, will be considered at the next FEC meeting. Prof. Pelcovits has developed some information on the topic and will meet with a group of research faculty.

Prof. Valente asked about a putative Graduate Council proposal on plus/minus grades. It had not been brought to the FEC—evidently an article in the Brown Daily Herald was incorrect.

The Faculty went into Executive Session.

After the Executive Session, Prof. Fishman presented a motion to delete from the *Faculty Rules and Regulations* the section regarding the University Creative Arts Council—such is no longer a faculty committee. The motion had been distributed with the Agenda. The text of the motion is:

Motion to Delete the Section of the Faculty Rules and Regulations regarding the University Creative Arts Council

SUMMARY: Motion to delete in its entirety the section pertaining to the University Creative Arts Council (CAC) as it appears in the Faculty Rules and Regulations, as the CAC is no longer a faculty committee.

MOTION: To amend the Faculty Rules & Regulations, effective immediately, by deleting in its entirety Part 1, Section III. E., pertaining to the University Creative Arts Council.

RATIONALE: In Spring 2003, the Task Force on Faculty Governance recommended that the University Creative Arts Council should consider reconfiguring itself from a committee of the faculty into an entity representing the expanded activities, goals, and objectives of the Council. Upon this recommendation, the Executive Committee of the

Creative Arts Council discussed the changes to its charge as stated, and took steps necessary to alter its governance structure. These changes included expanding the membership to include undergraduate and graduate student representatives, members of the University administration, faculty-at-large, and representatives from the Brown/Trinity Consortium and the Rhode Island School of Design. The reporting structure was also altered, with the CAC now reporting directly to the Provost. These changes were agreed to by the members of the CAC Executive Committee, and discussed with and approved by the Provost.

The purpose of this motion is to officially remove the CAC from its listing as a Faculty Committee.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Prof. Gruppuso presented the motion changing the medical school admission policies to allow for standard admission of qualified candidates. The motion had been distributed with the Agenda. The text of the motion is:

Motion to Change the Brown Medical School Admission Policy April 2006

SUMMARY: Motion to recommend to the Corporation an amendment to the Faculty Rules & Regulations, effective July 1, 2006, for the purpose of changing the Brown Medical School admission policy to allow for standard admission of qualified candidates.

MOTION: That the Faculty recommend to the Corporation that they in Part 2, Section 6.I.7. of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on The Brown Medical School delete the existing language as struck-through below and replace it with the proposed new language underlined and in bold below:

7. a. Students, other than those in the PLME, who possess a baccalaureate degree from any college or university and who have fulfilled the necessary premedical requirements may be admitted to the first year of the Brown Medical School. In addition, These students may ~~are to~~ be nominated for admission by those colleges and universities with which Brown University has established Early Identification Programs and by those colleges and universities that conduct a premedical post-baccalaureate program with which Brown University has established agreements for early provisional acceptance into the Brown Medical School. Students from any college or university may apply for acceptance into the first year of the Brown Medical School and the Graduate School as M.D./Ph.D. students.
- ~~b. Effective July 1, 2004 students, other than those in the PLME and those specified in paragraph 7.a. above, who possess a baccalaureate degree from any college or university and who have fulfilled the necessary premedical requirements may be admitted to the first year of the Brown Medical School. Such students may be admitted into the first year classes entering the Brown Medical School in September 2005 and September~~

~~2006. Following September 2006, a recommendation will be made to the faculty as to whether a program of standard admission should be implemented on a permanent basis.~~

RATIONALE: From 1985 until 2004 the Brown Medical School admitted students to the first year of the Doctor of Medicine program through one of four routes – the eight-year Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME), the Brown Avenue, the Early Identification Programs and pre-medical post-baccalaureate programs from colleges and universities with which Brown has established agreements. In April 2004, upon recommendation from the faculty, the Corporation approved a two-year pilot project to allow for a “standard admission” route to the Medical School by qualified students from the general population of colleges and universities. Up to ten first-year openings were designated for standard route matriculants in the classes of 2009 (admitted in the fall of 2005) and 2010 (to be admitted in the fall of 2006). The pilot project was intended to test the belief that the absence of standard admissions to Brown Medical School had adverse affects on the School’s reputation. Brown Medical School was essentially invisible to the thousands of applicants to U.S. medical schools. The faculty and Corporation approval of the pilot stated that it would be considered successful if the number of applicants is large and the academic qualifications of the matriculated students are very strong.

For the class of 2009, 2,716 AMCAS applications were made to Brown Medical School. Of that number, 1,615 completed a secondary application, 239 applicants were interviewed, and 48 interviews were offered admission. 11 students enrolled in Brown Medical School through the standard route. Brown was significantly more selective than the nation’s medical schools in offering acceptance (3% vs. 48%) and the percentage of the applicant pool offered admission was similar to that seen at other Ivy League institutions (3% vs. 6%). These results from the first year of the pilot project indicated a highly selective admission process.

The scholastic performance of interviewees was excellent, as indicated by a mean undergraduate grade point average (GPA) of 3.67. In addition, 70% of the interviewees had undergraduate GPAs equal to or greater than 3.60 and 51% of interviewees presented GPAs equal to or greater than 3.70. The mean composite MCAT score for the interviewed was 32.5 (89th percentile nationally).

Four of the 11 matriculants (36%) had obtained graduate degrees, as compared to 3% for other matriculants. Examples include an associate professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School and director of the Center for Matrix Biology at the Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital; a Marshall scholar who recently completed a Master of Science degree in Health Policy, Planning, and Financing at the London School of Economics; and a former program manager for Microsoft with undergraduate and graduate degrees from MIT in electrical engineering and computer science. Matriculants were also more likely to have chosen undergraduate majors in the natural or physical sciences. Nine of the eleven

matriculants (82%) were science or engineering majors, as compared with 37% for other matriculants.

For the class of 2010 Brown Medical School has seen a marked increase in all categories: 4,090 AMCAS applications received (42% increase over last year); 2,684 secondary applications received for the M.D. program (66% increase over last year); 297 candidates have been offered interviews. The academic credentials and qualifications of the applicants continue to remain very high.

In February 2004, the Brown Corporation endorsed the goal of expanding the current size of the student body of Brown Medical School by approximately 33 percent. While the size of the Brown Medical School student body is a matter for the Corporation to decide, it should be noted that a proposal has been submitted to the Liason Committee on Medical Education (whose approval as the accrediting body of Brown Medical School is also required) and is anticipated to be made to the Corporation to increase the size of the Brown Medical School student body by approximately 25 percent over the next six years. This would be accomplished by increasing the number of matriculants entering the medical school through the standard (premed) admissions route, if approved. It has been proposed that the number of first-year students go from the present 72 to 108 through an increase of 12 per year over the next three years. The size of the entire medical student body would be brought to 432. The proposed increase in class size would occur at the same time that the Brown/Dartmouth Program, presently a source of 15 third-year students per year, is being phased out over the next four years. Thus, the proposed expansion would lead to only modest expansion of our present contingent of students in their clinical training years while the size of the first-year class would increase by nearly 50 percent. The faculty resources and facilities required for continued effective implementation of the preclinical curriculum have with an expanded student body, for the most part, been identified and are not an impediment to expansion.

The proposal to establish a permanent standard route of admission to Brown Medical School, and the intention to propose an increase in the size of the medical student body, have been discussed with and received the support of: the clinical and campus department chairs within the Division of Biology and Medicine, the Biomedical Faculty Council, Medical Faculty Executive Committee, the Faculty Executive Committee and the Academic Priorities Committee.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

In answer to a question, Prof. Gruppuso commented that the size of the Brown Medical School is planned to increase by 33%. If matters proceed as planned, the percentage of PLME students in the program will drop from about 75% to less than 50%.

Prof. Lichtenbaum presented the motion clarifying the charge of the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee. The motion had been distributed with the Agenda. The text of the motion is:

Motion by the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee to Revise the Faculty Rules and Regulations

SUMMARY: Motion by the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee to revise the Faculty Rules, effective July 1, 2006, for the purpose of clarifying the charge of TPAC. After more than two years of operation, the committee members recommend some revisions to the current charge to bring the rules in line with actual practice.

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 1 of Memberships, Meetings and Committees, Section 2, VI. B.1.a, B.1.c., B.1.d., B.5.b, B.5.h., and B.5.i. delete the existing language (as struck-through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below) effective July 1, 2006.

B. Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee

1. Charge

- a. ~~The Committee shall review and, where appropriate, approve each academic unit's written criteria for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure. These shall be submitted for review every five years by academic units and shall be kept on file with the Dean of the Faculty.~~
- b. ~~The Committee will review recommendations concerning (1) the renewal of appointments of Instructors, Assistant Professors and Senior Lecturers, (2) the promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer, Associate and full Professor, and (3) the awarding of tenure to untenured faculty members in light of each academic unit's written criteria for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure. The Committee will review recommendations of appointments to tenured positions or to the rank of Senior Lecturer. The Committee will transmit such recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Medicine & Biological Sciences, as appropriate, as well as the Provost. After receiving recommendations from the Committee and the appropriate Dean the Provost will submit his or her recommendation to the President and the Corporation for final action. This charge applies to all appointments and promotions noted above, except for non-tenurable positions within the School of Medicine, which are reviewed by the Committee on Medical Faculty Appointments.~~
- b. The Committee will review Departmental Statements of Criteria and Standards and will make recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty and/or the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, when necessary, to bring them in line with generally accepted University practices.
- c. In reviewing recommendations for tenure, the Committee is guided by the following statements:
Candidates for tenure at Brown must show evidence of outstanding scholarship. They must also be highly effective teachers, and be positive contributors to faculty governance as well as to the intellectual life of their

department, university, and profession. Demonstrated ability in teaching and service are necessary but not sufficient conditions for tenure.

Peer esteem, both within and outside the university, is a valuable indicator of scholarly ability and achievement. In all cases, the quality and not only the quantity of scholarly production should be paramount.

RATIONALE: TPAC is the right committee to make recommendations on revisions to department standards and criteria, but the Deans are in a better position to oversee and negotiate the process of changing them with each department. Serving as a review board for departmental criteria and standards on a regular five year basis is beyond the scope of the Committee's charge to evaluate cases submitted to us and would only interfere with it. Also, we recommend switching the order of paragraphs a and b since the primary responsibility of TPAC, reviewing recommendations for renewal, tenure, etc. should be placed first among its charges. The last two paragraphs of 1.c. were adapted from the Handbook for Academic Administration, Chapter 16.

- d. In its review the Committee shall give due weight to the statements and evidence gathered by the academic units sponsoring the recommendation, including all evidence submitted by the individual under review. The Committee may solicit additional evidence from within or without the sponsoring group. ~~The Committee's review shall include consideration of procedures, of the evaluations of professional qualifications, and of institutional needs.~~ The Committee's review shall consist primarily of the evaluation of professional qualifications and shall consider whether proper procedures have been followed. The ~~procedural~~ review shall also determine whether the decision was consistent with (1) ~~the written University Affirmative Action Plan, the Corporation Statement on Non-discrimination,~~ (2) the academic unit's written criteria for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure on file with the Dean of the Faculty, and (3) procedural regulations of the University.

RATIONALE: TPAC's primary role is the review of professional qualifications, and the charge should reflect that fact. While TPAC should evaluate if candidates are treated fairly in the review process in comparison with other candidates, the committee does not review search information related to the University's adherence to the Affirmative Action policy. Finally, the evaluation of institutional needs is beyond the scope of the committee's responsibilities.

- ~~d.e.~~ The Committee shall, in its advisory capacity, either ~~endorse~~ accept or reject the recommendation of the department or make a recommendation of its own.
- e.f. Recommendations for appointments, reappointments, and promotion of faculty members other than specifically described above shall be reported to the Committee. The Committee may review any of these it feels requires such review. In all cases, when a review is requested, the Committee shall undertake such a review. A review may be requested by

the candidate concerned, the Provost, the President, or the Chair of the academic unit.

f.g. The Committee shall report on its deliberations annually to the Faculty and to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

RATIONALE: The additional words clarify this charge and the source of the recommendation under consideration by TPAC.

B. Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee

5. Operation

b. Upon receipt of a recommendation, be it positive or negative, regarding the renewal of appointment, promotion, or the award of tenure, the ~~Committee~~ Dean of the Faculty shall inform the faculty member concerned that such a recommendation is under review. ~~At the conclusion of this review, the Committee shall notify the individual and Chair concerned of the outcome and, upon request, the rationale for its decision.~~

RATIONALE: Once a recommendation from a department has been received by the Dean of the Faculty, the candidate under review should receive notice from the Dean, whose office receives the dossier for the case from the department. The second sentence is redundant with B.5.i. See change to that section below.

h. If the Committee finds reason to question the recommendation of the academic unit, it ~~will~~ may ask the academic unit to make further explanations. In such a case the Committee may ask the academic unit to reconsider its recommendation.

RATIONALE: This word change reflects the actual operation of TPAC.

i. At the conclusion of the Committee's discussion, a vote will be taken on whether the Committee accepts the recommendation before it. The record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation, and all other documents in the Committee's possession, shall be supplied to the Provost and to the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Medicine & Biological Sciences, as appropriate. ~~The Chair of the Committee shall inform the department chair about the substance of the Committee's recommendation to the Provost and the Dean soon after the Committee has made its decision. The department chair shall communicate this information promptly to the candidate, though underscoring for the candidate that it is still not necessarily the University's final decision. The decision of the Committee shall also be conveyed to the department chair by the Chair of the Committee soon after that decision is reached, and the department chair shall promptly communicate this information to the candidate, though underscoring for the candidate that it is still not necessarily the University's final decision. In the event of a denial of the department's recommendation, the Chair of the Committee shall provide to the department chair in writing a statement of the rationale for its decision within three weeks of the date of its decision.~~ The Dean will convey his or

her recommendation to the Provost. The Provost, thereafter, shall declare his or her acceptance or rejection of the vote, and, in the case of rejection, provide the Committee with a written response. The Provost will recommend action for the approval of the President and Corporation, if such is called for by the decision.

RATIONALE: The new language is intended to clarify the existing procedure by which the Chair of the Committee conveys a committee decision to a department. Immediately after the meeting at which TPAC votes on a departmental recommendation, the Chair of the Committee verbally informs the department chair whether a recommendation has been approved or denied; in the case of a denial, the Chair of the Committee relates the alternative recommendation made by the committee. However, at this point the Chair of the Committee does not discuss the rationale for the decision. In the case of a negative decision, the Chair of the Committee will provide a written explanation to the department chair as soon as possible, with an outer time limit of three weeks. This procedure provides time for other members of TPAC to review the written explanation, thus ensuring that the explanation accurately reflects the reasons for the committee vote.

Prof. Lichtenbaum commented that this change reflected what the Committee has actually been doing. Prof. Sibulkin asked about the wording of the last sentence in Section 2, VI, B.1, c. Prof. Lichtenbaum said the sentence should read, "In all cases, it is important to consider the quality and not only the quantity of scholarly production." The change was considered a friendly amendment and accepted.

Discussion ensued concerning the deletion from the charge that the Committee review regularly each academic unit's criteria for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure. Prof. Braun asked if TPAC is not responsible for ensuring diversity in the faculty, who is? The answer given was Provost Brenda Allen and the Committee on Diversity in Hiring. Prof. Braun commented that some group should be considering the issue in broad terms. In answer to a question about the history of having a faculty committee do the review, Prof. Spoehr commented that such had been part of the Lamphere consent agreement and at one time CONFRAT was involved in such matters. Prof. Spoehr went on to comment that a proactive review was necessary. We do not want to have to do a review when a case is before us. Prof. Savage noted these reviews had been a joint responsibility of the FEC and CONFRAT. They are now the duty of the Dean of the Faculty.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Prof. Armstrong announced that Prof. Whitfield in Comparative Literature will receive the Wriston Fellowship. He reviewed the fellowship and Prof. Whitfield's accomplishments. The announcement was met with applause.

Prof. Spoehr presented the report of the Committee on Nominations. First she gave the result of the recent ballot elections to committees.

BALLOT ELECTIONS RESULTS:

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

Diane Lipscombe (Neuroscience) filling an existing vacancy until June 30, 2008.

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON GRIEVANCE

Peter Heywood (MCB) to June 30, 2008

Reid Cooper (Geological Sciences) to June 30, 2008

Susan Short (Sociology) to June 30, 2007

K. Dian Kriz (History of Art & Architecture) to June 30, 2007

Alternate: David Gottlieb (Applied Mathematics) to June 30, 2008

She also presented nominations for committee memberships:

NOMINATIONS FOR FACULTY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO BE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY:

TENURE, PROMOTIONS & APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

Donald Jackson (MPPB) replacing Barry Connors (Neuroscience) to June 30, 2006.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY IN INVESTMENT POLICIES

Eli Upfal (Computer Science) replacing Paul Hess (Geology) to June 30, 2008.

The President asked for other nominations. None were made. The nominations were approved by a voice vote.

Prof. Dube presented the report of the Academic Code Committee. The report had been distributed in the Agenda. She introduced her co-chair, Prof. Depuydt, and Dean Krahulik, the Case Administrator. She said the main purpose of the Committee is to adjudicate cases but the Committee has also been discussing academic honesty in general and collecting data using the senior survey. No questions were asked.

Prof. Rand presented the report of the Academic Priorities Committee. The report had been distributed in the Agenda. He reviewed the various items discussed during the year. No questions were asked.

Prof. Spoehr presented the report of the Computing Advisory Board. The report had been distributed in the Agenda. She said she was speaking for a Committee officer, Dr. Waryn, who was completing responsibilities related to acquiring citizenship. She noted that computers are ubiquitous on campus and the report touches on many issues. She said she would be glad to answer questions. None were asked.

Prof. Campbell presented the report of the University Resources Committee. Again, the report had been distributed with the Agenda. He reviewed the high points of the report. He believes the FY 07 budget is reasonable, especially in light of rising fuel costs. The budget problems are certainly not unique to Brown. He welcomes additional funds from the campaign.

No old business existed. No new business was brought before the Faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barrett Hazeltine
Secretary of the Faculty