

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Faculty Meeting— March 3, 2009

President Simmons called the meeting to order at about 4:05 p.m. The customary motion to adjourn at 6:00 p.m. was made, seconded, and passed.

Approval of Minutes of the February 3, 2009 Faculty Meeting will be postponed until the April meeting.

Professor Paul Dupuis presented a Memorial Minute for David Gottlieb, Ford Foundation Professor Emeritus of Applied Mathematics. The minute is attached and will be entered into the permanent records of the Faculty and copies sent to members of the immediate family.

Professor Dreier, Chair of the FEC, noted the large number of motions before the Faculty at this meeting. He reviewed them briefly.

The first motion dealt with the establishment of the Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences. The text of the motion was

MOTION: The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences. The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows that a Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences be established.

The proposal had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. The motion was explained by Prof. Padbury. The Center has been developed over the past two and one half years by many campus and hospital-based faculty. Brown had been the recipient of a Planning Grant from the National Institute of Health, which had supported the development.

Prof. Clifton noted that the Department of Bio-Medical Engineering had not been listed in the document distributed. Prof. Padbury said many examples of appropriate activities existed at Brown and the Center is prepared to work with all. Prof. Valente asked about the required financial commitment—some will come from the hospitals, some from the University. Dean Wing commented that the Division of Biology and Medicine believes this is a very important Center and will support it fully. Prof. Padbury noted that education is the cornerstone of the NIH awards and will be a priority for the Center. The proposal does not mention new degree programs but such are expected to be planned.

The motion carried on a voice vote.

The second motion was intended to clean up the *Faculty Rules and Regulations* by removing references to Modes of Thought courses. The text of the motion was

MOTION: That the Faculty amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective immediately, for the purpose of removing Modes of Thought Courses, found in the

Faculty Rules and Regulations, Part 2, Section 4, II, F and all other references thereto and renumbering sections where needed.

Part 2. Academic Programs

Section 4. The College

II. Courses of Instruction

F. Modes of Thought Courses

Resolved

That, because the first college years are so significant in the formulation of the student's educational objectives, a special program — Modes of Thought — be established to provide freshmen and sophomores with opportunities to participate actively with a professor and a small group of students in courses in a variety of academic areas.

Resolved further

To start offering in 1969-70 Modes of Thought Courses as described below.

1. The Modes of Thought course should place major emphasis on the methods, concepts, and value systems required in approaching an understanding of a specific problem, topic or issue in a particular field of inquiry. The how and why of studying a given field should pervade the entire structure of the course. Facts must be considered as a point of departure in a course where the purpose is to create the spirit of a field and to spark the student's interest and capacity to deal with it meaningfully.
2. The particular subject in a given course, as limited or as broad as it may be, must always serve primarily as a vehicle for exploring modes of thought in the field of inquiry to which it belongs. By "field of inquiry" is meant a general category of scholarly activity such as Humanities, Social Studies, Natural Sciences or Formal Thought, that transcends departmental disciplines.
3. Modes of Thought courses include: (a) the course which explores the modes of thought in a particular field of inquiry (Humanities, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, Formal Thought); (b) the Interfield course (e.g., Darwinism, World War III; Population Growth), designed to examine the relationship between modes of thought in two or more fields of inquiry. The Interfield course would be offered under one or more fields of inquiry as designated by the professor(s).
4. It being recognized that an atmosphere of excitement and interest is a most important factor in the learning process, the Modes of Thought course should be viewed as highly personal. It should have its justification for existence in the individuals serving as faculty and students. Accordingly, course subject matter and course structure should not be propagated from one year to the next; rather, a course should be offered only as long as a professor is willing to teach it and a sufficient number of students choose to enroll in it.

5. To ensure further this atmosphere of excitement and interest, the Modes of Thought course should be the focal point for lively experimentation, and innovative proposals for courses should be encouraged and supported enthusiastically.
6. The Modes of Thought course should not be a prerequisite for any advanced course. The danger exists that inappropriate pressures may be placed on the course to shape its direction in order to serve the purposes of 50 advanced students. Accordingly, traditional "Survey" and "Service" courses are not appropriate for designation as Modes of Thought courses.
7. In the Modes of Thought courses special emphasis should be placed on the "problem approach," in which a single problem might be viewed from several different perspectives by professors and students of differing academic backgrounds. Participating faculty should not divide the course into consecutive blocks of time whereby they phase in and out of teaching duties. Rather, the students in such courses should have direct contact with at least one faculty member throughout the course. The College Curriculum Council should encourage and support courses that are proposed by two or more professors working as a team. At the same time, it is recognized that many of the Modes of Thought courses will be taught by one professor working alone with the students.
8. Although lectures may form a necessary and desirable approach in the teaching of some Modes of Thought courses, in all cases there must be ample opportunity for discussions pursued in small groups of twenty or less. The more detailed mechanics of any particular course, however, will always be determined by the course itself and the individuals involved.
9. Along with the opportunity for discussion pursued in small groups, self-expression through written work should also be encouraged in a manner consistent with the aims of the specific course. Above all, the student should have direct access to detailed and constructive criticism of his or her writing efforts.
10. To create a relaxed atmosphere in which the student is able to explore fields of inquiry that might interest him or her, the Modes of Thought courses should always be graded on a "Satisfactory" basis, with qualitative statements made for individual performance. The qualitative statements prepared by the professor in consultation with the students will be used for counseling purposes.
11. The College Curriculum Council should encourage professors to use qualified undergraduates as teaching assistants to provide ancillary services beyond those possible by the professor. Active participation of undergraduate teaching assistants as tutors will not only enrich the experience of the advanced student but will also provide incentives for the entering freshmen.
12. (a) The Faculty should be encouraged to give, the students to take, and the Administration to support Modes of Thought courses; (b) the program should be subject to continued scrutiny and change; and (c) the Faculty and Administration should be committed to implement this program to the fullest possible extent.

13. Amendment by the Faculty, March 5, 1974: Notwithstanding the first sentence of paragraph 6, above, Modes of Thought courses with appropriate content may be included as part of a student's concentration program when a petition to do so is submitted on such student's behalf by the student's concentration advisor and approved by the College Curriculum Council.

RATIONALE:

In her 1989 report, *The Brown Curriculum, Twenty Years Later* Dean of the College Sheila Blumstein acknowledged the failure of the Modes of Thought courses as a viable general education program for Brown students. In view of the fact that Modes of Thought courses have not existed as a separate program for twenty years, it seems prudent to delete this language from the Faculty Rules and Regulations.

The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. Dean Bergeron noted she had found the original language describing the Modes of Thought program to be inspiring.

Prof. Colwill asked why the Modes of Thought program failed. Dean Bergeron said she understood it was felt not to meet the need for general education. The present Freshman Seminars serve somewhat the same purpose. People who had been involved with the program earlier might know better about why the Program was discontinued. Prof. Fishman noted he had been involved with a Modes of Thought course, together with faculty members from Biology and Mathematics. The course went well; no one was paid to teach it.

The motion carried on a voice vote.

The next motion clarified the distinctions between the various mechanisms for undergraduates to do independent studies. The text of the motion was

MOTION: That the Faculty amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, effective immediately, and expand the description of independent study courses found in the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, Part 2, Section 4, II, D, E, F, for the purpose of clarifying the distinctions between the Independent Study Program, the Group Independent Study Program, and the Departmental Independent Study Program.

D. Independent Study Program (ISP)

1. Any student may register for an Independent Study course or courses for any semester. Each such course must have the approval of a Brown university instructor who shall be responsible for the scrutiny of the proposal, the evaluation of the work done, and the assignment of a grade. The sponsor is not expected to give regular tutorial instruction.

2. Proposals for ~~Independent Study~~ ISP courses ~~must be submitted in accordance with guidelines established by the College Curriculum Council. The proposals will be reviewed by the College Curriculum Council to assure the academic quality of the proposed course and to avoid undue duplication. Proposals for the fall semester are~~

~~due by September 1 and for the spring semester by January 15. Proposals for the fall semester should be turned in by April 1 of the preceding spring semester; proposals for the spring semester are due in November 15 of the fall semester (precise deadlines are listed on the Dean of the College website). Proposals submitted after these dates, but not later than the first day of classes of the pertinent semester, will be considered only upon clear justification to the College Curriculum Council of the late submittal.~~

~~3. The deadlines for submission of Internship proposals are the same as those for Group Study, i.e., fall semester proposals are due April 1 of the preceding spring semester; proposals for the spring semester are due by November 15 of the preceding fall semester. ISP courses appear on the transcript with a unique course number and title.~~

E. Group Independent Study Program (GISP)

1. Group Independent Study courses ~~studies~~ are cooperative inquiries in which participating students bear major responsibility for both planning and conduct of the work. They provide an opportunity for academic pursuits which might not be available in regular courses. They carry course credit.

2. Each group study is sponsored by ~~an a~~ Brown University instructor ~~who holds a teaching appointment in Brown University and~~ whose central functions are to assess the proposed study, to provide advice during the work, and to be responsible for the evaluation of each student's work. ~~Group studies~~ GISP courses permit instructors to interact with more students than independent studies can realistically permit. A teaching assistant or teaching associate may sponsor a GISP course ~~Group Study~~ if the department chair recommends that he or she be permitted to do so.

3. Proposals for ~~Group Studies~~ GISP courses will be reviewed by the College Curriculum Council to assure the academic quality of the proposed study and to avoid undue duplication. Proposal deadlines for the fall and spring semesters are the same as those for ISP courses. ~~should be turned in by April 1 of the preceding spring semester; proposals for the spring semester are due November 15 of the fall semester. Proposals received after these dates, and no later than the first day of classes of the next semester, will be considered only upon clear justification of the late submittal.~~

4. GISP courses appear on the transcript with a unique course number and title.

~~4. At the end of each Group Study, a joint student-faculty evaluation of the accomplishments of the project must be submitted by the faculty sponsor to the College Curriculum Council.~~

F. Departmental Independent Study Program

1. Departmental Independent Study courses allow students to pursue a reading, research, or thesis project with a Brown University instructor. Because the course appears on the transcript with a generic course number and title, no additional approval from the CCC is necessary.

2. The CCC has prepared a set of recommended guidelines for departmental independent studies, which can be found on the website of the Office of the Dean of the College, and on the Registrar's website.

3. The last day to register for a departmental independent study shall be the end of the fourth week of classes.

RATIONALE: The Brown curriculum places a high value on independent learning experiences for undergraduates. Currently, there are three separate programs in which Brown undergraduates can pursue independent work for credit. In the Independent Study Program (ISP), a single student — in consultation with an instructor — designs an independent course. In the Group Independent Study Program (GISP) two or more undergraduates design an independent course. In both, students are required to prepare a syllabus during the previous semester, and to submit it to the College Curriculum Council (CCC) for approval. The courses then show up on the student transcript with a unique title and number.

Brown students may also pursue open-ended reading or research projects with a faculty member through the Departmental Independent Study Program (DISP). Such courses already exist within the departmental course listings with a generic number and title and do not require additional CCC approval.

Each year hundreds of students enroll in departmental independent study courses; however, the Faculty Rules and Regulations currently offer no information about this option, mentioning only the ISP and GISP. To clear up potential confusion, we propose a revision to the existing language in Part 2, Section 4, Parts D, E, F.

The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. Dean Bergeron noted that a great many students do independent studies, many within their departments. The CCC has prepared recommended guidelines for departmental independent studies. The only new stipulation is that a student cannot add an independent study course after the fourth week of classes.

Prof. Belozovsky asked the difference between independent studies and Special Themes and Topics courses—Special Themes and Topics are expected to be given more than once and approval is done by the CCC.

The motion carried on a voice vote.

The next motion was intended to clarify various deadlines in the tenure process. The text of the motion was

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 4, Section 10.I.D.6 of the *Faculty Rules & Regulations* on Faculty Hiring, Review, Promotion and Tenure: Contract Renewal and Promotions alter the language as indicated.

6. Tenure Procedures and Recommendations in Divisions, Departments, Programs and Centers:

a. Initial Academic Unit Procedure

i. No later than ~~November 1~~ **October 11** of the sixth year of the candidate's probationary period (assuming a probationary period of seven years), the academic unit Chair, in consultation with the candidate, shall select no less than a three person "tenure committee" to guide the evaluation procedure (the "tenure committee" shall be smaller if there are fewer than three tenured faculty within the academic unit). The Chair may or may not be a member of the "tenure committee" and the head of the committee may be a tenured person in the academic unit or the unit's Chair or Director.

ii. As soon as the "tenure committee" has been selected, ~~which is normally during the first week in November,~~ the academic unit Chair/Director will convene a meeting of all tenured faculty of the unit and outline the procedures to be used in the evaluation for tenure. Where a candidate for tenure holds a joint appointment, each academic unit in which the individual has an appointment may have a separate tenure committee meeting and make separate evaluations and recommendations. As an alternative, the academic units may form a joint tenure committee with faculty from all units involved as members.

iii. The "tenure committee," in consultation with the candidate, will be responsible for assembling the candidate's tenure dossier. This process should begin as soon after ~~November 1~~ **the appointment of the tenure committee** as possible. This dossier will ultimately carry the academic unit's recommendation on promotion to tenure, and will be kept permanently in the files of the Dean of the Faculty. It will contain the following:

- a) an updated curriculum vitae;*
- b) a list of individuals outside the University who should be well acquainted with the candidate's field(s) of scholarship and who were asked to serve as referees;*
- c) letters of reference, including the academic unit's letters of solicitation; and a statement of how each referee was chosen;*
- d) materials pertaining to the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance and contributions to the curriculum, including summary tabulations of ~~semesterly~~ teaching evaluations;*
- e) records of the candidate's service to the University;*
- f) copies of all minutes of meetings and correspondence of the academic unit, which bear upon the question of the candidate's promotion to tenured rank.*

¹ **Note that this and other dates apply to faculty whose contracts end on June 30. In the event that the appointment has a different end date (e.g. December 31), the timetable should be adjusted accordingly.**

iv. In addition, the “tenure committee” will assemble, in consultation with the candidate, a complete file of scholarly publications and material submitted for publication as supplied by candidate to be considered by the “tenure committee” and made available for reading to all tenured members of the academic unit. The “tenure committee” will also assemble a file of material on teaching performance gathered in accordance with the procedures outlined in its program for teaching evaluation filed with the Deans of Faculty and/or Medicine and Biological Sciences. The “tenure committee” will make these materials available (publications and teaching evaluation materials) to the **Tenure, Promotion and Appointment Committee** ~~Committee on Faculty Reappointment and Tenure on request.~~

v. ~~Not later than December 1 of the sixth year, t~~ **The candidate shall supply the** “tenure committee” with a list of distinguished outside scholars who are well acquainted with his or her scholarship. At the same time, the “tenure committee” may select other individuals who are acknowledged scholarly and/or educational leaders in the discipline from whom to seek confidential written comments on the quality of accomplishment of the individual under review. Before writing these individuals, the Chair of the “tenure committee” shall inform the candidate of the additional names, and the candidate may, within two weeks, lodge such objections as he or she may have. ~~not later than December 15 of the sixth year.~~ The “tenure committee” shall write to a number of persons suggested by the candidate, as well as those added by the “tenure committee,” for confidential letters of reference. In consultation with the candidate, the Chair of the “tenure committee” shall decide on how many people will be asked to serve as referees. At least five letters should be received from individuals who are not on the Brown faculty. **None of these five should have served as adviser to the candidate, have collaborated with him or her, or have written regarding a previous action.**

vi. **Before the dossier is submitted to TPAC,** a statement of the contents of the ~~dossier~~ (including the names of all referees but not the contents of their letters) shall be given to the candidate ~~no later than February 1 of the sixth year,~~ so that the candidate may complete or supplement it with additional material, if necessary. **The candidate shall have at least two weeks to do so.**

vii. The academic unit’s recommendation shall not be made without a complete dossier for the candidate, unless the candidate fails to submit the required materials ~~by February 15 of the sixth year.~~ **Recommendations are to be forwarded to TPAC by February 1.**

viii. Documented efforts must be made to secure the maximum participation of the tenured faculty of the academic unit, as required in the evaluation and recommendation process. The candidates’ dossier shall be sent to those tenured faculty members in the academic unit not in residence ~~not later than March 1 of the sixth year.~~ Copies of any of the materials or publications held by the “tenure committee” shall be sent to such members on request. Those tenured faculty not in residence shall be requested to send written statements concerning the candidate to

the Chairperson of the “tenure committee” ~~no later than March 15 of the sixth year,~~ but failure to receive statements from absent members shall not prevent completion of the evaluation and recommendation process.

b. Making the Recommendation

i. At a meeting of the tenured faculty, called with at least a week’s notice, the candidate’s “tenure committee” will present the evidence on scholarship, teaching, and service. The tenured faculty will further discuss the evidence and take a vote which will be recorded and which will be the basis of the academic unit’s recommendation to the Committee on Tenure, Promotions and Appointments. This recommendation shall be made in writing and indicate the quorum the Department has established as necessary to make such decisions.

ii. The academic unit’s recommendation, together with the reasons therefore, whether positive or negative, shall be made and forwarded with the tenure dossier (described above) to the Committee on Tenure, Promotions and Appointments no later than ~~April 1~~ **February 1** of the sixth year.

iii. The following documents shall be forwarded to the Committee on Tenure, Promotions and Appointments:

- a) the candidate’s dossier (as specified above);*
- b) the Department’s recommendation, including reasons, and ~~in the case of a negative recommendation~~ the votes, signed by the academic unit Chair/Director and the Chair of the “tenure committee”;*
- c) a certification by the “tenure committee” Chair that the academic unit’s and University’s standards and procedures for tenure review have been applied; or, if they have not, the reasons therefore and what different standards and procedures were used;*
- d) a copy of any specific supplement of the academic unit to the University’s standards and procedures for contract renewal and tenure not already on file in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.*

c. When it leaves the academic unit, the recommendations shall contain the following:

~~i. For promotions to tenure, a statement that an opening exists at that level, according to the academic unit’s staffing plan and needs, must be provided. If no opening exists, a careful and thorough statement why this case requires an exception in the interests of both the academic unit and the University as a whole must be offered.~~

~~ii.~~ **i.** A review of the candidate’s scholarship and intellectual development giving:

- a) a description of the distinctive nature, reputation, and influence of his or her published work, if any;*
- b) an evaluation of that work with respect to the goals and structure of the academic unit;*
- c) a description and evaluation of unpublished work, completed or in progress, if any;*

d) a description of the potential development and influence of the person's scholarship on the discipline, the academic unit and the University at large.

- iii-ii. A review of the candidate's teaching record at Brown,
a) describing teaching activities — i.e. specific courses taught, enrollment, independent study supervised, undergraduate and graduate theses supervised;
b) evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness with respect to various formats and levels of instruction; and describing students' evaluations of the candidates' teaching, with any explanatory comment summarizing the findings of the academic unit's program of teaching evaluation;
c) describing any specific contributions the person has made either to the academic unit or the University curricula, or to the academic unit's continuing concern for its teaching effectiveness if any.

iv-iii. An assessment of the candidate's personal and intellectual service to both Department and the University.

v-iv. An estimate of the candidate's potential for further professional growth.

RATIONALE: The Faculty Rules & Regulations currently include a very detailed timetable for the tenure review, which is at odds both with the timeline in the Handbook of Academic Administration and with current practice. Insofar as the Faculty Rules are intended primarily to ensure that the various stages of the review process proceed properly, rather than to dictate precise deadlines by which particular actions must be completed, the inclusion of specific dates for each stage of this process is neither necessary nor desirable. The revised language preserves the candidate's right to have the review commence by a particular date and establishes a date by which the tenure dossier is ordinarily to be forwarded to the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee, but eliminates many of the intervening deadlines. There are in addition some minor editorial changes recommended, including the removal of the quotation marks around "tenure committee" throughout. Finally, section 6.c.i, discusses the need for an open slot; this is no longer required.

The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. Prof. Boekelheide explained that the motion would simplify existing language, clarify dates, and remove a requirement that an open slot must exist. A friendly amendment was introduced, intended to protect the candidate for tenure. The text of the amendment is attached to the original of these minutes.

A somewhat lengthy discussion followed, much of which addressed the original language in the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*. Some of the points raised were whether the candidate should know who will be asked to serve as referees, how closely a candidate can have collaborated with a referee, use of bold and underlined words in the original document and the amendments, and specific dates for candidates whose contracts end on a date other than June 30. Dean Vohra reminded the Faculty that the motion was basically to clarify language not to rewrite the process. Prof. Valente commented that the amendment seemed to go in a different direction than simply language. Prof. Diebold moved to postpone consideration until the April meeting, suggesting that faculty members communicate with members of the FEC with suggestions.

The motion to postpone carried on a voice vote, but not unanimously.

The final motion was to change the name of the Columbus Day holiday. The text of the motion was

MOVED: That the Faculty, in Part 3, Section 7.I.A.1-10 of the *Faculty Rules & Regulations* on Principles Governing the Academic Calendar, delete the existing language (as struck-through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below), effective July 1, 2009.

I. Principles Governing the Academic Calendar

A. Semester I, Fall 2009

1. Sunday before the first Monday in September (Labor Day). Orientation begins.
2. Wednesday following the first Monday in September. Opening of the (year minus 1800 plus 37) Academic Year (Convocation).
3. Second Monday in October (~~Columbus Day~~ **Fall Weekend**). No University exercises.
4. Third Saturday in October. Mid-semester.
5. Wednesday (noon) to Monday (8:00 a.m.), including fourth Thursday in November. Thanksgiving Recess.
6. December 8 (or December 7 in years when December 13 or December 21 falls on a Sunday). Beginning of Reading Period.
7. December 12, 6:00 p.m. (or December 11 when December 13 or December 21 falls on a Sunday). Classes of Semester I end.
8. December 13 (or December 12 when December 13 or 21 is a Sunday). Beginning of the Final Examination Period.
9. December 21 (or December 20 when December 21 is a Sunday). End of Final Examination Period.
10. January 6 (or preceding Friday when January 6 falls on a weekend). First semester grades due.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this specific motion delivered to the Faculty Executive Committee is to:

- I. Formally discontinue the observance of Columbus Day by Brown University.
- II. Establish a new academic and administrative calendar holiday for the second Monday in October by fall of 2009.

RATIONALE:

In view of recent trends among peer institutions, Brown should change the name of this Fall holiday to one that can be celebrated by all.

The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. Prof. Dreier reviewed the history of the motion. A group of students came to the FEC in February with an extensive document requesting the change of name. The FEC asked them to condense the document, which they did. The proposed change has been discussed by several groups including the Community Council and the Undergraduate Council of Students. The FEC is forwarding the motion without having made an endorsement. An undergraduate, Peter Hatch, a member of the NAB—the Native American student group, was present. He explained a fellow student, Perie Koyama, was on her way but he would be glad to answer questions. President Simmons asked Mr. Hatch to explain the reason for the motion. Mr. Hatch said the motion had been a long time coming, that the Native American students believe the name Columbus Day is inconsistent with the ideals of Brown University, that the name represents colonization. Ms. Koyama arrived and made a statement, consistent with Mr. Hatch's.

Both students expressed their willingness to answer questions. Prof. Orr asked about the name of other University holidays—Columbus Day is the only one honoring an individual. Another question asked about the practice at other universities—only Brown and Harvard in the Ivy League celebrate a Columbus Day. Several questions were asked about the choice of the replacement name. Prof. Bossy noted that Brown does not celebrate Veteran's Day. Would eliminating the Columbus Day holiday be seen as an affront in Rhode Island, with a large Italian population? Prof. Diebold commented that changing the name here puts us on a slippery slope; other names could be more easily changed. He commented that Columbus was in fact a great explorer. Prof. Garcia-Coll said that a name change would recognize both sides of history. Prof. Clifton asked if the name might include both Columbus and Native Americans? Prof. Diebold pointed out that if the name is changed the reason would have to be explained to the press. He asked if President Simmons believed such would be difficult—no, the President often has to explain why universities are different from other organizations. A request was made to hear from the parties in the FEC that objected to the name change. Prof. Dreier explained that no consensus existed against the motion, that the FEC's discussion focused on whether to bring the matter to the Faculty. Prof. Wey-Gomez pointed out that practice related to that holiday has changed, noting a major celebration at Brown in 1892 commemorating the event. Such would not take place today.

President Simmons then asked if anyone had a comment based on an idea not yet presented or if anyone had an urgent question. None arose. The question was called. The motion carried on a voice vote. A quorum call was made. The parliamentarian confirmed that a quorum call is valid immediately after a vote. In fact a quorum was not present; 43 voting members of the Faculty were present. The vote will have to be ratified at the next Faculty meeting. The Registrar pointed out that the Course Announcement Bulletin will go to press shortly and will therefore use "Columbus Day". Future online notices could reflect a name change.

The President said she would ask Vice President Huidekoper to review the deliberations of the Corporation about the budget. Vice President Huidekoper started by praising the members of the Corporation for their thoughtful and constructive guidance. Brown is fortunate to have such Corporation members. Beppie Huidekoper reviewed how the budget has changed due to present economic conditions. She noted the decrease in the endowment. She pointed out that endowment draw at Brown is based on a 12 quarter moving average so the present drop will affect the draw for a long time. She showed the very large range of uncertainty in the future value of the

endowment. She showed various scenarios based on different projections of endowment yield. All show significant future deficits, in the order of several tens of millions of dollars. She discussed budget reductions in next year's budget, in the order of five million dollars.

Mr. Patterson asked the approximate value of the endowment now—about \$2 Billion—and how much of this is liquid—about 70%, counting funds that may not be available immediately. He asked if the Corporation's estimate might, in fact, be optimistic and noted we should be prepared for the worst. The President said we should not react hastily but should keep all possibilities in mind. Prof. Belozovsky asked if the cap on salaries mentioned by Vice President Huidekoper implied a cap on the number of promotions—the President said no, the number of promotions would not be capped.

Prof. Simmons then presented a slate of committee nominations. The list is appended to the original of these minutes and given here.

NOMINATIONS RECOMMENDED TO THE FACULTY FOR COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO BE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY:

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Kristi Wharton (MCB) replacing Hernando Ombao (Community Health) to 6/30/09

The President then asked for further nominations. None were made. The slate was then approved by a voice vote. Because a quorum was not present this vote will have to be ratified at the next meeting of the Faculty. Professor Simmons also announced nominations that did not require a Faculty vote and this list is also appended to the original of these minutes and given here.

BALLOT ELECTION RESULTS:

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES COMMITTEE (URC)

Regular members serving to February 28, 2012:

Ross Kraemer (Religious Studies)

Robert Self (History)

Alternates serving to February 28, 2012:

Vladimir Golstein (Slavic Languages)

Peter Howitt (Economics)

Prof. Hesthaven presented the report of the University Resources Council. The report had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. He spoke of the design process in creating the Fiscal Year 2010 budget. Some principles in the design were protecting Financial Aid, a modest increase in endowment payout, slower growth in tuition and fees, and much budget reductions and reallocations. No questions were asked.

The President noted with pleasure that a Brown graduate, Dr. Jim Yong Kim, will be the next president of Dartmouth College.

There being neither Old Business nor New Business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barrett Hazeltine
Interim Secretary of the Faculty

Memorial Minute
David Gottlieb, Ford Foundation Professor
Division of Applied Mathematics

David Gottlieb came to Brown in 1985. He was made Ford Foundation Professor in 1993, served as the Chair of the department from 1996 to 1999, and passed away in December 2008 at the age of 64.

David's scientific accomplishments were outstanding. He was a central figure in the development of high-order and spectral methods for the solution of partial differential equations.

With Stephen Orszag he co-authored the first book to systematically analyze these methods. This work would shape the careers of many researchers as the field matured during the following decades. He made many other vital contributions to scientific computing, and these were recognized by honorary doctorates from the University of Paris VI and Uppsala University, and election to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences in 2006 and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 2007. He delivered his last public lecture at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics as the 2008 John von Neumann Lecturer – the highest honor bestowed by this premier professional society.

David had been brought to Brown to lead the development of a program in large scale scientific computing. At the time, an appreciation for the deep impact that large scale computing would have on much of science was just emerging. The Division and Brown have taken few actions that were more fruitful, and today we all benefit greatly from his leadership in this area.

Throughout his tenure at Brown David was a strong advocate for the Division and the University. Few things were more important to him than the teaching and mentoring of young people. He always had time to discuss their concerns, and former students would continue to seek his advice long after their careers were established.

David was diagnosed with kidney cancer in December of 1997, and, after it recurred in 1999, was told he would perhaps live for 8 more months. He never accepted that diagnosis. Rather than withdrawing, he became even more energetic, more focused on his work, and an even more ardent supporter of the department, especially its young people. A telling example of his resolve and determination occurred this past November, one month before he died. Rather than postpone a preliminary exam and inconvenience a graduate student, he insisted on conducting the exam from the hospital bed to which pneumonia had confined him. He was truly an inspiration to the faculty and students of Applied Mathematics, and is deeply missed by all.

Madam President, I move that the Faculty adopt this Minute by a standing vote of respect, and that the Secretary of the Faculty be instructed to enter the Minute into the permanent records of the Faculty and to send copies of it to members of the immediate family.

Paul Dupuis
Professor and Chair
Division of Applied Mathematics