

Minutes of a Faculty Meeting

March 4, 2008

The meeting convened at 4:05 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of February 5 were approved, and the President enjoined those present to exercise their voting rights in the primary election.

Professor Colwill presented the following motion:

Madam President, I move that the Faculty rise in a standing vote of respect for the five students whose lives were abruptly ended in a classroom at Northern Illinois University on February 14, 2008, for the students who were injured in this attack, and for all those affected by this heart-breaking tragedy.

Professor Foley presented a memorial minute for A.D. Van Nostrand, late Professor of English and American Literature (attached) and the Faculty rose in a standing vote of respect.

Reporting for the FEC, Professor Colwill noted that the URC ballot is available; that a Talkback to the FEC would take place Friday at noon in Petteruti Lounge; and that notice about the renaming of the John Nicholas Brown Center had been posted. She announced that after two years of work, the FEC's report on faculty governance mandated by the Task Force on Faculty Governance was released and is available on the FEC website. Last year, the FEC distributed a survey to the faculty leadership on committees, councils and boards that asked about the clarity of the charge, the extent to which the charge was covered, and the effectiveness of the work being done. The FEC has also received input from faculty chairs and vice-chairs through their regular annual reports to the faculty and at luncheons hosted by the FEC. Open informal meetings have been held for all faculty members to discuss faculty governance issues with the FEC. Issues related to faculty governance arose in the discussions the FEC had with department chairs, junior faculty and others on the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE). The FEC has also spent considerable time in its meetings discussing the new system of faculty governance and the FEC Officers and/or members have met with the chairs and/or members of several committees including the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee, the Committee on Diversity in Hiring, and the Committee on the Status of Women. Conveying gratitude to all for their participation, Professor Colwill suggested that this would be an opportunity to get critical feedback on the proposal, a sense of priority for implementation, as well as thoughts about possible omission or alternative recommendations. She mentioned four specific items brought to the FEC in response to the report: Feedback after the report was released: 1) the report is not accurate about UCC's start. The Council convened once and brought a motion to the faculty but UCC was not identified in the minutes; there has been no annual report; 2) a pool to replace recusals on TPAC would offset the loss of members from units best able to assess cases; this pool might comprise former TPAC/Confrat members; 3) the problem of the consistency of standards across academic units for faculty with multiple appointment

must be addressed; 4) the three-week TPAC timetable for providing a written statement of its rationale for a negative decision needs review.

Professor Colwill then highlighted four items in the report: 1) The TPAC proposal on the promotion of associate professors which would begin to address structural inequities Brown suffers among our peers due to our failure to define timelines and policies; a recommendation on this matter shall be forthcoming in April; 2) the current three- year appointment/ zero, two, or four year reappointment process presents problems in the sciences such as inadequate time to secure funding and assemble an adequate teaching record and thus for Brown to profit from its initial investment; 3) restructuring FAC, CSW and CDH is needed to address overlapping charges in regard to compensation and diversity; and to regain some of the strength lost in reviewing negative decisions when the former committee model was abandoned; 4) merging parts of UCC and CAB into UCAC while continuing the current joint subcommittee of CCC and the Graduate Council; since the CAB no longer meets, this new structure would fill the gap on large advisory issues and oversight of several committees without overlapping the responsibilities of the CCC. The FEC will work with individual committees to develop motions for the Faculty to consider in the next two months. Feedback from all sources will be used to guide the development of these motions.

In discussion, the question of whether or not TPAC has studied the uniformity or lack of uniformity of tenure procedures and standards across departments was answered by Professor Maxey, TPAC chair. Maxey affirmed that the review of standards and criteria across departments does take place, and that while there are differences between departments with and without graduate programs, he was confident in uniformity. In response to an objection to the lack of uniformity in the administration of policies regarding the solicitation of letters from external reviewers and the disconnect between current procedures and those stated in the Handbook of Academic Administration, Dean Vohra stated that he believed that while the standards and criteria differ somewhat across departments, the procedures were uniform and consistent with the Faculty Rules and the Handbook. Professor Savage endorsed the proposal for the promotion of associate professors, and Professor Banchoff asked whether service was the sole basis for promotion. Professor Maxey replied that the timetable does not replace the standards and criteria. Professor Russom commented that without a timetable, there is no structure in place for mentoring. In response to the question of whether failure to be promoted or refusal to be considered would count against an associate professor, Professor Maxey stated that this process was meant to be positive rather than punitive; he also commented in response to several remarks that while there is concern about the large pool of associates at Brown, demographics is not the primary reason for the proposal. He reasserted that opting out is possible and will not be held against a faculty member. President Simmons remarked that faculty members should not be penalized for being appointed to positions at Brown, which in contrast to Princeton or Yale has failed to articulate fair and timely promotion procedures.

President Simmons referred the Faculty to recent Corporation meeting announcements, stating that the last meeting was one of the best she had ever attended in terms of the

depth and range of the discussion, the degree of engagement of the trustees and fellows, and the extent to which they had studied and understood the challenges before the University. In addition to considering the review of the PAE, members faced difficult questions arising from the economic forecast, asking how much of the Plan and the proposed financial aid improvements do we dare take on? Sometimes passionate debate ended in unanimity. Given the serious implications of these commitments, the President asked Vice-President Huidekoper to give an overview of the 2009 budget (followed by Professor Bauer's report on the process) and to show data about the implications of reduced tuition revenue, increased endowment draw, and the sequencing of capital projects.

Vice-President Huidekoper explained that since FY01, Brown's revenues have grown and diversified - consistent with the goals of the PAE. Tuition provides 53% of total revenue, up 6.5%. Endowment payout provides 18%, up 12%. Annual fundraising provides 7%, and this figure is up 14.1%. These numbers are consistent with expectations for supporting the PAE. But revenue is still dependent upon tuition and fees, and while Brown still stands in the middle of our group of peers, among which many like Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Princeton can afford a lower cap, in order to stay competitive, future rates of increase are likely to be less than in the past five years. Since FY 2001, the market value of the endowment has increased from \$1.48 billion to \$2.7 billion, an average increase of 12.8% after payout. Through growth and gifts the market value has exceeded the adjusted purchasing power. But other institutions have more flexibility, and Congress is considering mandating that colleges and universities spend 5% of their endowments each year. An increase in spending will put more pressure on future endowment returns. Again, competitiveness is important. Our rate for FY08 is 3.8%. Dartmouth's is 4.7% and they have announced an increase to 6% in FY09. Fundraising has been critical to our present financial position. Since the beginning of the PAE, the amount of cash received (not pledges) from fundraising has almost tripled. Our competitiveness in Financial Aid has increased by an annual average of 8.5%, bringing the total since 2002 from \$35.4 million almost \$57 million. But even before the most recent increases by our peers we were lagging, with an average parental contribution of \$16K putting us at the bottom of the scale. And now within the last six months, we have seen dramatic changes in the competitive environment. The improvements in aid programs made by most of our peers will significantly lessen the financial burden for students and their families. Brown must remain competitive in meeting our commitment to access and affordability. Total graduate student support has doubled under the PAE. The base stipend plus health insurance has gone from \$13,200 to \$21,150. The support is now significantly more competitive. But the number of graduate students at Brown has not grown with the increase in faculty. At what pace and in what areas should Brown increase the number of graduate students? What percentage of graduate students should we plan on being supported on grants? Looking at budget projections for FY08 as of February, Ms. Huidekoper reported that we are on budget with a planned draw on reserves of \$7.8 million. But we must anticipate an unplanned drop in annual giving, which would necessitate a larger draw. The approved FY09 budget may also be vulnerable in terms of revenue, with a 3.8% increase in tuition and a 3.9% increase in total charges. This may be compared on the low end to Yale at 2.2% and Cornell, Duke,

Dartmouth, and Northwestern at between 4.7% and 4.9%. The budget authorizes 24% increase in endowment payout per share, plus payout from \$56 million of new endowment expected to be raised during the current fiscal year – \$20 million received as of 1/31/08. The cumulative use of balances is expected to be \$25 million by the end of FY09, with the flexibility to increase use of balances to \$4 million if other revenues (new endowment income, BAF, indirect cost recovery) are under budget. As for expenditures, the budget expects an increase of twenty in the size of the faculty with the faculty salary pool at 4% and taking into account support for existing and new programs. There will be an increase of 16% overall for the graduate school with additional support set aside for areas of critical need. The financial aid budget will increase by 20% to \$68.5 million, including \$7.4 million in additional funds to eliminate loans for families with incomes less than \$100K, to eliminate parental contribution for most families with incomes less than \$60K and to reduce loans for all other students. Given current economic uncertainties, the FY09 E&G revenue budget may be overly optimistic. As a consequence, we may need to make mid year expenditure adjustments in FY09 and make even more difficult budget decisions for FY10. The cost of the \$7.4M enhancements to financial aid will increase to about \$9M in five years if we have 43% of each class on aid and fees increase by 4% per year. We have run a number of scenarios to assess the financial impact of supporting the financial aid enhancements while completing Phase 1 of the PAE. All of the scenarios are based on the FY09 budget and combination of raising more funds, adjusting tuition and fees, and increasing the payout, perhaps beyond the comfort level. The plan for Bio-Med represents another large increase in payout—up to a 24% increase. As to capital improvements, \$535 million of \$800 million is committed to project yet to be completed, of which \$175 million has been secured through fundraising and existing external debt.

To complete the projects, we still need to secure \$362.8 million in funding. Projects will need to be reassessed for elimination, delay, proceeding, and re-ordering. And we must also take into account the enhancements that the Plan review has identified which must also be taken into account. To address such enhancement we would be considering increased cash gift, investment returns of 10%, reduced compensation increases, increased fees, increased payout and borrowing. And there remains the likelihood of an increasing competitive market in financial aid, which would put these solutions at risk.

Provost Kertzer began an overview of financial aid by summarizing recent enhancements: reduced average loan debt; no first-year employment; need-blind admission for U.S. citizens and eligible non-citizens; and the Frank Scholarship gift. But public pressure about college affordability and endowment spending creates a changed landscape. Harvard's and Yale's adjustment of family income scales, parental contributions, and their elimination of student loans is breathtaking. Even Dartmouth and Penn, with profiles closer to ours, plan reductions in loans as part of the package and major readjustment in income and contribution ratios. Stanford offers no loans for all financial aid recipients and no parental contribution for those with family incomes below \$60K and no tuition for those with incomes below \$100K. This daunting picture has produced lively discussion at every forum, with one underlying question being whether or not Brown could afford not to meet Dartmouth, Penn, and Columbia. Under our

current policy for family incomes of \$87K, we offer a scholarship of \$25K, Penn almost \$27K and Yale almost \$40K. So there was a real problem even before the new plans were announced. The proposed Brown policy eliminates loans for family incomes under \$100K, reduces loans for all students, eliminates parental contributions for incomes under \$60K, and eliminates the University Work Scholarship. Proposed loan groups are tilted towards the lower end, favoring those with incomes under \$100,000 and rising in increments of \$25K to a cutout at \$150K. These policies overall will make us competitive at the lower end.

Asked if there were goals for economic diversity, Mr. Kertzer replied that while there were not specific targets the goal of economic diversity was implicit in the PAE, and Dean of Admissions James Miller said the enhanced financial aid packages give us a chance of attaining critical mass previously unavailable due to our lower offers. Following a discussion of the relation of internationality and diversity, discussion turned to competitiveness not just in relation to select peers but to large and distinguished state schools like Wisconsin, UNC, or UC Berkeley, and Dean Miller stated that 70% of our losses go to the same eleven private institutions, but that among those losses to those others the new policies will help but not in great numbers. Asked why tuition and fees must inexorably rise, Provost Kertzer cited economic factors and noted that as charges rise so will aid.

Professor Andrea Simmons presented a motion on behalf of the Committee on Nominations to nominate Greg Hirth (Geological Sciences) to replace Yan Liang (Geological Sciences) on the Graduate Council effective immediately to 6/30/08. This nomination was approved without dissent.

Professor Bauer, as vice-chair, presented a report for the University Resources Committee (URC), commenting that she would edit her remarks on the spot to avoid the effect of refried beans following the reports of Huidekoper and Kertzer.

In its deliberations, Professor Bauer reported, the URC was guided by the Plan for Academic Enrichment while at the same time and also aware of the ongoing review of the Plan, trying to incorporate its preliminary findings into our recommendations. During the fall, the committee reviewed the University's overall financial condition, received updates on reallocations and considered requests for new budget allotments from senior officers. The URC held open forums for community members, and it completed initial deliberations in two meetings in December.

Yet things changed, Professor Bauer remarked. Upon return from winter break, increased national attention to university endowments and to the financial impact of higher education on individual families had brought dramatic responses from several of our peer institutions in the form of improved aid packages and tuition increases as low as 2.2%. In order to continue to attract the very best students across a broad socioeconomic spectrum, Brown was challenged to respond boldly, even (or especially) in the face of faltering markets and growing concern over a possible economic downturn. Thanks to exceptional endowment returns over the past four years, the vigor of our Campaign, and

accumulated reserves, the Committee was able to meet those challenges with budget recommendations that respect that financial concerns of students and their families and, at the same time, keep us moving forward to accomplish the goals of the PAE.

The URC recommended a 6.8% increase in the consolidated operating budget, which includes the budgets for E&G, BioMed, and Auxiliary Operations. This budget relies less on tuition increases and more on endowment payout than at any time in Brown's history, setting a 3.9% increase in total undergraduate student charges and a 4.8% increase in medical school tuition. It incorporates a 24% increase on the payout from the current endowment, strategic use of reserves—\$3 million for E&G and \$0.5 million for BioMed—and a targeted annual fund-raising increase of 4%.

The FY09 budget recommendations provide additional resources to promote excellence in faculty teaching and research, including \$2.3 million for the addition of approximately 20 new faculty, a more modest 4% salary pool that will nonetheless allow us to maintain the competitive ground vis a vis faculty salaries we have gained in recent years, and funding to support the new faculty sabbatical policy. The academic enterprise will be enriched by faculty growth, international initiatives, increases in Library and Computing resources, and continued investment in renewal of academic facilities and the physical plant.

With respect to our goal of enhancing undergraduate education, an increase of 20% in the undergraduate scholarship budget will allow us to continue to compete for the very best students by reducing student loans across the board, eliminating loans for students whose families earn less than \$100k a year, and by eliminating family contributions for most households earning under \$60k a year. The FY09 budget sustains our policy of need-blind admissions, provides more financial support for international students, expands our outreach to prospective students, provides funding for new initiatives from the Dean of the College Office, particularly those targeting enhancements to Brown's advising system, and funds for Campus Life initiatives.

The new budget also promotes our goal of excellence in graduate education with a net increase in graduate student support of 16%, which includes funding to increase the size of the entering doctoral cohort to somewhere between 200 and 210 students (including BioMed), monies to increase the numbers of students receiving stipendiary support, and a modest increase in the base graduate student stipend (from \$18.5k to \$19k).

The FY09 budget for the Division of Biology and Medicine moves ahead on the goals of the PAE by allowing for several searches for new and replacement faculty positions, and for expanded enrollments in the medical school and the Masters in Public Health Program. The Division budget anticipates modest revenue increases of 3.7% in sponsored funding and 4.5%, despite a constrained federal funding research environment.

This spring the URC will meet again several times in order to make preliminary assessments of the likely challenges for FY2010 and beyond. For the first time in several years the general economic outlook is uncertain at best and could potentially affect

endowment performance, fundraising yields, and federal funding for research, leading us in the direction of more conservative budgets. Caution will be key, yet with the continued leadership of the Provost and the financial guidance of Executive Vice-President for Finance, the Committee will work to prioritize the findings of the Review of the PAE, the Task Force on Undergraduate Education, the Working Group on Graduate Education, and the Committee on the Residential Experience in order to move forward with a coherent plan for enriching Brown.

With thanks to Professor Bauer and the committee, President Simmons solicited those present for old business and new business. There being none, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley
Secretary of the Faculty

Memorial Minute

A. D. Van Nostrand, Professor Emeritus of English

March 4, 2008

A. D. Van Nostrand joined the Department of English at Brown in 1951, after the completion of his Ph.D. in English and American Literature at Harvard University. The initials “A” and “D” refer to his given names “Albert” and “Douglass,” but among his friends he was known as “Van.” In his thirty-one years at Brown, he devoted his teaching and research not only to American literature, but to a broad range of concerns about what “writing” means, in novels or poetry and in the lives of people writing their lives at home, at work, and in school. Van Nostrand left Brown to become chair of the department of English at the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1982, where he founded the Writing Research Institute, an initiative that began with his work on the teaching of writing at Brown. As a member of the English department and as chair of the department from 1973-1978, Van Nostrand promoted innovation, helping to put in place the “semiotics” track, which has now evolved into the department of Modern Culture and Media Studies, and he also laid the ground for what is now the non-fiction writing program in English. During the turbulent years of the Vietnam War, Van Nostrand produced an NEH funded multi-media presentation “Exiles in the House,” a documentary on generational conflict and he was a recipient of the Peabody Award for educational television. Van Nostrand was a graduate of Amherst College. In 1957-58, he received a Guggenheim Fellowship to study the economics of book publishing, and from 1961-63, he was a Fulbright Lecturer in American Literature at the University of Sao Paul, Brazil. His books include *Everyman His Own Poet*, *Major Book Markets in South America*, a research report completed for the U.S. Information Agency, and *The Denatured Novel*, a study of the influence of the publishing business in the United States on the structure of American novels. His work on composition theory and instruction was published in *Functional Writing*. At the time of his retirement from Brown in June, 1982, President Howard Swearer wrote “I would like to take this opportunity to express out deep appreciation for all that you have done for Brown during your many years on the Faculty. You have contributed immeasurably in so many ways to the life of the University that it would be impossible to list them.”

Madam President, I move that the Faculty adopt this Minute by 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.