

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

April 1, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m., followed by unanimous passage of the traditional motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. and by approval of the March minutes without change.

Professor Colwill presented the report for the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). She thanked those present for being there. The credibility of the FEC depends upon the faculty at large. The FEC occasionally receives requests to intervene on behalf of an individual faculty member, and she commented that their ability to respond effectively depends upon being supported by faculty involved in a large range of government participation. And then there are others who not only do not attend meetings at the first Tuesday slot reserved for faculty meeting, but who schedule classes and meetings at that time or who repeatedly decline to serve on committees and boards. Without such support our credibility with the administration will suffer. Given the full agenda, Professor Colwill reported just briefly on forthcoming matters. In response to the many general and specific matters generated in the Faculty Forum on the promotion of associate professor, especially procedural concerns about TPAC, the FEC will meet with chairs and chairs of promotion committees to review all aspects of the process as thoroughly as possible. She invited the faculty to submit further information, questions, and concerns. In cooperation with the Dean of the Faculty, the FEC is conducting a survey of associate professors to build data suggesting what adjustments are needed. The motion to create a University College Academic Council is postponed to the May meeting. The FEC collectively endorses the Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee (TPAC) motion for a timetable towards promotion to full professor. She assured the faculty that the process was not intended to marginalize or to penalize, but simply to insure that departments bring forward candidates for promotion according to an established calendar of expectations.

Professor Valente commended the survey as a good idea, but asked why it had not been conducted before the motion was on the floor. Professor Colwill pointed to her inexperience and lack of time due to overwork. She asked if associate professors felt comfortable being ignored or if they found it difficult because of rank to win graduate students or write successful grants. Professor Valente replied that the information from the survey would contribute to the well being of the faculty. Professor Colwill said that it was important to launch the discussion, and that the motion itself can be postponed.

Professor Dill seconded Professor Colwill's sense of the importance of the issues, but not her self-blame. The FEC faces, especially as the second semester closes, a log jam of consideration and active proposals for motions; it should always strive for better timing.

Dean Vohra cited the need to remember that faculty committees do include associate professors, and that since the Faculty Forum made clear the need for a change, the work

now is to determine how actually to implement this change. Professor Valente stated that he is not opposed to the initiative but wanted to call attention to timing.

Professor Colwill presented the motion that the Faculty amend in Part 2, Section 4. III.G.1. of the Faculty Rules and Regulations the procedure for designating degrees with distinction, effective immediately:

Motion to amend the procedure for designating Degrees with Distinction

SUMMARY: Motion by the Faculty Executive Committee to amend the procedure, effective immediately, for the purpose of designating Degrees with Distinction.

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 2, Section 4.III.G.1. of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on Degrees with Distinction, delete the existing language (as struck-through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below), effective immediately:

Faculty Rules & Regulations

Part 2. Academic Programs

Section 4. The College

III. Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

G. Degrees with Distinction

1. The Faculty has reiterated its support of the policy of awarding Degrees with Distinction. Accordingly, approximately 20% of each year's senior class will be awarded the Bachelor's Degree *magna cum laude*. Such awards are to be made by the Committee on Academic Standing on the basis of the student's cumulative academic record. In order to accumulate evidence for such judgments, you are requested to ~~designate~~ **award an S with distinction to** those students ~~(regardless of grade option)~~ **taking a course S/NC** whose academic performance in the course ~~merits consideration at the appropriate time for the awarding of the Bachelor's degree magna cum laude.~~ **is equivalent to an A.**

RATIONALE: This motion brings the Faculty Rules & Regulations into line with the practical manner in which *magna cum laude* has been determined and awarded for the past 30+ years. On the basis of the University Registrar's review of official documents, the manner by which the top 20% (at one time 10%) of the graduating class has been identified has been a subject of extensive discussion. The early 1970's was a particularly active period which included a proposal from the Educational Policy Committee (the precursor to the CCC) that *cum laude* be abolished altogether, a proposal that was voted down by the faculty. The central issue seemed to be that, while the faculty set general principles for the determination of *magna*, it did not settle the issue as to exactly how it was to be done and handed CAS the responsibility of figuring it out. The CAS apparently came up with the idea of creating the 'S check' which, combined with A's, could be used to determine which courses a student had passed with high distinction. This amendment is long overdue and simply brings the general principle stated in Faculty

Rules & Regulations into line with the practical manner in which *magna cum laude* can be determined.

Professor Colwill explained that while Banner has touched off this discussion, the system of grade sheet checks in order to allow the calculation of S's representing superior work toward the magna has been in place for thirty years, but has not been used widely or consistently enough to be of probative value.

Professor Valente commented that the "check" was implemented as a marker of magna quality at the time when the summa-magna-cum was collapsed into a single Latin honor, the faculty believing in the context of the grading system that finer distinctions did not obtain. Professor Colwill stated that the faculty needs to be responsible for understanding how the system works, with magna calculated on the number of A's and S "checks." Professor Russom asked respectfully if Professor Valente was smuggling in an "A+." Professor Bryan asked if an A "check" counted towards magna. Mr. Pesta replied that the check is used only to supplement S grades. Professor Hermance asked whether the motion was intended to limit the "check" to S grades, and he commented that faculty should not be instructed how to distribute grades. In his hydrology class, for example, he should like to make distinction between the level of excellence attained by a quantitative engineer and the achievement of a student from an outlying field. Professor Colwill pointed out that two separate issues have come up. After a brief discussion of whether further work was needed on this motion, Dean Bergeron commented that is important for the faculty to know how the "check" has always worked and how it will work under the new proposal. Professor Cutts asked in Banner rather than the rules might be adjusted, and Professor Colwill explained that the rules allow for a "check" to be attached to any grade, while Banner does not. Professor Cutts said that distinction belongs with A's as well. After Professor Banchoff thanked Colwill and Pesta for the clarification and Professor Valente asked if A's with "check" were calculated in the Phi Beta Kappa election, the ayes carried the vote, with some dissent.

Professor Colwill presented a motion to amend in Part I, Section 2.III, I.3. of the Faculty Rules and Regulations, Committee on Nominations, Method of Election, effective immediately:

Motion to amend the election procedure for the Committee on Nominations

SUMMARY: Motion by the Faculty Executive Committee to amend the procedure, effective immediately, for the purpose of electing voting members of the Faculty to serve on the Committee on Nominations.

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 1, Section 2.III.I.3. of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on Committee on Nominations, Method of Election, delete the existing language (as struck-through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below), effective immediately:

Faculty Rules & Regulations

Part 1. Membership, Meetings and Committees

Section 2. Committees: Faculty Members Elected by the Faculty

III. Standing Committees

I. Committee on Nominations

3. Method of Election

The FEC shall solicit nominations from the voting members of the Faculty, and may add names to the list of nominees. **The FEC shall present its slate of candidates for election by the Faculty at the last Regular Faculty Meeting for the academic year, appointments to begin on the following July 1.** ~~The Office of Faculty Governance will send an electronic ballot to all voting members of the Faculty. The nominee within each category receiving a plurality will be elected. In the event of a tie vote, a run-off election by electronic ballot will be held to decide the winner. In the event of a vacancy on the Committee, the FEC shall make an interim appointment subject to review by the Faculty at the next Faculty Meeting. Such interim appointments shall last only until the next election. If there are more than two vacancies to be filled, a special election to fill them shall be held as soon as possible.~~

RATIONALE: For the past two years at least, the FEC has had considerable difficulty finding faculty members to stand for a ballot election for this Committee. Replacing a ballot election with a slate of candidates to be presented to and voted on by the Faculty is expected to save an enormous amount of time for the FEC and to increase the participation of a broader group of faculty in the governance process.

Professor Colwill explained the simple rationale of the motion: to overcome near universal refusal of faculty to serve on the Nominations Committee and promote a diverse membership, restoring prestige to service on the committee.

The motion was approved without dissent.

Professor Colwill presented a motion that the Faculty amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective July 1, 2008, for the purpose of removing the charge of the Faculty Development Advisory Board, found in the Faculty Rules and Regulations, Part I, Section 2.VII.H, and all other references thereto:

Motion to delete the Faculty Development Advisory Board

SUMMARY: Motion by the Faculty Executive Committee to delete from the Faculty Rules and Regulations the charge of and references to the Faculty Development Advisory Board.

MOTION: That the Faculty amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective July 1, 2008, for the purpose of removing the charge of the Faculty Development Advisory Board, found in the Faculty Rules and Regulations as Part 1, Section 2, VII, H and all other references thereto.

Faculty Rules & Regulations

Part 1. Membership, Meetings and Committees

Section 2. Committees: Faculty Members Elected by the Faculty

VII. Administrative Advisory Boards

H. Faculty Development Advisory Board

1. Charge

The Faculty Development Advisory Board (FDAB) shall serve to advise the Dean of the Faculty, and other senior officers as appropriate, on resources and priorities concerning faculty development. The FDAB shall review and make recommendations concerning policies, programs, and initiatives designed to support and promote the intellectual and professional development of the faculty. The Board shall consider such matters as the training and support provided to academic department chairs and center directors; orientation and support for new members of the faculty; and the promotion of a healthy academic community within and between academic units. The FDAB will regularly consult with department chairs and directors of centers/programs about faculty development needs. The FDAB will also consult as needed with the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Subcommittee on Diversity in Hiring.

The FDAB shall administer selected professional development programs for the Faculty (e.g., the Faculty Travel Fund, the New Faculty Mentoring Program). In carrying out this responsibility, the Board may establish *ad hoc* advisory committees, with members drawn both from the Board and from the faculty at large.

The Board shall also, on an annual basis, solicit proposals from the department chairs, center/program directors and the faculty for lectures and or workshops, and evaluate proposals and allocate the funds available.

2. Membership

The members shall consist of the Dean of the Faculty and a minimum of four faculty members, and two department chairs or center/program directors. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms.

3. Chair and Staffing

The Board Chair shall be the Dean of the Faculty. The Vice Chair shall be a faculty member who is elected by the board at the end of his/her first year of service. The Board will be staffed by the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

4. Procedures

An Executive Committee, consisting of the Chair and Vice Chair shall set the agenda for Board meetings. The Board shall meet at least once per semester.

The Board shall report annually in writing to the Faculty. The report is to be given by the Vice Chair or, in his/her absence, by the Chair.

5. Appointment of Members

Faculty and department chair/director members will be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty with advice from the Committee on Nominations.

RATIONALE: The Faculty Development Advisory Board was disbanded in 2005. This Motion is presented to delete the charge of and any references to the Faculty Development Advisory Board from the Faculty Rules & Regulations.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Dean Bonde presented a motion that the Faculty amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective immediately, for the purpose of suspending the Master of Medical Science (MMSc) degree, found in the Faculty Rules and Regulations as Part 2, Section 5, I, and all other references thereto:

Motion to suspend the Master of Medical Science Degree

SUMMARY: Motion by the Dean of the Graduate School to suspend the Master of Medical Science (MMSc) degree and to delete from the Faculty Rules and Regulations any references to the MMSc degree.

MOTION: That the Faculty amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective immediately, for the purpose of suspending the Master of Medical Science (MMSc) degree, found in the Faculty Rules and Regulations as Part 2, Section 5, I, and all other references thereto.

Faculty Rules & Regulations

Part 2: Academic Programs

Section 5. The Graduate School

I. Master of Medical Science

This degree is for medical students who wish to obtain experience in biological and medical science research problems through the preparation of a research thesis.

A. Admission Requirements:

a. Students already enrolled in the first year of the Brown Medical School or in or beyond the fourth year of the Program in Liberal Medical Education may apply to the Graduate School for admission to one of the Graduate Programs of the Division of Biology and Medicine. Enrollment in other Graduate Programs in the University is possible if the student meets the admission requirements of that program.

b. Admission is limited to students who have a high record of academic performance, who have submitted a thesis research plan approved by a prospective thesis supervisor in one of the Graduate Programs, and who are recommended by the appropriate Graduate Program Admissions Committee and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies of the Division of Biology and Medicine.

B. Degree Requirements:

- a. Successful completion of eight courses, six of which are from the pre-clinical basic science courses normally required of the first year of the Program in Medicine (currently Bio-Med 117, 128, 130, 158, 181, 184 and 189), at least one thesis-research course and one 200-level course in a field relevant to the area of the thesis research. Medical students who have completed the two pre-clinical years in the Brown-Dartmouth Medical Program may substitute that course work for the six pre-clinical basic science courses, subject to the approval of the Dean of Medicine or his appointee for substantial equivalence of the program taken at Dartmouth to that taken by students at Brown. The thesis must be directed or co-directed by a faculty member in a Graduate Program at Brown University, and the 200-level course must be taken at Brown.
- b. Presentation of a thesis approved by two members of the faculty in addition to the thesis supervisor.
- c. Students are expected to meet all of the appropriate requirements of the Graduate Program in which they enroll.

RATIONALE: The Master of Medical Science (MMSc) degree morphed through mechanisms not known to the current administration to include a research experience and, in the process, became a **supplemental** degree option for PLME or Medical Students. The MMSc degree option has been used infrequently (16 students in the period from 2002-2006), the program is not well known outside of Brown and is considerably less rigorous than a Master of Science degree, in that only one graduate course is required in addition to the research experience and the courses from year one and two of the medical curriculum. The existing academic construct provides little guidance regarding the body of work that qualifies for a suitable thesis for this degree and does not set criteria for faculty research mentors. In relation to the new integrated medical curriculum introduced in 2006, the MMSc requirement of an additional graduate level course poses major scheduling challenges for a medical student. Moreover, the introduction of the Scholarly Concentrations Program in the new curriculum provides for a new and rigorous mechanism to promote and reward scholarship within the medical education process. This Motion is presented to suspend the Master of Medical Science degree and delete references to it from the Faculty Rules & Regulations.

Professor Colwill moved the postponement of the motion on the merger of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), Committee on Diversity in Hiring (CDH), and Committee on the Status of Women (CSW), and Professor Banchoff commented that this issue had not been raised at the Faculty Forum. The motion carried.

Professor Maxey presented a motion that the Faculty amend Part 4, Section 10.I.DE.4 of the Faculty Rules and Regulations on Faculty Hiring, Review, Promotion and Tenure: Contract Renewal and Promotions, effective July 1, 2008, for the purpose of adding new language regarding a timeline for promotion review of tenured associate professors:

Motion by the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee to Add a Timeline for Promotion Review of Tenured Associate Professors

SUMMARY: Motion by the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee to amend the Faculty Rules & Regulations, effective July 1, 2008, for the purpose of adding new language regarding a timeline for promotion review of tenured associate professors.

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 4, Section 10.I.D.4 of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on Faculty Hiring, Review, Promotion and Tenure: Contract Renewal and Promotions add the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below) to the second paragraph.

Faculty Rules & Regulations

Part 4. Faculty Resolutions, Policies and Procedures

Section 10. Faculty Rules Pertaining to the Faculty & Students

I. Professional Affairs of the Faculty

D. Faculty Hiring, Review, Promotion and Tenure

4. Contract Renewal and Promotions

Every department or other academic unit with contract renewal or promotion decisions to make is responsible to provide each member of the faculty, including anyone who may become a candidate for tenure, and whose appointment was not made on the prior assumption that the position was not tenurable, with the department's written criteria for evaluating scholarship, teaching and service. This statement shall be detailed, clear, objective and fair and will state the relative importance of each criterion. The standards for meeting these criteria will also be described and defined by the department, to the extent possible. The criteria and standards will be applied consistently and uniformly. While the criteria and standards are not to be altered without approval by the Dean of the Faculty, or the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences (as may be appropriate) and the CMFA, TPA and the FEC, changes in the weighting of the criteria may occasionally occur. If a department has received approval for such a change, faculty should be notified as far in advance as possible of the exception and reasons for the change, and they must receive a copy of any alterations or amendments to the standards and criteria.

Recommendations to renew or not to renew contracts, or to promote or not to promote, are initiated by the faculty member's academic unit. All recommendations must be prepared and concluded in sufficient time to enable the University to notify formally the individual of its decision at least twelve months before the expiration of the term appointment, except that for individuals whose term appointments total three years or less, notice shall be given at least eight months before the expiration of the appointment. Initial faculty appointments of one year or less duration, and visiting and adjunct appointments of whatever duration, are to be considered term appointments not requiring additional notice from the University of expiration. At least one year before such a recommendation is made, the faculty member may request and receive (1) a written statement of the academic unit's criteria for recommending a renewal of an appointment or promotion and the academic unit's procedures in making such a recommendation; and (2) an explanation of the academic unit's needs as far as these may affect his or her reappointment or promotion or potential tenure review. The faculty member also has the

right to an explanation of what the recommendation is and to whom and when it will be sent. In the case of a negative recommendation, and at the request of the individual, he or she shall be given, in writing, the reasons of the academic unit for its decision. As outlined in the section concerning the Committee on Tenure, Promotions and Appointments, the individual also has the right to present written material in person and/or in writing to such Committee.

In the case of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, a review may be initiated at any time after the granting of tenure. As a minimum requirement, tenured associate professors who have completed ten years in rank shall be reviewed for promotion to professor. However a candidate may decline or defer this required review by sending a letter to that effect to the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, as appropriate.

At a duly called meeting of the tenured (senior) ¹¹ faculty, the tenured (senior) members of the academic unit will review the candidate's performance with regard to scholarship, teaching and service, in accordance with the specific criteria established by the academic unit which are on file with the appropriate Dean. (Publications and teaching evaluations, as well as other pertinent parts of the academic unit's file on the faculty member, will be available to tenured (senior) members of the academic unit two weeks before the meeting to make the recommendation.) On the basis of an evaluation of these aspects of an individual's performance, as well as **in the case of promotion of assistant to associate with tenure** consideration of the academic unit's staffing needs, a recommendation will be made in writing by the proper date and indicating the quorum the academic unit has established as necessary to make such decisions. The recommendation will contain a conscientious documentation by the academic unit of the candidate's professional career, as well as the reasons for the recommendation and the data used to arrive at the decision.

¹¹

In the case of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the group acting to make a recommendation consists of the Professors of the academic unit. A full description of the procedures to be followed in the case of promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure will be the subject of a separate recommendation to the faculty.

RATIONALE: In contrast to the well-specified timetable for the review of Assistant Professors for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, there is no pre-determined timetable governing the review of tenured Associate Professors for promotion to full Professor. This motion establishes a maximum period of service as Associate Professor of ten years after which a review for promotion ought to be undertaken. The idea of a mandatory review is not intended to be punitive and for this reason, language is included to allow a candidate to decline or defer a promotion review after serving ten years as a tenured associate professor by writing a letter to that effect to the appropriate Dean.

Professor Maxey noted that a phrase had been added to an earlier version: the change was posted on the web March 26, 10:00 a.m.

Professor Silverman asked if there were a timetable for a candidate denied at the first ten-year interval.

Professor Maxey said that TPAC's role is to review recommendations for appointment and promotion and to review standards. TPAC meets with the Provost, the President, and the FEC. President Simmons raised the issue of the timeline. The Faculty Forum produced useful discussion. There seems to be a lack of common understanding about the issue. While many associates come upon around the sixth year and longer, some do not come up. We need to make sure the departments are not holding back. Princeton uses a similar device, and Yale is now doing it as well.

Professor Silverman asked again what timetable would apply after an initial denial. Professor Maxey replied that as the motion is written that decision rests with the department, giving the candidate the right to be reviewed in a timely manner, or to defer.

President Simmons suggested that the language of the motion be rephrased to insure that a second review opportunity would occur with a certain interval. Professor Colwill proposed as a friendly amendment stating, "If denied, a candidate should be reviewed again after five years." A second friendly amendment rephrased the motion to read: "If denied, a candidate should be granted the opportunity to be reviewed within five years. The candidate may defer or decline as described above."

Discussion then turned to whether the ten-year period included only those years as an associate professor at Brown or whether appointment elsewhere at that rank would count. Professor Maxey raised the related issue of how to treat associate professors without tenure. Professor Russom said he thought the language was clearly inclusive since it does not specify "at Brown." Professor Savage said he thought the intent of the motion would be legible in the minutes of the meeting. After discussion of the wording, a friendly amendment by Professor Savage was accepted: "A candidate shall be reviewed for promotion at least every five years if not promoted. A candidate may defer or decline as described above."

Dean Vohra questioned whether "defer" was better than "defer or decline."

Professor Valente asked if TPAC was taking demographics into consideration, especially in terms of gender, department, and division. Professor Maxey replied that they were not working with such data. Professor Valente asked if TPAC was prepared to review 45 candidates for promotion to full professor next year. Professor Maxey stated that the promotion reviews would have to be phased over the next couple of years. Professor Valente expressed the wish that this matter had come up for full discussion before a motion was made, so that more wide-ranging issues about support services, mentoring, reduced teaching loads have been addressed. There is a national problem, and Brown has missed a chance to take the lead. The concept is good, not the sequencing. Professor Hogan commented that TPAC is part of a larger system, review of which would be long and hard, while this small but important improvement would be languishing. Professor Chung-I Tan again raised the importance of clarifying the inclusion of those promoted and tenured outside of Brown. Professor Colwill accepted as a friendly amendment the inclusion of "at Brown or another institution," but stated that she did not find the addition necessary. Professor Savage asked if it was understood that those now serving as

associates shall be granted a review as quickly as possible. Professor Bryan, stating the discussion was incomplete, moved to postpone the motion to the May 6 meeting. Professor Valente seconded. Professor Hogan stated that postponement seemed like a good idea allowing departmental discussion. Professor Valente stated that postponement would be productive. Professor Dill stated that as much good might be done by building in welcome support for associate professors, the problem cannot be fixed by a magic bullet. She urged faculty to move ahead. Professor Patterson moved to close debate. The motion carried. The second motion (to amend) carried. After prompting from Messrs. Patterson and Silverman, the relation of the second and first motions was clarified, and the first (main) motion carried. The amended section of the motion reads: A candidate shall be reviewed for promotion at least every five years if not promoted. A candidate may defer or decline as described above.

President Simmons declined to present a report, noting the restraints of time, and the Provost likewise declined.

Professor Lipscombe spoke to the attached report of the Academic Priorities Committee (APC), calling attention to its three main activities: 1) monitoring existing units; 2) reviewing proposals for new units; 3) discussion issues of ongoing and emerging importance.

Professor Pelcovits presented the attached report of the Human Resources Advisory Board.

President Simmons asked if there were any question on the reports or anything. Professor Banchoff asked what she would have said in her report. She stated that she would have sketched out the address she will be presenting to the Economics Club about the proposed legislation on the use of endowment funds and other intrusions into the private educational sector. Professor Banchoff asked the same of the Provost, who responded, April Fools. He would have spoken to the admissions announcement and financial aid matters, as well as the first class admitted to the joint Brown-RISD program. President Simmons made reference to the pile of nasty mail that has crossed her desk from parents who are withdrawing gifts and spreading vitriol. Professor Banchoff expressed appreciation to the administration for their service and for our new financial aid policies.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley
Secretary of the Faculty