

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting October 6, 2009

President Simmons called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m., and the traditional motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. was approved. It was explained that, to correct a printing error, one page of the minutes of the September Special Faculty Meeting was separately inserted into the collated agenda and attachments distributed at the meeting. The minutes of the meeting of September 9, 2009 were approved.

Professor Morone delivered memorial minutes for Alan Zuckerman, late Professor of Political Science, and for Edward Beiser, late Professor Emeritus of Political Science. The faculty rose in standing votes of respect. The minutes are attached and will be entered into the permanent records of the Faculty, with copies to be sent to members of the immediate families.

Professor Tan prefaced his Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Chair's report with a recollection of the rather daunting purpose of Faculty Meetings advocated by a recent former FEC Chair: to inform faculty members about ongoing and upcoming FEC business, discussing and debating issues of faculty concern and making suggestions for FEC attention, and communicating the faculty's academic priorities and values to the Senior Administration. He issued an open invitation to colleagues to suggest, either here or via e-mails, any worthwhile projects which the FEC should address on behalf of the faculty. Professor Tan reported that the FEC has had two meetings (9/15 and 9/29). A request by Professor Tom Doeppner, Vice Chair of the Computer Advisory board (CAB) for changes to the name and charge of CAB was discussed and is presented at today's meeting as a motion for consideration by the faculty. The FEC also met with the Dean of the College on the issue of the Writing Requirement for a Brown Degree, with representatives from the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) on the revised Conflict of Interest (COI) form which has now been posted on the OVPR webpage for faculty comment before adoption, and with VP Clyde Briant on the role of the Research Advisory Board (RAB). After a lengthy discussion with the latter, the FEC agreed that no change is necessary to the present charge but that several issues should be addressed by the OVPR including adoption by the Office of Sponsored Programs of a less bureaucratic and more "customer-oriented" approach in dealing with the faculty. Continuing a two year tradition, the FEC Officers met with members of the Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee (TPAC) to share concerns and to thank the members of the TPAC for their time-consuming service to the Faculty and Brown.

Professor Tan reminded the faculty of the vacancy of the Faculty Ombudsperson. This position will be filled when the financial health of the university improves. Meanwhile, the webpage for the Ombudsperson has been edited appropriately.

The FEC has also met twice with representatives of the Organizational Review Committee (ORC). The first meeting concerned an unfortunate and perhaps misleading quote reported in the Brown Daily Herald about the effect of the ORC on junior faculty. At the second meeting, there was a presentation by the Executive VP for Finance & Administration, Beppie Huidekoper, together with Karen Davis, VP for Human Resources, and Deputy Provost Vince Tompkins.

Items in the pipeline that were mentioned included (1) procedure for handling (i) Sexual Harassment Complaints, (ii) Faculty Dismissal, (2) Calendar modification, (3) meeting with Student representatives: Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS) and the Graduate Student Council (GSC). The issue of Campus Safety will also be addressed by the FEC. This is partly prompted by the recent incident at Harvard involving a well-known faculty, the unfortunate incident at Yale, as well as other incidents on campus. The FEC will be working with the Campus Police in updating their FAQ page as well as publicizing other proactive efforts taken by the campus police. The FEC will also be meeting with junior faculty. This effort, which started two years ago, has proved to be extremely fruitful for all. The FEC will also consider how this kind of effort could be expanded to address the needs of other faculty.

The FEC Officers met separately with the President and the Provost to discuss many important issues confronting the University and to provide inputs from a faculty perspective. The President, the Provost and the VP for Finance & Administration will address some of the key issues in their respective reports.

Professor Tan continued his report with comments on the Provost's Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Faculty Development Policies and the ORC. The FEC feels strongly that any meaningful review of tenure process at Brown should be faculty driven. However, due to the fact that the current impetus for this review resides with the Corporation, the FEC feels that it is appropriate for the Provost to chair this Ad Hoc Committee. The FEC suggested names of senior faculty to serve on the committee. There will be a Faculty Forum in November to solicit broader faculty input. A preliminary report from the committee, expected by late January/early February, will be discussed by the FEC at a retreat with the Administration. Turning to the ORC, Professor Tan indicated that the FEC is particularly interested in the working groups dealing with (1) Academic Unit Support, (2) Student Support, (3) Library Support. Separate meetings with these groups as well as a meeting with faculty members of the ORC are being arranged.

Faculty Governance was discussed at the first monthly meeting between the FEC Chair and the Dean of the Faculty. Is incentive or reward necessary for Faculty Service? If it should not be the primary reason for one to get engaged, what else can be done to encourage participation? How do we develop a culture of engaging Faculty in Governance? One specific suggestion is to engage Department Chairs and Center Directors more in this effort. A meeting has been organized for this purpose.

At the upcoming meeting with members of the Corporation, the FEC Officers will convey the faculty's investment in the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) and its readiness to work with the Administration on any issues that may require attention coming from the NEASC report. In particular, they plan to discuss: (1) Issues facing Brown University, (2) Issue of Faculty Assessment, (3) Faculty Governance. In commenting on the realization that the PAE goal of hiring 100 new faculty is not enough, Professor Tan emphasized the need to involve new faculty in faculty governance and to encourage them to teach and advise at the undergraduate level. In this way, we can hold true to our belief in having a leading research institution with a global presence while maintaining its distinctive character as a "university-college". Professor Tan concluded his remarks with a humorous but pointed analogy between building leading academic departments and winning baseball teams.

Professor Tan then invited Professor Andrea Simmons to report for the Committee on Nominations. The following nominations for committee appointments were presented:

Nominations recommended to the Faculty for Committee Appointments to be effective immediately:

Graduate Council

Gianpaolo Baiocchi (Sociology) replacing Robert Lee (American Civilization) to 6/30/10

Nominations recommended to the Faculty for Committee Appointments to be effective January 1, 2010:

Faculty Executive Committee

Evelyn Hu-Dehart (History/Ethnic Studies) replacing Cynthia Garcia Coll (Education) to 6/30/10

Tenure, Promotion and Appointment Committee (TPAC)

Alexander Levitsky (Slavic Languages) to replace Coppelia Kahn (English) to 6/30/10

The President called for further nominations. There were none and the slate was elected unanimously.

Professor Doeppner presented a motion to modify the name and charge of the Computing Advisory Board to reflect more accurately the full scope of the board:

MOTION: To amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, Part 1, Section 2, VII. D. Computing Advisory Board, effective immediately, for the purpose of clarifying its role.

RATIONALE: The reason for the change to the charge is that the CAB is no longer focused just on CIS, but on computing, information, and communication campus-wide. We advise the vice president for computing, but this person's title has been expanded to "chief information officer." The CIO's responsibilities include oversight of all computing, information, and communication throughout the university. The committee has been acting in this expanded role for the past few years; we seek now to adjust the charge to reflect reality.

Information-Technology Advisory Board

~~Computing Advisory Board~~

1. Charge

The ~~Computing~~ **Information-Technology** Advisory Board shall serve to advise the ~~Vice President for Computing and Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer**, and other senior officers as appropriate, on resources and priorities concerning **all aspects of** computing, **information management**, and ~~information~~ **communication** technology.

The ~~Computing~~ **Information-Technology** Advisory Board shall review and make recommendations concerning the University's planning and implementation of plans for current and proposed computing and information technologies. The Board shall review and make recommendations with regard to policies consistent with the goals and objectives of the University for the proper use of computing resources by faculty, staff, and students. **Its goals include** the enhancement of the faculty and student academic environment through the effective use of computing and communication technology, including appropriate computing, **information, and communication** support for teaching and research. The ~~Computing~~ **Information-Technology** Advisory Board shall also be a source of input and feedback regarding matters of administrative computing, **communication, and information technology** needs and requirements.

2. Membership

The members shall consist of the ~~Vice President for Computing and Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer**, six faculty members representative of academic grouping as listed in Section 12, II, whenever possible, two staff members, two undergraduates, two graduate students, and one medical student. Faculty members shall serve staggered three-year terms. Staff and student members shall serve staggered two-year terms. The University Librarian and Director of the Center for computation and visualization shall be ex-officio members.

3. Chair and Staffing

The Board Chair shall be the ~~Vice President for Computing and Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer**. The Vice Chair shall be a faculty member who is elected by the board at the end of his/her first year of service and shall serve as such for one academic year. The Board shall be staffed by the Office of the ~~Vice President for Computing and Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer**.

4. Procedures

An Executive Committee, consisting of the Chair and Vice Chair, shall set the agenda for Board meetings. The Board should meet at least once a month during the academic year. 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 members will be appointed by the ~~Vice President for Computing and Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer** with advice from the Committee on Nominations. Staff members will be appointed by the ~~Vice President for Computing and Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer** with advice from the Staff Advisory Committee (SAC). Student members will be appointed by the ~~Vice President for Computing & Information Services~~ **Chief Information Officer** with advice from the appropriate student government. At least one undergraduate member shall be chosen from the membership of the committee on computing of the Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS), if such a committee exists.

In response to a question from Professor Hermance, Professor Doeppner clarified that both the name and the charge of the committee were presented for modification. The motion carried without dissent.

President Simmons offered an extemporaneous response to Professor Tan's baseball analogy to which she took exception. She mentioned that the President of Dartmouth, a Brown alumnus, declared at his inauguration that Dartmouth was the best undergraduate college in the country. She stressed Brown's very strong position relative to peer institutions in these troubling economic times and called not only for an intelligent use of resources to address the problems we face but a strong spirit of community and trust.

President Simmons then turned to the matter of the legislation that was introduced in the RI General Assembly that seeks both to tax out-of-state students attending private colleges and universities as well as the private institutions and hospitals. There were two features of this legislation that would have significant consequences for Brown. One, introduced last May in the General Assembly, would tax our out-of-state residents \$300 per year. A separate bill would enable cities and towns to levy a tax on the property of hospitals or private colleges/universities with a value greater than \$20 million, up to 25% of the applicable tax rate. These bills were referred to the House and Senate Committees.

On June 25th the bill to tax students was voted out of the House Finance Committee and placed on the House calendar for consideration. Brown is working closely with other colleges and universities to convey opposition to the bill. President Simmons explained the steps for this bill to become law. Recognizing the dismal fiscal situation facing Providence and Rhode Island, President Simmons emphasized Brown's willingness to be a constructive partner with the city and state to spur long term economic growth. She reminded the faculty of the terms of the 2003 MOU through which Brown agreed to pay the city \$50 million over 20 years as well as tax payments on property purchased for a span of 15 years. Since the enactment of the MOU, Brown has removed only one property from the tax rolls – the land that is the site of the Perry and Marty Granoff Center for the Creative Arts. Other recently purchased properties including 121 South Main and those in the Jewelry District remain on the tax rolls. In FY 2009, Brown paid a total of \$3.34 million in property taxes and voluntary payments.

A major concern expressed about the student tax is that it is a fee that could be increased at will as politicians change and the city needs additional revenue – a bad and highly risky public policy.

As the eighth largest employer in the state, Brown creates almost 2,000 local, full-time equivalent jobs through its spending on payroll, goods, supplies, services, and construction. A report conducted by Appleseed cited the following:

In FY05, Brown spent more than \$243 million on purchases of goods and services on construction, \$64.3 million of which was paid to Rhode Island companies; 72 percent of those dollars were paid to Providence companies. Of the \$52.7 million spent on construction and renovation of University facilities in FY05, \$39.5 million was paid to Rhode Island-based contractors. Brown continues to be a significant source of employment for the construction trades, with more than 300 workers on campus this summer alone. Spending by Brown students totaled more than \$40 million in AY 2004-05 and, along with spending by visitors to Brown, generated more than 840 jobs throughout the state. Since 2001, Brown has spent more than \$100

million on research each year, the bulk of which is spent locally on salaries, supplies, equipment, and overhead costs. Finally, Brown and its hospital partners accounted for 87 percent (a total of \$120.8 million) of the state's 2008 NIH funding.

President Simmons expressed confidence that there is real promise in a close partnership with the city, state, public and private sectors to support and build upon this research activity and fulfill the promise of the knowledge economy. She cited the Medical Education Building, our partnerships with IBM and with Draper Labs, our Center for Entrepreneurship and other initiatives as potential for widespread benefits for Brown, the city, the state and the region.

The President then turned to the Annual Sustainability Progress Report just issued by Steve Maiorisi's office and available on the Facilities website. She is pleased to see that we are making progress towards the goal of reducing, by 2020, our energy related carbon footprint by 42 percent below 2007 levels. We are accomplishing this through local purchasing, fuel-switching, retro-commissioning of existing buildings and Leed certification for new buildings. The Sustainability and Environmental Initiatives Office has received funding to reduce energy consumption by 20 percent and there are some 100 projects completed or in the works to achieve this goal. President Simmons concluded her report with a listing of some salient accomplishments in the past year: an all time high recycling rate of 38 percent; 120 tons of leaf and yard waste was composted representing a 26 percent increase over FY08; 600 tons of food waste were recycled, including edible food to "After the Harvest" which supplies food banks; a 25 percent decrease in food waste in Verney Wooley; an 18.8 percent reduction in energy-related carbon footprint and a 3.7 percent reduction in the 2007 baseline for carbon dioxide equivalents. A significant contribution to this latter result was the replacement of #6 fuel oil by natural gas.

The Provost began his report by announcing the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Faculty Development Policies which held its first meeting last week. Members of the committee are: Susan Alcock (Joukowsky Institute and Classics), Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive and Linguistic Sciences), Barry Connors (Neuroscience), Sharon Krause (Political Science), Charles Larmore (Philosophy), Arto Nurmikko (Engineering), Tricia Rose (Africana Studies) and Andy Van Dam (Computer Science). The Dean of the Faculty, Rajiv Vohra, and the Dean of Biology and Medicine, Ed Wing, will also serve ex officio. Among the items to be considered by the committee are how to mentor and develop the careers of junior faculty, and how to make the tenure process as strong and as fair as it can be. The Corporation has requested this review of our tenure process in light of the NEASC report. He expects the committee to meet every two weeks. There will be a Faculty Forum as well as meetings of the committee with the FEC, TPAC and junior faculty.

Professor Tricia Serio asked why membership of the committee had been restricted to Full Professors. The Provost replied that two main criteria were applied to the selection of faculty for the committee – nationally prominent scholars and devoted teachers – with consideration given to representation across academic divisions and diversity. Professor Corey Walker pointed out that the faculty most affected by the recommendations of this ad hoc committee would be junior faculty. He questioned how the committee could be reasonable without a junior faculty member on the committee to ensure a balanced hearing. Provost Kertzer commented that this is not an "us versus them" issue. Professor Fausto-Sterling commented that

junior faculty members and newly tenured associate professors have a perspective that is very different from that shared by Full Professors. Provost Kertzer countered that one of the committee members was a recently promoted Full Professor. Other issues raised were concerns about the effectiveness of a Faculty Forum in the absence of access to the NEASC report and the development of a charge to the committee prior to faculty consideration of the NEASC report, the desirability for faculty to have an opportunity to frame the discussion of the tenure process and the difficulty in doing so without access to the NEASC report, and the process through which the committee's recommendations might be enacted. The timing of the Faculty Forum and the release of the NEASC report was discussed at length. The charge to the committee is not a mystery – the topics are to determine if we are supporting junior faculty in the best possible way and if the tenure process is the best it can be. Here, mention was made of the tenure clock and its challenges to junior faculty in the Life/Medical Sciences. The Provost emphasized that the committee had no legislative power and that there would be opportunities for additional input from faculty throughout the review. In response to a question about whether the Administration was open to adding representation from other ranks to the committee, the Provost indicated that he thought it was a bad idea and cited the fact that there are no untenured faculty members on TPAC. He commented that he had received a complaint that there were no arts faculty on the committee. Provost Kertzer restated his position that he has a good committee that will report to the faculty and that all faculty will have an opportunity to go over the recommendations. At this point President Simmons interjected with the suggestion that in light of the concerns raised, the question of membership might be reconsidered by the FEC and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Corporation. The Provost concurred.

Professor Wegner invited members of the faculty to contribute articles on the matter of tenure to add to the two he had already received for the next issue of the Faculty Bulletin. Discussion then turned back to the concern that although the charge to the ad hoc committee was limited, its scope touched on all aspects of faculty life at Brown. Professor Walker argued that the time pressure to develop a set of recommendations for the Corporation to discuss at its retreat in February 2010 was not conducive to the development of an adequate set of recommendations. He worries that the committee may not have time to capture the complexity of the dynamics of the tenure process at Brown. The Provost replied that there was no set time frame and that the committee had met only once.

Vice President Beppie Huidekoper presented an update on Brown's finances. FY09 results were better than expected. Total university revenue exceeded expenses allowing a contribution of \$5,718K to reserves rather than the expected draw on reserves of \$493K. This savings was due largely to the freeze on salaries, leaving vacancies unfilled, and fundraising success. Total cash gifts were excellent in FY09. A number of pledge payments for the pool, the Alpert Medical School, the Creative Arts Center, and the Fitness/Aquatics Center helped us achieve total gifts of \$192 million. Gifts to capital were \$60.9 million vs. a fundraising goal of \$30 million; gifts to endowment were \$44.2 million vs. a fundraising goal of \$50 million; and gifts to current use OR undesignated were \$77 million vs a fundraising goal of \$60 million. FY09 endowment investment returns were -23.1% and Brown's endowment went from \$2.8 billion to \$2.0 billion in the year ending June 30, 2009.

In early September, the Administration reviewed the FY09 year end results as well as the assumptions about the recovery with a subcommittee of the Corporation. They remain extremely cautious and recommended that: we assume endowment returns of 0% in CY09 and +5% per year for the next 4 years; we plan on decreasing the payout in FY11 by 20%; and we continue to work on identifying ways in which to reduce the FY11 projected deficit of ~\$30 million. Current projections of E&G gross revenues total \$600 million by FY14 which leaves us with a \$60 million deficit so we need to plan on cutting \$60 million more from expenditures to balance the budget in FY14. The E&G financial plan includes more than \$100 million of increases between FY10 and FY14 for critical academic priorities: financial aid, new faculty, compensation, facilities, research. To add \$100 million for these or other priorities, we must continue to raise funds (including \$40-50 million of new endowment per year) and make reductions in other areas. VP Huidekoper went on to review the assumptions underlying a net increase of only 1.4 percent per year in undergraduate tuition.

Turning to the budget planning for FY11, VP Huidekoper provided some context: To achieve the required deficit reductions Brown could cut all compensation by 10 percent or increase fees by 35 percent to eliminate the projected deficit. To achieve the best results for Brown, budget planning will be more strategic. The University Resources Committee (URC) will focus on revenue enhancements, modifications to planned increases and operating budget reductions. The Organizational Review Committee (ORC) will focus on possible organizational changes. To achieve the target reduction of \$30 million for FY11, \$5 will be cut from the Capital Plan, \$14 million from reorganizations, \$5 million from operating expenses and \$6 million from other sources. The roles of the URC and the ORC in this budget process were then described.

The URC will focus on: Undergraduate enrollment, financial aid and tuition and net tuition; the resources necessary to enhance the excellence and competitiveness of our doctoral programs; compensation for faculty and staff; continuing academic initiatives aimed at strengthening key departments and programs; pressures in the library and information technology, and other areas identified by the NEASC team as priority areas for attention and possible investment; the way in which capital/IT projects will affect the FY11 budget; operating expense reductions. The URC will make final budget recommendations to the President before winter break. The Organizational Review Committee will oversee a campus wide effort designed to ensure that our administrative operations are optimally organized (revenues and expenses) to support our highest priorities. ORC teams will meet for the first time later this week. Teams will solicit input and get feedback re different organizational objectives and designs. Teams will be mindful of existing vacancies. They will make their recommendations - with anticipated implications - to the full ORC in December. The ORC will forward the team recommendations to the President for her consideration by winter break. Information about the ORC teams is available on a new website called "Brown and the Economy". VP Huidekoper continued her presentation with an overview of the functions and departments that are being reviewed. She concluded her presentation with a discussion of what failure and success would look like.

A flurry of questions ensued. VP Huidekoper explained that approximately \$30 million of the \$550 million went to debt services and that debt has been added over time to address another liability: deferred maintenance. The approximate cost of staff compensation and benefits was \$140 million in the E&G budget. The Holiday Bazaar was not cut to save money. Calling on

VP Davis, it was learned that the bigger issue was risk related to staff selling items while at work. The President raised an objection to the Athletics Department setting a \$20 parking fee on university property at the recent football match.

The next item of business was presented by Dean of the College, Katherine Bergeron. She described some work her Office has done on Brown's only general education requirement: that all students demonstrate the ability to write well. When the Task Force on Undergraduate Education reviewed the curriculum in 2007-08, there was a strong sentiment expressed by the community that our writing requirement needed closer attention: faculty members were concerned that the requirement was not strong enough; the Brown Daily Herald ran two editorials that said more or less the same thing. The final report of the Task Force urged that we strengthen and clarify our writing requirement. The College Writing Advisory Board and the College Curriculum Council have worked collaboratively over the past year to make the writing requirement more transparent. In April the CCC passed an updated statement on writing which is before the faculty today for comment prior to its introduction to students.

Dean Bergeron explained that the purpose of the statement is to communicate the expectation that students should work on their writing throughout their Brown career. It explains why writing is important; what students have to do; and how they will show that they have done it. The updated version pays greater attention to the longstanding expectation (as expressed in the Faculty Rules) that students will work on their writing throughout their four years. This includes, then, writing in the concentration. Dean Bergeron explained the ramifications of this new expectation for concentration programs: Concentrations will not only have to provide sufficient opportunities for students to work on their writing, but they will also have to ensure that students have completed this expectation at the time of graduation. Most concentrations will need to work out a plan to do this. The CCC voted to create a new course designation ("W") to signify courses that encouraged drafting, revision, or other forms of engagement with the writing process. A list of such courses will be compiled and curricular incentive grants will be offered to encourage faculty to develop discipline specific efforts in writing.

Professor Blumstein pointed out that students should be encouraged to pick up their graded term papers. Students will be asked to upload copies of their best work to an online portfolio. Professor Tullis, Geological Sciences, advocated for an earlier deadline for term papers so that students could get feedback and revise their papers for a final submission. Professor Dill asked if the designation of courses as "writing courses" would hinge on this process of instructor feedback rather than on the number or length or other attributes of the writing assignments per se. Dean Bergeron indicated that this was consistent with the "W" designation, and that she understood there were many such courses in the curriculum. The idea of the "W" designation is to capture them and make them visible to students. A question was raised about how the writing requirement should be vetted by concentrations involving Foreign Language Acquisition. Dean Bergeron replied that departments in which students do writing in another language would have to determine how this work would fulfill the general expectation, and then define their own policies and procedures in this light. A comment was made that faculty assessment of student writing implies that all faculty are competent to judge student writing and are interested in doing so. Dean Bergeron responded that faculty are not being asked simply to make judgments but rather to encourage students to maximize opportunities to engage in writing. Such engagement

could take many forms quite apart from the standard essay or term paper. She reiterated that departments should talk about the writing requirement and that resources would be made available to departments to support relevant initiatives in the concentrations.

The meeting continued with reports from the Computing Advisory Board, Campus Life Advisory Board, the Library Advisory Board and the Research Advisory Board. Professor Dill asked if the Organizational Review Committee would be interfacing with the advisory boards. VP Huidekoper assured her it would.

There being no Old Business and no New Business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth M. Colwill
Secretary of the Faculty

Memorial Minute for

Alan Zuckerman, Professor of Political Science

**Presented to the Faculty on
October 6, 2009**

Alan Zuckerman arrived at Brown University as an Assistant Professor of political science in 1970. He received a B.A. (1966) from Brooklyn College (CUNY), and his M.A. (1968) and Ph.D. (1971) from Princeton University. He served as the Chair of the Department of Political Science from 2002 to 2005.

Alan profoundly shaped political science at Brown. He was the prime mover in restoring our graduate program in the mid 1980s; he had a hand in hiring every active member of the department; and he cared fiercely about our standing both at the university and the discipline.

Professor Zuckerman was the author, coauthor, editor, and co-editor of many books with various university presses and numerous articles in the leading journals of political science, as well as monographs in the United States, Britain, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Israel. He published his first book, *The Politics of Faction: Christian Democratic Rule in Italy* with Yale University Press (1979) and his second, *The Transformation of the Jews*, co-authored with Calvin Goldscheider, with the University of Chicago (1984).

Next, he turned to the subject that would become his most passionate intellectual focus: the analytic principles underlying comparative politics and political science. He explored the possibilities and limits of political studies as a scientific enterprise. His *Doing Political Science* (Westbrook, 1991) laid out his thinking. More recently, Alan convened conferences and edited collections that took up this question –What is political science? Can it be a science? He edited important publications on this question, engaging many of the most significant thinkers in the discipline. Cambridge University Press is bringing out an all new second edition of essays, edited by Alan Zuckerman, on this subject, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Structure, and Culture* in 2009.

Professor Zuckerman's *Partisan Families: the Social Logic of Bounded Partisanship in Germany and Britain* (Cambridge University Press) won the International Society of Political Psychology's Alexander George Award for the best book published in 2007. He wrote the book with two of his graduate students, Jennifer Fitzgerald and Josef Dasovic.

Professor Zuckerman's many honors include serving on the faculty at Tel-Aviv University (Visiting Professor and Fulbright Professor); the University of Pisa (Fulbright Fellow), and the University of Florence (Visiting Professor); visiting professor in the Doctoral Program of the Istituto Italiano diScienza Umane in Florence; research professor, DIW, Berlin; visiting scholar, Center for European Studies, NYU, and Visiting Professor, Center for European Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, and most recently Lady Davis Visiting Professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

He is remembered by his students, especially his graduate students, as one of the most demanding –and exhilarating-- professors they ever encountered. He is remembered by his colleagues as passionate, intellectual, funny, brilliant, demanding, a Yankees fan, and always larger-than life. He was our friend, our mentor, our teacher, a scholar, and a constant challenge to always aim higher.

Memorial Minute for
Edward Beiser, Professor Emeritus of Political Science

Presented to the Faculty on
October 6, 2009

Professor Edward Beiser was an emeritus professor of political science. Professor Beiser received his BA from the City University of New York in 1962 and his MA (64) and Ph. D. (67) from Princeton University. He served on the faculty of Williams College from 1965 to 1968.

Ed came to Brown in 1968. He taught courses on the politics of the legal system and quickly developed a reputation as an extraordinary lecturer. Professor Beiser's signature Socratic style – remembered by generations of Brown students—was to ask, politely, if someone was “present”, and then proceed to grill them on the legal case at hand. He was a challenging and much loved professor. Grateful students raised funds to name his long time office in Prospect House the Beiser Room. Professor Beiser founded a concentration in Law and Society which he ran in conjunction with the political science department.

Long before there was a Sheridan Center, Professor Beiser mentored young faculty on how to be an effective teacher. He'd invite us to one of his lectures, gently suggest that it would be polite for us to reciprocate and invite him to one of our classes; that would begin an energetic dialogue about teaching which, in many cases, continued right up to his retirement. Ed Beiser turned our department into a running seminar about the art of teaching.

Professor Beiser took a law degree at Harvard University in 1977 (he later admitted to going up to Boston to take the LSAT so as not to be surrounded by his own students). He became a highly regarded authority on the Rhode Island Supreme Court and was a court appointed special master during the high profile murder trial of Klaus Von Bulow. His eight part lecture series, *Ethics and Public Policy* became an early success from the teaching company.

Professor Beiser became increasingly interested in medical law and medical ethics. He left political science and became an associate dean at the medical school. Professor Beiser helped organize and run the eight year joint undergraduate/ medical school PLME program. He retired from Brown in 2003.