

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

November 2, 2010

President Simmons called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m., and the customary motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. was approved without dissent.

The Secretary reported two proposed changes to the posted draft of the minutes of October 29: One addition (to page 14), proposed by Professor Dill (Sociology), follows Professor Dill's introduction of the motion to refer and includes a statement missing in the draft: "She explained the rationale for the motion as being drawn from the statements of Professors Fausto-Sterling and Ahearn, namely that motion number two and, in addition, all the remaining motions that have been brought to the faculty and represented by the Ad Hoc Committee as of a piece with one another, should receive further examination and refinement by a body representative of the faculty as a whole, namely the FEC." Another addition of missing material, proposed by Professor Richardson, is to the language of the ruling on page 10: "Professor Richardson stated that, according to *Roberts Rules*, in a section regarding Motions that cannot be divided, the original Motion must be divided so that any decision made on one part can be made regardless of any decision made on the other, and he paraphrased the example given in Roberts, by saying that an original Motion to congratulate a Member on a specific achievement, and to award the Member with a sum of money, could be divided." Professor Newman (Comparative Literature) proposed that in the remarks of Provost Kertzer on the last paragraph of page 10, "he stated that he did not understand how consideration paragraph by paragraph," be amended to "...he did not understand how voting paragraph by paragraph." These amendments were accepted, and the minutes were approved without dissent.

Professor Garcia Coll, reporting for the FEC, recalled the will of the Faculty at the last meeting to refer the motion withdrawn to the FEC for work on the question in consultation with the ad hoc committee that had originated the motion. That consultation raised the question of the meaning of the charge given to the FEC by the motion to refer: was the motion to refer limited to division of the motion as originally made or did it allow reshaping of the question in the context of the debate for subsequent consideration of the Faculty? She reported that the Secretary and the Parliamentarian had confirmed that the motion to refer was not limited to division. She asserted that in the coming month the FEC would work with new resolve to consolidate and organize the questions raised by the report of the ad hoc committee so as to accelerate and clarify the process. Professor Garcia Coll reported that meetings on TPAC matters had again raised the importance of clarifying the role of multiple departmental and program affiliations by TPAC nominees and members and the accompanying array of leave patterns by individual members in TPAC eligibility. She also reported on meetings with Medical School Faculty to arrive at workable procedures for Medical School appointments made jointly with positions at participating hospitals, including the fair distribution of access to Brown software, email, Morning Mail, and other University communications, these unpaid Medical school appointees working a great deal for the University and receiving little in return. The FEC also considered

forthcoming reports from CFED, the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees, and Committee on Academic Standing.

Mr. Patterson (Engineering), as chair of the Nominations Committee, presented the following nominations:

Nominations recommended to the Faculty for committee appointments to be effective immediately:

Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibilities in Investment Policies

Naoko Shibusawa (History) replacing Vern Henderson (Economics) effective immediately to 6/30/13

Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED)

Naoko Shibusawa (History) replacing Maud Mandel (History) to 6/30/11

These nominations were approved without dissent, and Mr. Patterson closed his remarks by noting the continuing need for nominations to the University Resources Committee (URC) and the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees.

Professor Pelcovits (Physics) reported for the Faculty Committee on the Campaign that with 60 days remaining the Campaign was celebrating a last hurrah, and that the committee will continue to encourage faculty members to contribute by earmarking gifts for such causes as Faculty Scholarships, departmental needs, or specific programs, noting that broad participation has proven an important aspect of the campaign.

President Simmons thanked Professor Pelcovits and the committee and called upon Vice President King to state the latest total for the campaign: \$1,582,518,534.00, a figure that was received by the Faculty with joy. President Simmons stated her concern as a citizen for some of the tragic actions, some carried out by young people, that have resulted in the suicides of individuals targeted for ridicule, harassment and violence because of their sexual identity. The fact that some environments more than others appear to sanction attacks, harassment, threats and the bullying of individuals based on bigotry and indifference should be of deep concern. Noting that today was election day, the President stated that she was concerned about a national mood that insufficiently challenges savagely egregious personal attacks. One is certainly aware at this time of the stresses on family and personal finances, the general malaise in regard to the uncertainty of the future; the divisive associated with the country's partisan politics; and other factors that so easily give rise to anger, resentment and blame. While one cannot draw a direct link between these factors and the seeming rise of divisive, bullying, untruthful and downright scatological discourse, the President stated her belief that our failure to strongly challenge this behavior can lead to an escalation in the occurrence of such activities. Clearly, an extensively unsettled period holds much of the world in its grip. When security, lack of hope for near term improvement in the economy, and other stressful factors converge, the climate for civil debate in the context of an orderly democratic process erodes. She expressed the hope that some of this incivility will begin to subside in the wake of the

election but acknowledged the fear that this will not occur naturally and that it will take enormous effort, focus and involvement from all to prevent our communities and the country from descending into a prolonged period of divisiveness that can lead to threats to basic human and civil rights. Brown, like every other institution at this time, has the opportunity and the obligation to speak to the importance of safeguarding these rights. The President affirmed with hope that all will continue to do that wherever we see bigotry and intolerance surface as a threat to a peaceful and inclusive way of life. We at Brown should set an example by steadfast efforts to advance debate and resolve differences so as to protect the rights of all to be heard. Ours is an unusually privileged community from this vantage point but it will remain so only as long as we work hard at maintaining an environment of genuine respect and cooperation.

The President then addressed the University's FY11 operating budget. A large number of needs in the context of continued constraints limit our ability to increase the budget. Since we cannot predict precisely when those constraints will be eased, the question of how we should operate in these circumstances is one that a good many of us are considering. Between 2002 and 2009, Brown and the Plan for Academic Enrichment benefited enormously from a bull market and a strong positive donor reaction to the University's needs. Total revenues during that period grew by an average of 6% per year. Reflecting the growth in the endowment, the payout almost doubled from \$69 M to \$135 M, an average annual increase of 9 per year. The annual fund grew from \$17 M to \$36 M with average annual increases of 10% per year. Over that same period, net income from tuition and sponsored support—our two largest sources of support—grew by 3% per year. Then, in less than 6 months, between September '08 and March '09, the value of the Brown endowment dropped from \$2.8B to roughly \$2.0 B, a loss of almost \$800 million, causing an anticipated drop in revenue of over \$25 million per year. At the same time, families were greatly affected by the economic crisis and the result was greater financial aid need. With advice and support from the Corporation, Brown developed a three phased response to the significant drop in endowment and increased demand for financial aid. The first two phases involved budget cuts, reduction in the capital plan and increases in undergraduate enrollment. Over a two-year period we reduced administrative staff by 200 FTEs or 7%; we decreased the endowment payout from \$135 M in FY10 to \$110 M in the current year, representing a payout this year of slightly more than 5% of the June 30, 2010 market value. Despite the painful organizational changes made over the past year, the E&G budget assumes a small \$2.7 million deficit on \$570 million of expenses. The division's budget is projected to break even this year. The good news is that, unless we see further declines in the market, we do not anticipate additional budget cuts. However, our total revenues are expected to grow by 3-4% per year over the next few years and we do not therefore expect to have the capacity to grow overall expenses by any more than that. With financial aid growing by 7-8% per year, health care by 9-10% per year, and new facilities opening, we will be hard pressed to manage incremental support and improvements. The URC will once again have a huge challenge in developing a set of FY12 budget recommendations. Upon considering these recommendations, the President will then present her FY12 recommendations to the Corporation in February 2011. With this in mind, it is important that the community be prepared for the more modest increments we expect to see in the University budget. Over time, we understand that we must grow and expand the sources of

the University's revenue if we are to manage the current priorities and plan. These opportunities are being reviewed to determine where investments could yield significant improvements in revenue. However, these streams may take some time to develop and mature. So for the immediate term, we hope to hold on to our ability to improve compensation, continue a strong financial aid program, support the graduate school and research agendas, and improve the experience of students. We hope that our donors will support needed improvements to the physical plant and further academic program enhancements because, during this period, such support will be especially important. In sum, we will continue to work with departments and programs to manage this new economic reality. That work will be challenging but we still have much to be grateful for as we continue to attract outstanding students, offer outstanding teaching and research programs, and provide excellent jobs for a depressed Rhode Island economy.

The President, stating that she would be remiss if she failed to comment on the ongoing efforts to determine how to address the proposed changes in tenure policy and procedures, noted that FEC will bring back its recommendations in regard to this matter. But the debate and action of this body will be but one step in the process of understanding how we should meet our obligations in this important area. She stated that she wishes the Faculty to know that Corporation committees have undertaken a process to understand better what their responsibilities are as the ultimate authority for approving both the policy on tenure as well as individual recommendations for tenure and promotion. A number of meetings on this subject have been held, including meetings with the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and between the Fellows and FEC officers. The Academic Affairs Committee will hold a joint session with the Fellows to determine what the Corporation should do to assure that the campus process leads to outcomes that they can ultimately support. With responsibility for the long term mission and strategy of the University, they are aware that they bear ultimate responsibility for tenure results. As fiduciaries, they are also aware that tenure, more than any other single action, obligates the university to substantial expenditures over an extended period of time such that they could limit the capacity of the University to move in new directions. The NEASC report and the requirements of the next review necessitate the Corporation's being able to answer the question of whether the tenure process at Brown is appropriate to its current profile and mission. Preparing for that discussion with NEASC, the Corporation will want to develop its own measures in keeping with its specific realm of authority. She does not expect the Corporation to try to intervene inappropriately in the campus process, but she does expect that they will determine what is in keeping with the expected role of an engaged and responsible board and that they will establish a clear set of aims, standards and practices in line with their particular responsibilities. She noted the news that David Kertzer will be stepping down in June at the end of his term as Provost. She expressed her gratitude to David for his phenomenal service to the University. The Provost's position is a challenging one. Those who like David take this on out of a sense of duty and loyalty are of course to be commended. Those who, like David, do so with the highest standards and concern for the future of the university are extremely vital to the quality of institutions like Brown. She acknowledged his exceptional leadership and thanked him for all that he is doing for Brown. She stated that she will soon organize a search for a new provost who would begin on July 1, 2011. She invited comments on the search and nominations for the position.

Faculty may direct both to “ruth_simmons@brown.edu,” which is her personal e-mail address.

Professor Pelcovits asked if the search would be national or internal, and the President replied the search would be national while always open to internal candidates. Professor Valente (Portuguese and Brazilian Studies; Comparative Literature) commended the Corporation for conferring with the FEC on tenure concerns, but he noted the value of having the Academic Affairs Committee meet more widely with faculty members at large, perhaps in small and informal groups, to facilitate full understanding of the issues, and he asked the President if Mr. Roberts as Chair of that committee might be open to such meetings. The President responded that such meetings were already being initiated by the Corporation as part of their responsibility for these matters. Professor Elliott (Sociology) commented that this presents an excellent opportunity for considering the creeping tendency to treat the University as a corporation and to run it like a business. He stated as a sociologist that some institutions like the military may be receptive to this management style but some are not. President Simmons stated that the Corporation and its committees welcome comments on values and goals. She expressed the plan to conduct the meetings of Corporation committee members with the Faculty before Corporation meetings scheduled for December 10 and in early February.

Provost Kertzer reported briefly on the valiant struggle of Vice President Clyde Briant and the Advisory Committee of OSP to deal with ludicrous compliance matters; on Dean Bergeron’s introduction of the online Focal Point tool for presenting information on concentrations; and on APC concerns that will come before the Faculty, including the plans for a School of Public Health; a name change from American Civilization to American Studies, the shift of Literary Arts from program to department status; and continuing departmental reviews. In a PowerPoint presentation, the Provost reported on the difficulties and opportunities of interpreting the NRC report, matters he had already reviewed with department chairs. Despite its inadequacies, the NRC data must be taken seriously, taking into account our position among the 500 doctoral programs reviewed according to their variables despite visible errors in the process. The Graduate School is working on how to incorporate the results of the report in planning. In response to questions about how to respond to the data and introduce corrections, the Provost responded that the NRC will take our corrections into account, and that the university has begun to gather corrections through department chairs; this process will continue over the next two years.

Professor Terry-Morgan (Theatre Arts and Performance Studies), reporting for the Diversity Advisory Board, referred the Faculty to the report and encouraged members to volunteer to serve on the Board, which he has remained on because of its great value to the University. Under the leadership of Valerie Wilson, the Board met four times, exercising a wide vision of its charge and initiating processes for opening greater vistas on diversity and enriching the university conversation of issues of wide importance. Professor Terry-Morgan closed his remarks by noting on the agenda for 2010-11 better coordination with the Advisory Council on Diversity, increasing efforts to deal with critical shared issues like admissions, and also better coordination with the work of the Alumni Council.

Dean Lassonde presented the report of the Committee on Academic Standing, noting in particular the decline in the number of students on Serious Warning, a decline that may be attributed to enhanced follow-up procedures, and the new category of Serious Warning in Lieu of Suspension. He responded to questions about retroactive course registration and faculty overrides and about better communication with faculty members about students on Serious Warning, taking faculty suggestions into account. Professor Elliott questioned a correlation of the number of "S" grades and the number of retroactive grade changes, which he believed to be rising, and he and Dean Lassonde exchanged information about the interpretation of the data, which Dean Lassonde believed to present no basis for concern.

Under New Business, a question was raised about the tabling of a tenure case by the Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee (TPAC) and whether tabling was allowed under the Faculty Rules and Regulations. Jerome Sanes, chair of TPAC, earlier provided a possible explanation for such tabling (having earlier served as Vice Chair) based upon the need for further information, and the Provost stated that he had never tabled a case. Professor Colwill reiterated concerns about the possible abuse of procedures of delay. Professor Sanes restated that TPAC did occasionally table while awaiting information and Professor Morone (Political Science) asked about the fair administration of the timetable. Professor Colwill stated that her concern was not an individual case but preserving transparency in the ongoing process according to the Faculty Rules, asking the Parliamentarian about the status of tabling. Professor Richardson remarked that tabling did not represent a dead-end and actions tabled could also be taken up once more; further discussion followed of the possible reasons to table a case, the problems of transparency and precedence involved in TPAC tabling and consistency with the rules, and possible avenues of redressing potential problems through TPAC policy review or possible legislation.

There being no further New Business and no Old Business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley
Secretary of the Faculty