

## MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

November 6, 2007

With the customary motion to adjourn not later than 6:00 p.m., the meeting was convened at 4:07, and the minutes were approved with a correction of the hour in the customary motion from 5:00 to 6:00.

As chair of the FEC, Professor Colwill called attention to the online survey gathering information on whether to continue, terminate, or make permanent the position of faculty ombudsperson. She announced the forthcoming Monday luncheon where faculty may discuss with Vice President Chapman the shaping of the image of Brown and the forthcoming FEC meeting with the Undergraduate Council of Students. She thanked Professor Bostrom for the expected report of the Honorary Degrees Committee.

On behalf of the annual Charities Drive (Mark Cladis and Roberta Gordon, co-chairs), Professor Cladis urged the faculty to stand up together because individuals in the community rely upon one another. Professor Dill announced the November 12 Veteran's Day ceremony with the placement of flags and wreaths and the reading of letters from Brown students enlisted in the armed services in the First World War.

Professor Colwill reported that a meeting of the FEC Officers with the Graduate Student Council revealed a frustration among some graduate students that their research advisors do not support participation in governance as part of the graduate school experience while supporting their students on federal grants and that the possibility of summer funding for graduate students involved in governance had been raised. FEC discussion with the Board of Fellows focused upon the impact of personnel changes in the College, faculty diversity at department (local) and university (global) levels, support for core faculty, and assessment of progress with the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE). She called on the Faculty to provide feedback on implementation of the PAE. She conveyed to the faculty President Simmons's assurance of a thorough and unfiltered flow of information on the assessment of the effectiveness of the Plan. Among issues to be looked at by the FEC are the possible neglect of language instruction in the growth of the faculty, new investments needed to support UTRAs, undergraduate science study, a winter session for students in introductory math and chemistry courses, core faculty support, an increase in the number of graduate students, interdisciplinary projects and activities, and the recognition of excellence in teaching and advising through various forms of compensation and reward.

Professor Raaflaub questioned the adequacy of fellowship funding to recruit and retain the best graduate students. Professor Colwill thanked the President for the opportunity to review the PAE, and President Simmons seconded that opinion and solicited information from the faculty in view of the forthcoming February meeting of the Corporation.

A motion to amend the Faculty Rules in regard to the participation of administrators as non-voting members was presented by Professor Colwill:

## **Motion to Amend the List of Non-voting Members and to Add a Category for Administrator Participation**

**SUMMARY:** Motion by the Faculty Executive Committee to amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective immediately, for the purpose of specifying administrators with faculty committee and administrative advisory board appointments as non-voting members of the faculty, and to create a new category for other administrators called administrator participation.

**MOTION:** That the Faculty, in Part 1, Section 1.I.B. of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on Non-Voting Members delete specific administrative titles (as struck-through below) and replace with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below), insert a new Part 1, Section 1.IV.B.11 and renumber the existing Part 1, Section 1.IV.B.11 to 13 as Part1, Section 1.IV.B.12 to 14, effective immediately.

### **1.I.B. Non-Voting Members**

Non-Voting members of the Faculty shall include the ~~Administrative Vice Presidents~~ **who are not otherwise voting members of the faculty; Administrators who serve on Faculty Committees; Administrators who chair Administrative Advisory Boards;** the Associate Deans of the Faculty, the College, Medicine and Biological Sciences, Student Life, Research, the Graduate School; the Dean of Campus Life and Student Services; the Dean of Summer and Continuing Studies; Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and Instructors associated with the Medical School and having Clinical in their titles; Professors and Associate Professors Emeriti; ~~the Registrar; the Assistant University Librarians; the Librarian of the John Carter Brown Library; the Chaplain of the University; the Associate Chaplains; the Director of Athletics; the Assistants to the President; the Faculty Ombudsperson; the Editor of the Brown Alumni Magazine; the Director of the News Service; the Vice President of Public Affairs and University Relations; the Director of Admission;~~ Officers of Instruction with titles other than those required for voting membership, and such other officers of the Administration as may be designated by the Faculty Executive Committee. **Administrators who are also members of the Brown faculty with voting privileges retain their title of voting members of the faculty.**

### **IV.B.11 Administrator participation**

**The President, Provost and Faculty Executive Committee may invite administrators who are not members of the voting or non-voting faculty to attend each Faculty Meeting. The names of those invited shall be given to the Secretary of the Faculty at the beginning of each academic year.**

**RATIONALE:** This motion will eliminate the need to revise the list of administrators who are non-voting members of the faculty when new titles are created by the Administration, grant the honorific title of non-voting member of the faculty to vice presidents and to those members of the administration serving on faculty committees and chairing advisory boards, authorize the presence of administrators key to assisting the voting faculty conduct its business, and create a procedure for

expediting the participation of other relevant administrators in university faculty meetings.

The motion was approved without dissent.

Professor Colwill presented a motion from the FEC to amend the Faculty Rules regarding the renaming of departments, programs, and centers:

**Motion to adopt a procedure for renaming academic departments, programs, centers or institutes**

**SUMMARY:** This motion will create a procedure for renaming academic departments, programs, centers or institutes that is modeled after the procedure currently used to create new academic departments, programs, centers or institutes.

**MOTION:** That the Faculty amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective immediately, for the purpose of establishing a procedure for renaming academic departments, programs, centers or institutes by renumbering Part 4, Section 10. I. E. 2. Departments, Centers, Programs and Institutes as Part 4, Section 10. I. E. 3. Departments, Centers, Programs and Institutes, and by inserting in the Faculty Rules and Regulations as Part 4, Section 10. I. E. 2. the text below on Renaming Departments, Centers, Programs and Institutes.

2. Proposals for Renaming Academic Departments, Programs, Centers or Institutes

a. A proposal for renaming an academic department (as defined in 3 below) shall be made by the department chair to the Dean of Faculty or Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, as appropriate, who will forward the proposal to the Provost with his or her recommendation regarding the merits of the proposal, after completion of the following steps. Prior to the presentation of the proposal to the Provost, discussions with the appropriate Dean and potentially interested academic units shall take place. The proposal shall offer an analysis of any scholarly, pedagogical, and financial consequences that the change in name may have for the University. Specifically, the proposal should include an assessment of how, if at all, the department's current objectives, functions and/or activities will change. The department should address the implications of the name change (1) for students and/or faculty in the department particularly if the name of a concentration or graduate program is affected, and (2) for resources and other academic units, including comments by such units as appropriate in its proposal. Finally, the department should vote on the proposal; any negative votes or abstentions should be explained in an attachment to the proposal.

b. A proposal for renaming an academic program, center or institute (as defined in 3 below) shall be made by the unit's director to the Dean of Faculty or Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, as appropriate, who will forward the proposal to the Provost with his or her recommendation regarding the merits of the proposal, after completion of the following steps. Prior to the presentation of the proposal to the Provost, discussions with the appropriate Dean and with potentially interested academic units shall take place. The proposal shall offer an analysis of any scholarly, pedagogical, and

financial consequences that the change in name may have for the University. Specifically, the proposal should include an assessment of how, if at all, the unit's current objectives, functions and/or activities will change. The program, center or institute should address the implications of the name change (1) for students and/or faculty in the unit particularly if the name of a concentration or graduate program is affected, and (2) for resources and other academic units, including comments by such units as appropriate in its proposal.

Finally, the program, center or institute should vote on the proposal; any negative votes or abstentions should be explained in an attachment to the proposal.

c. The Provost, upon determination that all necessary supporting documentation has been provided and sufficient consultation with the appropriate Dean and faculty has occurred, shall bring the proposal to the Academic Priorities Committee (APC) for its consideration and review. Simultaneously, the Provost shall provide copies of the proposal to the President and the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) to both make them aware of the proposal and to provide an opportunity for their input to be considered by the APC at an early stage of its review.

d. The APC may, at its discretion, initiate a review of the proposal through the appointment of relevant evaluating committees composed of Brown University faculty and/or scholars in relevant fields from peer institutions.

e. At an early stage in their review the APC, through the office of the FEC, shall notify the Faculty as a whole of the proposal and make it available for review and comment. This notice is intended to both make the Faculty at large aware of the proposal and to provide an opportunity for their input to be received and considered by the APC in its review.

f. The APC, through the Provost, shall offer its recommendations regarding the renaming of an academic department, program, center or institute to the Faculty, through the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee. The APC's recommendation shall simultaneously be provided to the President and made available to the Faculty.

g. The Faculty shall consider the recommendations of the APC and shall vote to approve or reject the proposal. The results of this vote shall constitute a recommendation to the President and shall be forwarded to the President for his or her consideration. The Provost, as chief academic officer of the University, shall also make his or her own recommendation to the President at this stage.

h. The President shall consider the recommendation of the Faculty and of the Provost and shall make his or her own recommendation on the matter to the Board of Fellows, who have ultimate responsibility for the renaming of academic departments, programs, centers and institutes. The President shall notify the APC, the FEC, and the interested faculty of the determination of the Board of Fellows.

**RATIONALE:** The senior administration asked the Faculty Executive Committee to devise a procedure to be followed for renaming academic departments, programs,

centers and institutes. After examining procedures used at other institutions and discussing a variety of hypothetical cases, the Faculty Executive Committee recommended that the procedure to rename academic units should be modeled after that used to create them. This Motion is presented to create a procedure for renaming academic departments, programs, centers and institutes and to insert it in the proper place in the Faculty Rules & Regulations. This motion was crafted by the Faculty Executive Committee in consultation with the Academic Priorities Committee.

Discussion followed concerning the laboriousness of the process and the constitution and quorum of the different voting bodies. The FEC will monitor this process over the next year. The motion carried unanimously.

President Simmons reported upon the first Corporation meeting under Chancellor Tisch and new committee chairs Sam Menco (Budget and Finance), Peter Voss (Facilities and Design), Alison Ressler (Advancement) and Ken O'Keefe (Campus Life). New vice-chairs have also been selected. Attention will be paid to governance principles in this new team (rotation, term limits, diversity, transparency).

At the Strategic Discussion Session, Dean Bergeron reported on the Task Force for Undergraduate Education, the historic roots of the curriculum, and the questions commonly raised by students and parents. At the dinner following, the Corporation was joined by members of the Task Force and some fifty students, as well as Elliot Maxwell and Ira Magaziner, former student leaders instrumental in the creation of the curriculum. Mr. Maxwell spoke about the importance of greater access and transparency as opportunities arise for technology in higher education. Mr. Magaziner noted that the continued value and relevance of the curriculum depends upon ongoing review and renewal.

The following day discussion opened with comments arising out of media reports on corporation/campus/alumni disputes at Dartmouth and exploring means of strengthening the positive relation between the Board and the campus. Another matter arising out of recent press reports (the Mahmoud Ahmedinajad's speech at Columbia) led President Simmons to reaffirm the commitment of Brown to open discourse in the context of respectful exchange, with the caveat that it not be her approach to interfere with speakers sponsored by departments or organizations, even if controversial. President Simmons stated that her role is less to join in every debate but to ensure that such debate can take place. The President reported that the Corporation had expressed support for her position, and an ovation from the Faculty indicated the same response.

The President noted the acute interest of the current Corporation in campus and collegiate matters, and reported that at the business meeting, in approving the reports of committees, the Board expressed concerns about the budget, and, especially, about funding undergraduate housing, asking that the administration report back in February on how to address this need in the nearer term.

With the acceptance of recent gifts by the Corporation, the Campaign has reached nearly 80% of the goal. Chancellor and Mrs. Tisch made an additional commitment to the Campaign that will support five endowed Chancellor Professorships and support undergraduate education, with intent of expressing support for the Plan for Academic Enrichment, the centrality of undergraduate education at Brown, and our commitment to rigorous standards of excellence. In discussion following her report, where questions were raised about the effect of student life issues upon the campaign and the need for information on this area, President Simmons stated that this issue was clearly critical for the Corporation, and understandably so, but that she will continue to keep the other important items on the agenda. Vice President Huidekoper is working on how to balance priorities in the budget. We have made progress in student facilities, but we have suffered unexpected setbacks like the loss of the Smith Swim Center or the expected bump in population that has converted the lounges at Keeney into dormitory rooms. Vice President Huidekoper stated that in the next three to four years, some shifts might be made among funds committed to major Corporation priorities (such as shifting funds for a data center towards new housing).

Through a slide presentation, Provost Kertzer reviewed some of the indicators and measurements in the vexed enterprise of measuring academic excellence. In the national ranking, for example, one may note improvements in the categories of faculty compensation, average expenditure per student, and growth and diversity of faculty with the goal at 65% fulfillment. Research expenditure shows steady growth, but faces the challenge of flat or decreasing federal funding. So while the number of new awards is up, this growth is needed just to remain in place. Different ways of accounting science and medical funding such as hospital-based research adversely affect Brown's NSF ranking, which is based upon dollar amounts. In the factors for the assessment of undergraduate education, there has been growth in resources for undergraduate advising, financial aid for international students, faculty/student ratio. Class size and first-year advising need more resources. Indicators for graduate education are up, with selectivity rising by eleven percentage points to 16% through an increase in Ph.D. applications. With the exception of the MFA program in Literary Arts, which wins a 4% selectivity rating, other MA programs stand only in mid range. Stipends are up, but only vigilance is required to remain competitive. The new medical admissions process has increased selectivity by 4%, accompanied by a rise in MCAT scores. Diversity, for which the indicators differ widely across programs, suggests that while we are respectable nationally we lag behind our peers. Faculty members raised questions about correlations between class size and independent study commitments, better accounting procedures for counting total science and medical research, including hospital based research.

Professor Gatsonis presented the current report of the Nominations Committee as well as the annual report, highlighting that structurally there are more positions on faculty committees than there are faculty to fill them; that the number of positions requiring a vote and hence two nominees may waste resources; and that the new sabbatic leave policy will require study. The following nominations from the Committee were approved without dissent.

**Nominations Recommended to the Faculty for Committee Appointments to be effective immediately:**

**College Curriculum Council (CCC)**

Kikuko Yamashita (East Asian Studies) replacing Daniel Kim (English) for to 12/31/07

**Committee on the Status of Women**

Risa Weisberg (Psychiatry & Human Behavior) replacing Kristin Maki (Psychiatry & Human Behavior) to 6/30/09

**Nominations recommended to the Faculty for Committee Appointments to be effective January 1, 2008:**

**Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees**

Corey Walker (Africana Studies) replacing Jin Li (Education) to 12/31/10  
David Gottlieb (Applied Math) replacing Eugene Charniak (Computer Science) to 12/31/09

**Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee (TPAC)**

See-Chen Ying (Physics) replacing Carle Pieters (Geological Sciences) to 12/31/08

**Committee on Commencement Speakers**

Barbara Tannebaum (Theatre, Speech and Dance) replacing Nancy Dunbar (Theatre, Speech and Dance) to 6/30/08

Professor Wharton introduced the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee, noting work over the past academic year on the sabbatic leave policy, and benefits (health, tuition assistance, retirement), where the individual health benefits Brown offers are competitive except for family health benefits, we fall at the bottom; where tuition assistance is likewise among those peers who offer it at all; and where the complexities of retirement issues requires further study. The increase in salaries overall raises continuing concerns about equity for minorities, women, and those with families.

Dean Bergeron presented the annual report of the College Curriculum Council, calling attention to revisions in seven concentrations, the creation of three programs, seven independent concentrations and 210 new courses; to recommendations from the subcommittee on course evaluations, including the possibility of on-line course evaluation; and to continuing work on the implementation of Banner. Registrar Michael Pesta, in response to a question about the availability of a printed Course Announcement Bulletin, stated that it would be in place for next year.

There being no old or new business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley  
Secretary of the Faculty