

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Faculty Meeting

February 6, 2007

President Simmons called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The customary motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. was approved; the minutes of the meeting of December 5, 2006 were also accepted without correction.

A motion from the FEC as proposed by Professor Dill was passed unanimously: to amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, Part 12, Section 1, IV B.6 effective immediately to change the Order of Business at Regular Faculty Meetings, thus placing the report and recommendations of the FEC prior to the report of the President, including in the rules a report from the Provost, and placing the reports and recommendations of committees before unfinished business.

The full text of the motion reads:

Faculty Rules and Regulations, Part I, IV. 6. Order of Business at Regular Faculty Meetings:

MOTION: To amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, Part I, IV. 6., effective immediately, for the purpose of changing the Order of Business at Regular Faculty Meetings.

SUMMARY: Motion by the Faculty Executive Committee to revise the Faculty Rules, effective immediately, for the purpose of changing the Order of Business at Regular Faculty Meetings so that the Report and recommendations of the Faculty Executive Committee precede the Report by the President. Further to amend this section of the Faculty Rules to incorporate the Report by the Provost and to place reports and recommendations of committees before the hearing of unfinished business. The changes proposed are given below, with the deleted language struck through and proposed new language underlined and in bold.

6. Order of Business

At Regular Faculty Meetings the order of business shall be (1) approval of minutes; (2) ~~report by the President~~ **report and recommendations by the Faculty Executive Committee and introduction of motions**; (3) ~~report and recommendations by the Faculty Executive Committee~~ **report by the President**; (4) ~~unfinished business~~ **report by the Provost**; (5) reports and recommendations of committees; **(6) unfinished business**; and ~~(6) (7)~~ **(7) new business**. This order can be changed by a vote adopted by two-thirds of the members attending the meeting.

RATIONALE: Beginning in October 2006, Regular Faculty Meetings have followed the order presented in this proposal. The objective has been to increase the priority given to the reports of the Faculty Executive Committee, given that these are the meetings of the Faculty at large. This change having been welcomed by members of the Faculty as well as of the Administration, the proposed changes will formalize the arrangement within the FRR. The Report by the Provost has been given without incorporation within the FRR; likewise, the practice has been to have

committee reports precede unfinished business, but this has been contrary to the order specified in FRR. The latter two changes are thus intended formally to incorporate into FRR what has become standard practice in Regular Faculty Meetings.

Upon Professor Dill's report of the presence of a BDH reporter, editor, and a vice-president of UCS as observers at the meeting, Mr. Patterson made a motion seconded by Professor Silverman to suspend the Faculty Rules to allow their presence; it was passed unanimously.

Professor Dill noted that the final leave-policy draft proposal from the FEC may be reviewed and comments submitted on the web page of the Provost.

Discussion followed on the motion to amend the Faculty Rules Part 1, Section 2, III, effective immediately, to create a Standing Committee on Faculty Retirement. Professor Dill explained that this proposal from the FEC emanated from communication with the "Elderbears" and addressed the optimal use of emeriti resources on issues of retirement.

The full text of the motion reads:

SUMMARY: This motion will create a new standing committee of the faculty to be called the Committee on Faculty Retirement.

MOTION: that the Faculty amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, Part 1, Section 2, III, effective immediately, to create a new Standing Committee of the Faculty.

J. Committee on Faculty Retirement

1. Charge

To facilitate the transition of faculty to retirement and help retirees to continue to use their experience and wisdom for the benefit of the University, the committee shall

- a. consult with individual retired faculty and with independent organizations of retired faculty at Brown (Society of the Elderbears) and other universities;
- b. act as a resource for faculty considering retirement;
- c. communicate with administrators and other Faculty Committees who can assist the committee in fulfilling its charge and work carefully with the Faculty Affairs Committee.
- d. issue reports as appropriate; and
- e. make recommendations for faculty and administrative action.

2. Membership

The committee shall consist of six faculty members at least three of whom shall be faculty emeriti. Members will serve staggered three-year terms. In choosing emeriti members, the Committee on Nominations may consult with the Society of the Elderbears.

RATIONALE: Starting in 2003 an informal group of retired faculty and administrators began to consider ways in which retirees could continue their contributions to the University, and in what ways the university could facilitate this relationship. This group subsequently formalized itself into the Society of the Elderbears. Among other efforts, they sent a questionnaire to all known retirees about their experiences since retirement and their current needs. Responses showed there were concerns about relationships with departments, desires for space on campus, possibilities of retiree medical benefits, and other matters. It was also felt that faculty approaching retirement needed to be better informed about conditions of post-retirement life at Brown. These concerns were brought to the attention of the Faculty Executive Committee and the result of these discussions was the decision to propose the creation of this new faculty committee. Retired faculty wish to continue to offer their experience and wisdom for the benefit of the University with the help of this proposed committee.

Professor Dill accepted as friendly an amendment (1.c) that the committee “work carefully with the Faculty Affairs Committee,” and declined an amendment to call for a subcommittee of the FAC rather than a standing committee.

Section 1.c of the motion as amended thus reads: “communicate with administrators and other Faculty Committees who can assist the committee in fulfilling its charge and work carefully with the Faculty Affairs Committee.”

Dean Vohra noted that current structures place retirement in between the FAC and the Committee on Human Resources and Benefits and that the new committee would overcome the deficits of this overlap by providing a more precise focus.

In response to points of information, Professor Dill explained that the members would be selected as stated in section 2 of the motion and that the committee, like all faculty committees will report to the faculty through the FEC.

The amended motion carried unanimously.

Professor Paradiso’s presentation of the motion to accept the report of the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Center for Vision Research and to recommend the creation of the center to the President and Board of Fellows was followed by a vote of unanimous approval.

The motion reads:

MOTION: The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Center for Vision Research. The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Center for Vision Research.

An explanatory memo from Professor Paradiso was attached to the Agenda.

Professor Lapane explained the history of the motion to recommend to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Health Sciences Research Doctoral Degree Program. The following motion was put on the floor, an explanatory memo from Professor Lapane attached to the Motion:

MOTION: The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Health Services Research Ph.D. Program at Brown.

Professor Wegner asked about financing the new program; Professor Lapane said that initially funding would not go beyond current levels but that requests for growth to the Dean of Medicine should be anticipated. In response to a question about reporting structure, Dean Bonde explained that the curricular oversight of this program rests with the Graduate School while funding comes from the School of Medicine. Following discussion of accreditation requirements, the definition of an outside reader, and the place of the program in undergraduate education, the motion carried unanimously.

Dean Bergeron presented the motion to amend the Faculty Rules Part 3, Section 7, I. A.1-10, effective July 1, 200-7, for the purpose of changing the first day of undergraduate orientation and the first and final days of the fall semester in order to implement a new schedule for undergraduate orientation, explaining that the proposal came to the FEC from a joint committee of her office and the office of the Vice President from Campus Life.

The full text of the motion reads:

SUMMARY: Motion to amend the Faculty Rules, effective July 1, 2007 for the purpose of changing the first day of undergraduate orientation, and the first and final days of the fall semester in order to implement a new schedule for undergraduate orientation.

MOVED: That the Faculty, in Part 3, Section 7.I.A.1-10 of the *Faculty Rules & Regulations* on Principles Governing the Academic Calendar, delete the existing language (as struck-through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below), effective July 1, 2007.

I. Principles Governing the Academic Calendar

A. Semester I

1. ~~Wednesday~~ **Sunday** before the first Monday in September (Labor Day). Orientation begins.
2. ~~Tuesday~~ **Wednesday** following the first Monday in September. Opening of the (year minus 1800 plus 37) Academic Year (Convocation).
3. Second Monday in October (Columbus Day Holiday). No University exercises.

4. Third Saturday in October. Mid-semester.
5. Wednesday (noon) to Monday (8:00 a.m.), including fourth Thursday in November. Thanksgiving Recess.
6. December ~~7~~ 8 (or December ~~6~~ 7 in years when December ~~12~~ 13 or December ~~20~~ 21 falls on a Sunday). Beginning of Reading Period.
7. December ~~11~~ 12, 6:00 p.m. (or December ~~10~~ 11 when December ~~12~~ 13 or December ~~20~~ 21 falls on a Sunday). Classes of Semester I end.
8. December ~~12~~ 13 (or December ~~11~~ 12 when December ~~12~~ 13 or ~~20~~ 21 is a Sunday). Beginning of the Final Examination Period.
9. December ~~20~~ 21 (or December ~~19~~ 20 when December ~~20~~ 21 is a Sunday). End of Final Examination Period.
10. January ~~5~~ 6 (or preceding Friday when January ~~5~~ 6 falls on a weekend). First semester grades due.

RATIONALE: The committee to review undergraduate orientation was formed during fall semester 2006 by the Dean of the College and the Interim Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services to review Brown's orientation programming, scheduling and other issues. The committee, consisting of faculty, staff and students, met frequently in the months of November and December and came to the consensus that first-year orientation was too long to be effective. The committee recommends that it be shortened from six days to three days. Students would move in over Labor Day weekend and orientation itself would begin on Sunday, providing three days of succinct and essential programs. While beginning orientation on a holiday weekend may not be ideal for all, it was generally agreed that this would be a significant improvement on the current schedule. The committee also proposed that University Convocation and the first day of classes be moved from Tuesday to Wednesday following the holiday weekend to allow for one non-weekend day of orientation.

The proposed schedule has a number of advantages. It allows new students and their families to move in over the Saturday and Sunday of Labor Day weekend (rather than the Tuesday and Wednesday of the week prior to Labor Day weekend, as they do now). It condenses the orientation and avoids the gaps of un-programmed time we have now (which often leads to alcohol and safety issues). And, perhaps most importantly, it facilitates faculty involvement in advising. Faculty would need to be on campus mainly on the Tuesday after Labor Day, rather than the Thursday and Friday before (as is the case with the current schedule). The weekend following orientation would be labeled "First Weekend" and would embrace many of the departmental open houses and co-curricular events that traditionally filled the six day orientation.

Adopting this new schedule requires a modest change to the academic calendar. The first day of classes would have to be moved from the Tuesday after Labor Day to Wednesday. This motion proposes to shift the fall academic calendar entirely by one day: so classes would start one day later and finals would end one day later; i.e., there would be no loss of instruction days.

The purpose of this motion is to change the academic calendar in the fall semester by one day in order to shorten Orientation from six to three days and will allow for some modest cost savings

but more importantly ensures faculty involvement, reduces risk to students, and will provide a much better introduction to the community for our students.

Professor Dill noted student concerns about compressing orientation and overlapping orientation with the start of classes and the practical difficulties of travel of moving in, likely to be felt especially by international students. Vice President Carey stated that Saturday and Sunday provided sufficient moving and travel time, that there has been success with pre-orientation processes, such as on-line tutorials on safety, substance abuse, and the academic code; and that the dangers posed by excessive drinking during the long down-time of the current orientation schedule are well documented and serious. In response to a suggestion that the delay in the start of classes to a Wednesday would exacerbate the dilatory effect of the shopping period, Dean Bergeron proposed that the result might also be the other way around. Professor Savage noted the need for studying results of the change, and Professor Banchoff expressed concern that the new schedule leaves no vacation except Thanksgiving for Tuesday/Thursday classes, asking why orientation could not begin on Friday, as well as questioning the issue of increased faculty participation. Professor Dill asked if more and better advising could be accommodated in the current schedule. Professor Colwill asked about faculty participation on Labor Day itself and raised the general question of what numbers are required for adequate faculty involvement. Dean Shaw explained that thirty-five faculty members would be needed for Labor Day and suggested that the length of the current program is excessive, while the new schedule may present benefits for families. Noting that a straw poll of some 200 students in a class indicated universal student opposition to the change, Professor Dill called for steady and consistent consultation with students over the change. Professor Spoehr questioned the likelihood of intelligent discussion in the proposed 8:00 a.m. informational session; the infeasibility of the 8:00 meetings with faculty advisors; the timing and value of the discussion of a single book; and the danger of throwing student travel booking for December into the holiday price increases. Dean Cornish replied that the timing of the proposal as currently drafted would be shifted, but that we could not change airline schedules. Dean Bergeron emphasized that having 200 faculty members available for orientation would be an advantage, and Vice President Carey stated again that there would be benefits to families in the holiday weekend plan. In response to questions about accountability, Carey and Bergeron agreed to submit a full report following potential implementation next fall. The motion carried with no dissent.

President Simmons announced the Corporation meeting for February, which will collapse many committee meetings in a retreat focusing on the key questions facing the university. Noting her gratitude to Chancellor Roberts, who is stepping down by statute after two consecutive three-year terms, President Simmons pointed out that the selection of new officers is forthcoming. The medical school had always been on the agenda for the retreat, and the need for careful planning is sharpened by the good news of the \$100 million dollar gift from the Warren Alpert Foundation. Following the 2004 proposal from the Corporation to strengthen the Program in Biology and Medicine, the corporations will hear presentations from the Strategic Planning Group, a report on the proposed plan for the Medical School, and will discuss relations with partner hospitals. Calling attention to the addition of 19 faculty to the division, partnership with the Woods Hole Biological Lab, the increase in start-up funds, the opening of Frank Hall and the new home for Public Health, and the revision of the Medical School curriculum, the president commended these accomplishments and cited for the attention of the corporation a set of goals

for planning: construction of a new Medical Education Building; developing with hospital partners areas of excellence, a shared science strategy, and a more holistic approach to research administration. Other items for consideration at the retreat are the creation of a social choice fund for donors, and the president's response to the Report of the Committee on Slavery and Justice, in which she hopes to refine a series of actions (such as commemoration, memorials, academic and community initiatives) for the University to take in following the committee report and the widespread and thoughtful consideration it has won. The president concluded by welcoming to Brown Al Dahlberg, succeeding Russell Carey as Secretary of the University. Mr. Dahlberg earned his B.A. from Georgetown and his law degree from Boston College Law School. His confidential correspondence will be carefully kept from mistakenly reaching his father, Al Dahlberg, Professor of Molecular Biology, Cell Biology, and Biochemistry,

Provost Kertzer opened his report with an update of URC consideration of the budget, the committee having met for seventeen two-hour sessions. Having gone to the President the report of the committee will be forwarded to the corporation. As usual, the report attempts to balance the many goals of the Plan for Academic Enrichment, including faculty compensation, facilities, and the graduate school. Tuition and fees are expected to stay in the middle of our peer group. Due to NIH policy we anticipate a 10% increase in indirect-cost recovery. Expected increase in expenses will come from continuing to increase faculty numbers (some 15-20 additional positions next year); from extending need-blind financial aid to transfers, international, and RUE students; and from such Campus Life initiatives as a new student center, wireless networking, and fitness facilities. The provost also signaled the increase in graduate student stipends from \$12,300 in 2001 to \$18,000 in 2006 and the subsequent effects in admissions and retention, noting also the re-affirmation of a five-year guarantee for graduate student funding. The provost answered questions about either holding tuition steady or increasing it beyond to 6% or 7% by citing both increasing costs (up 4.3%) and the realities of competing in our market. Discussion followed on the implementation of the five-year funding plan for graduate student support, addressing the use of external funds from the resources of individual faculty members, the overlapping control of funding between departments and the Graduate School, and the flexibility of the Graduate School in recognizing the differing practices of the disciplines.

Dear Shaw presented the annual report of the committee on academic standing, which in addition to normal business voted to approve the inclusion of RISD winter session programs in the Brown-RISD exchange, considered issues of academic standing for transfer students, investigated circumstances surrounding under-represented minority students and their academic life; and determined to include concentration advisors in the readmission process of students on suspension.

Professor Lusk presented the following slate on behalf of the nominations committee: for TPAC Donald Forsyth (Geology) replacing Steven Lichtenbaum (Math) to June 30, 2007; for FRUEPAC Leonor Simas-Almeida (Portuguese and Brazilian Studies) to replace Elizabeth Bryan (English) to June 30, 2007; Louis Putterman (Economics) replacing Harold Ward (Environmental Studies) to June 30, 2010. These nominations were unanimously approved.

There being no old or new business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley
Secretary of the Faculty