

## BROWN UNIVERSITY

### Minutes of Faculty Meeting—May 5, 2009

President Simmons called the meeting to order at about 4:05 PM. The customary motion to adjourn at 6:00 PM was made, seconded, and passed.

The Minutes of the April 7, 2009 Faculty Meeting were approved; a correction/clarification related to conflict of interest and prize money will be made.

Professor Dreier, Chair of the FEC, first called upon Prof. Andrea Simmons, Chair of the Nominations Committee, to present the slate prepared by that committee. The list had been circulated at the meeting and is included with the original of these minutes. The President called for further nominations—none were made. The slate was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Prof. Dreier announced the members of the Faculty Committee for the Campaign: Susan Alcock, Barrett Hazeltine, Sorin Istrail, Mark Johnson, Catherine Lutz, Bill Suggs, Luiz Valente, and Patricia Ybarra. Flora Keshgegian, Faculty Ombudsperson, is finishing her term and will not be replaced because of the current hiring freeze. Both the FEC and the Administration are committed to hiring a full time ombudsperson when finances improve. Prof. Dreier thanked Dr. Keshgegian and noted that problems advancing to the Grievance Committee or the FEC are way down. Next year faculty members with problems that an ombudsperson handles should bring them to the Dean of the Faculty's Office, to Valerie Wilson (replacing Brenda Allen), or to the FEC. Prof. Dreier thanked Brenda Allen, who is becoming Provost at Winston-Salem State University, for her help to the FEC.

Prof. Dreier also thanked Prof. Colwill, past Chair of the FEC, for her service and helpful mentoring. He introduced Prof. Diebold, the new chair of the FEC. Prof. Colwill made a highly eloquent thanks to Prof. Dreier for his exemplary leadership of the FEC this year.

Prof. Dreier presented a motion to reschedule the beginning of classes in 2010 and 2013 to avoid conflicts with Rosh Hashanah. The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. The text of the motion is

**MOTION:** That the Faculty amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, Part 3, Section 7.I.A.2. and 6-9, Principles Governing the Academic Calendar, effective July 1, 2009, for the purpose of rescheduling the beginning of classes in 2010 and 2013 so as to not conflict with Rosh Hashanah.

**RATIONALE:** Because of the way the Rosh Hashanah holiday falls in 2010 and 2013, the dates for beginning of classes in the first semester would conflict with Rosh Hashanah. For 2010, Brown would normally begin classes on Wednesday, September 8<sup>th</sup>, but this would mean that observant Jewish students and faculty would not be able to attend the first day of classes for Tuesday-Thursday courses. It is proposed that the Brown academic calendar for 2010-2011 start a week earlier, with classes beginning on Wednesday, September 1<sup>st</sup>. In this proposed new

schedule, the last day of regular classes would be Friday, December 3<sup>rd</sup>, and exams would end on Friday, December 17<sup>th</sup>. This would make for a slightly longer semester than has been standard (66 days as opposed to 64).

In 2013, Labor Day falls on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, and Rosh Hashanah falls on Thursday and Friday, September 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. This suggests a solution similar to the above, but because Labor Day comes four days earlier in September, it would not be desirable to start classes a week earlier. Instead, it is proposed that Brown would start classes a week later, on Wednesday, September 11<sup>th</sup>. Because of the late start, classes and exams would need to run somewhat later than they would otherwise, with the last day of regular classes on Friday, December 6<sup>th</sup> and the last day of exams on Friday, December 20<sup>th</sup>. This would make for a slightly shorter semester than has been standard (62 days as opposed to 64). The Provost brought this matter to our attention. The proposed changes have been discussed with the University Chaplains, the Office of Student Life, the Dean of the College, the Registrar, and the senior deans, all of whom are strongly supportive.

For the Academic Year 2010–11:

Part 3, Section 7.I.A.

2. Replace “Wednesday following the first Monday in September.” with Wednesday September 1<sup>st</sup>”
6. Replace “December 8 (or December 7 in years when December 13 or December 21 falls on a Sunday).” with “December 4” Beginning of Reading Period.
7. Replace “December 12, 6:00 p.m. (or December 11 when December 13 or December 21 falls on a Sunday).” with “December 8”.
8. Replace “December 13 (or December 12 when December 13 or 21 is a Sunday).” with “December 9.”
9. Replace “December 21 (or December 20 when December 21 is a Sunday).” with “December 17.”

For the Academic Year 2013–14:

Part 3, Section 7.I.A.

2. Replace “Wednesday following the first Monday in September.” with Wednesday September 11”
6. Replace “December 8 (or December 7 in years when December 13 or December 21 falls on a Sunday).” with “December 7” Beginning of Reading Period.
7. Replace “December 12, 6:00 p.m. (or December 11 when December 13 or December 21 falls on a Sunday).” with “December 11”.

8. Replace “December 13 (or December 12 when December 13 or 21 is a Sunday).” with “December 12.”

9. Replace “December 21 (or December 20 when December 21 is a Sunday).” with “December 20.”

**SUMMARY:** For 2010-11, classes will begin on September 1<sup>st</sup>; Reading Period will begin December 4<sup>th</sup>; classes end December 8<sup>th</sup>; Exam Period will begin December 9<sup>th</sup>; Exams end December 17<sup>th</sup>.

For 2013-14, classes will begin on September 11<sup>th</sup>, Reading Period will begin December 7<sup>th</sup>; classes end December 11<sup>th</sup>; Exam Period will begin December 12<sup>th</sup>; Exams end December 20<sup>th</sup>.

Prof. Valente commented that the first semester was shorter than desirable now. The Registrar said that it would now be 62 days. It has generally run from 64 to 68 days. The shortest it has been in recent times is 64 days. Prof. Banchoff said we should have a semester of a decent length and should seriously consider starting in August. Prof. Savage agreed. The Registrar stated that second semester has 68 class days, a 6 day reading period, and 9 days for exams. The President said the matter seemed to be of significant interest and should be taken up again by the FEC. The Registrar pointed out the decision for 2010 is needed shortly but that for 2013 could be made later. It was agreed to change the motion to include only 2010. The Provost agreed with the new motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Prof. Istrail presented a motion to establish a Doctoral Program in the Center for Computational Molecular Biology. The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. The text of the motion is

**MOTION:** The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Doctoral Program in the Center for Computational Molecular Biology. The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows that a Doctoral program in the Center for Computational Molecular Biology be established.

Dean Wing noted that Computational Molecular Biology is an expanding field, important to the Medical School. Prof. Istrail commented that it had been a pleasure working with colleagues from diverse fields in preparing the motion. A question was asked about whether Centers, rather than Departments, could award degrees. Degrees are awarded by the Graduate School. Dean Bonde said the degree would bear the names of the departments with whom the candidate had worked. Prof. Banchoff asked about the mathematics component of the program. Prof. Lawrence said it followed present practice and was satisfactory. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Prof. Dreier presented a motion to remove languages related to a separate admissions category for Resumed Undergraduate Education students. The change arose because of an age

discrimination suit. The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. The text of the motion is

**MOTION:** That the Faculty amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, effective immediately, for the purpose of removing the Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admission Committee, found in Part 1, Section 2, IV, F and to delete in Section 4, The College, IV.I.D. the sentences calling for a separate admissions category for RUE applicants and for the Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admission Committee.

Delete in Section 2.IV.F of the Faculty Rules and Regulations:

## **~~F. Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admission Committee~~**

### **~~1. Charge~~**

~~a. The Committee shall develop policies and consider procedures for RUE admission, recruitment, financial aid, student support and fundraising; work with the Dean of the College and the Director of Admission and the Director of Financial Aid to supervise the separate procedure as mandated by the Faculty in December 1972; consult with appropriate on-campus committees, such as CAFA, Enrollment Management, Corporation Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, Development Office, and Alumni Relations; and consult with the RUE Student Organization.~~

~~b. The Committee, absent the student members, shall review and recommend applicants to RUE.~~

### **~~2. Membership~~**

~~There shall be five faculty members elected by the Faculty for staggered three-year terms, two academic deans named by the Dean of the College, two admission officers named by the Director of Admissions, and two RUE students elected by the RUE student organization for two-year staggered terms.~~

### **~~3. Organization~~**

~~The Dean of the College shall name one of the deans on the committee as coordinator of the administrative aspects of Faculty Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admissions Committee (RUE). The members of the RUE committee shall elect one of the faculty members as Chair.~~

### **~~4. Procedures~~**

~~The Committee shall report annually to the College Curriculum Council and, on request, to the Faculty Executive Committee.~~

Delete in the Faculty Rules and Regulations, Section 4, The College, IV.I.D:

~~Such applicants shall be recognized as belonging to a separate category and not as part of the regular total admission pool of applicants.~~

~~An Advisory Committee for this Program shall be appointed by the Dean of the College.~~

**RATIONALE:** A recent legal decision has forced Brown to consider RUE students with other applicants in the ordinary undergraduate admissions process. The Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admission Committee has no significant remaining responsibilities.

The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Prof. Dreier presented a motion to add language specifying a procedure for dismissal of a faculty member. The motion had been distributed with the meeting Agenda. The text of the motion is

**MOTION:** That the Faculty amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, Section 11. I.A.2., University Regulations, effective immediately, by adding language to specify a procedure for the dismissal of a member of the faculty.

**RATIONALE:** Brown's Faculty Rules and Regulations currently contain no explicit procedure for the dismissal of a member of the faculty. The procedures here are cumbersome, but we should expect them to be needed only very rarely. The structure of the procedure was designed to be broadly analogous to the procedures for awarding tenure. The new procedure has been shown to the Administration and the Office of the General Counsel, and somewhat revised to meet with their concerns.

Amend 11.I.A.2 to refer to the new procedure:

2. A tenured appointment may not be terminated by the Corporation except for adequate cause and after the appointment holder has been accorded the rights of due process as prescribed in Section 10,I,A. 11.I.B.

Delete sections II.1.A.3 and II.1.A.4

Insert the new material below as 11.I.B, and renumber the remainder accordingly.

### **11.I.B. Procedures Governing Dismissal of a Member of the Faculty**

1. The dismissal of a member of the faculty during either a term appointment or tenure is a rare event. When circumstances arise that might lead to such an action, they must be handled fairly and expeditiously. It is essential to have a process that protects both the rights of a member of the faculty and the University. These procedures outline the process by which a member of the faculty may be dismissed from a term or tenured appointment. Nothing herein shall limit the right of the Corporation to remove any member of the faculty for adequate cause.

2. Adequate cause for dismissal of an individual during either a term appointment or tenure refers to:

- demonstrated incompetence;
- dishonesty in teaching, research, scholarship, or other academic responsibilities;
- substantial and manifest neglect of duty;
- personal conduct which substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of institutional responsibilities; or
- illegal activities which have a substantial negative impact on the University's operations or obligations.

The responsibility for establishing cause for dismissal of a member of the faculty with tenure or a member of the faculty during a term appointment rests upon the University.

3. Basis for Action by the Dean:

If the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Medicine, as appropriate, independently determines that there is adequate cause to consider dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty or a member of the faculty during a term appointment, the Dean will provide notice in writing to the member of the faculty of the basis for consideration of dismissal.

Complaints against a member of the faculty should be reported in writing in a timely manner to the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, as appropriate. Following receipt of the complaint, the Dean shall determine whether the complaint provides credible information which, if true, would warrant dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty or a non-tenured member of the faculty during a term of appointment. If the Dean makes such a determination, the Dean shall provide notice to the member of the faculty, in writing, identifying the allegations and the reasons why the allegations, if determined to be true, may subject the member of the faculty to dismissal. If the basis for the Dean's consideration is a complaint of conduct submitted by a third party to the Dean which, if determined to be true, could warrant dismissal of the member of the faculty, the Dean shall provide notice in writing to the member of the faculty of receipt of a complaint.

When the action is informed by a complaint, the notice to the member of the faculty shall also include the name of the person(s) filing the complaint. In very unusual circumstances, the Dean may choose not to include the name(s) of the complainant(s). If so, the Dean must provide the member of the faculty the reason(s) for not divulging the identity of the complainant. The member of the faculty shall be asked to meet with the Dean to respond to the allegations. The faculty member may have an advisor or legal counsel present, who may not participate in the proceedings. If the Dean determines that it is necessary or desirable and justifiable for others to attend the meeting based on the information to be presented to the member of the faculty, the Dean will inform the member of the faculty of all other

attendees in advance of the meeting. If the matter can be resolved by agreement between the parties, the Dean shall take the appropriate action and inform the President and Provost of the agreement reached between the parties. Other officers of the faculty or the University shall be informed only as may be necessary to implement the agreement or by agreement of the parties.

If, after the Dean's review and/or investigation, he/she recommends the dismissal of the member of the faculty, the Dean shall so inform the member of the faculty, the President, the Provost, and the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee or, in the case of a hospital-based member of the faculty, the Chair of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate. The Faculty Executive Committee or the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate, shall be responsible for appointing an Ad Hoc Hearing Committee (AHHC) of the faculty to conduct a hearing of the charges by the Dean. The member of the faculty has the right to request that the recommendation of the Dean not be reviewed by the AHHC by providing such a request in writing to the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee or of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate. If the faculty member so elects, the Dean's recommendation will be forwarded to the Provost for the Provost's recommendation to the President. If the member of the faculty chooses to have the recommendation reviewed by the AHHC, the procedures below will be followed.

#### 4. The AHHC

The AHHC of the faculty shall consist of no less than three and no more than seven tenured members of the faculty, appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee or the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate. Members of the AHHC shall have had no involvement with or relationship to the member of the faculty or the circumstances under review. A chair of the AHHC, who shall retain the right to vote, shall be elected from among the members of the committee at their first meeting.

The AHHC shall not be bound by rules of legal evidence, and it may elect to admit any evidence that it deems of probative value in determining the issues, making every effort to consider any information which it deems to be both reliable and relevant in order to safeguard the rights of the faculty member to a fair hearing. All proceedings, deliberations, records and documents reviewed and generated by the AHHC, shall be maintained as confidentially as possible.

The Chair of the AHHC shall:

- (i) confirm that the member of the faculty has received written notification and supportive information regarding the alleged conduct/misconduct from the Dean;
- (ii) provide the member of the faculty with a copy of these procedures;
- (iii) obtain from the Dean a written summary of the information/documents he or she intends to present and a provisional list of witnesses, if any, to be called;

- (iv) obtain from the member of the faculty a written response and a provisional list of witnesses, if any, to be called;
- (v) determine, in consideration of the evidence to be presented and the witnesses to be heard, the schedule and location of hearings and notify all parties promptly of them. Hearings shall be scheduled not less than twenty-one (21) days after the member of the faculty receives notice of the charges, unless an earlier date is agreed upon by all concerned.

## 5. The AHHC Hearing

During the hearings, the member of the faculty shall represent herself or himself, i.e. present information and/or documents on his/her behalf. Although only the member of the faculty may represent himself or herself, the member of the faculty may have the presence and assistance of another member of the faculty and/or, at his/her expense, legal counsel. Such person may assist the member of the faculty but may not present information or testimony in lieu of the member of the faculty's participation, or participate directly in the proceedings. Similarly, the Dean may be accompanied by a member of the faculty or staff member to assist in the presentation of the Dean's case subject to the same constraints as pertain to the member of the faculty.

Persons assisting the member of the faculty or the Dean may not engage in any behavior which has a disruptive or deterrent effect on the hearing proceedings. The Chair shall have the authority to dismiss any such persons from the hearing.

The Dean shall make the first presentation to the Committee. The Dean may present information orally and/or through written materials. Following presentation by the Dean of the allegations and supporting information/documents, the member of the faculty shall have the opportunity to make a presentation to the Committee. The member of the faculty may present information orally and/or through written materials. If either party intends to include written materials in their presentation, these materials should be submitted to the Chair at least three working days in advance of the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair to provide a secure mechanism for the committee members to review the written materials in advance of the hearing and make copies of the materials for review at the meeting. All materials presented to the Committee shall be collected at the conclusion of the meeting and secured to protect the confidentiality of the proceedings.

A party desiring to present witnesses to corroborate his/her statements may request that the committee require the attendance of such witnesses. The party shall provide sufficient information for the committee to determine how the witness's involvement in the hearing will be germane to the issues before the committee. When the AHHC determines that the witness's statements are vital to fair consideration of the issues before it but the witness cannot or will not appear, the AHHC will attempt to obtain a statement from the witness.

All testimony must be directed to the Committee. Parties may ask questions of witnesses only through the Chair of the AHHC.

#### 6. Report to the Provost

Upon completion of the hearings the AHHC shall prepare a written report expeditiously, based solely upon the evidence and argument (oral and written) presented in the hearings and available to the faculty member and the Dean. This report shall state the committee's findings on each part of the charge, and may include recommendations. The report shall go for action and response to the Provost, with copies to the member of the faculty, the Dean, the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee or of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate. Either the member of the faculty or the Dean may submit a written statement directly to the Provost for his or her consideration, within a period of time to be specified by the Provost (normally not exceeding 10 days).

The Provost shall review the recommendation of the Dean together with the report, findings and recommendations of the AHHC and following this review, if the Provost determines that the Dean's recommendation, in light of the findings of the AHHC, if pertinent, warrants dismissal of the member of the faculty during either a term appointment or tenure, he or she shall make a recommendation to that effect in writing to the President along with a copy of the AHHC's report. The member of the faculty, the Dean, and the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee or of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, shall receive a copy of the Provost's recommendation to the President.

#### 7. The President's Review

The President shall consider the recommendation of the Provost and the report of the AHHC. The President may grant to the member of the faculty under review an opportunity to discuss the recommendation with the President, in person.

If the President determines that the circumstances require a recommendation to the Corporation that the member of the faculty be dismissed during either a term appointment or tenure, the President shall so recommend in writing to the Corporation. The member of the faculty, the Dean, the Provost, the chair of the AHHC, and the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee or of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate, shall receive a copy of the President's recommendation to the Corporation.

#### 8. Action by the Corporation

The Corporation has sole authority to dismiss a member of the faculty from a term appointment or tenure for adequate cause. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the President, the Corporation shall consider the report of the AHHC and the recommendations of the President and the Dean. The Corporation may also review such other information as it deems necessary to reach its decision.

The decision of the Corporation shall be final. The Corporation's decision shall be communicated to the President. The President shall notify the member of the faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, the chair of the AHHC, and the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee or of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate, of the decision.

#### 9. Suspension of Member of the Faculty Pending Decision

The President shall have the power to suspend a member of the faculty accused of any conduct which could warrant dismissal if there is a threat of immediate harm to the member or others or sustained harm to the University by his/her continued active employment during the intervening period. During the period of this suspension, the regular salary and benefits of the member of the faculty shall be continued.

Prof. Valente pointed out that the use of the word "University" in the last paragraph of **II.I.B Procedures Governing ...** is unclear. The General Counsel stated "University" is being used as a placeholder—"University Administration" would be a reasonable substitute. Prof. Silverman and Prof. Savage pointed out the following section makes the meaning clear. Prof. Savage asked that the five adequate causes listed in the motion be read to the Faculty. They are

- Demonstrated incompetence
- Dishonesty in teaching, research, scholarship, or other academic responsibility
- Substantial and manifest neglect of duty
- Personal conduct which substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of institutional responsibilities
- or
- Illegal activities which have a substantial negative impact on the University's operations or obligations

Would any of these alone be ground for dismissal?—yes. Prof. Banchoff asked why "Moral Turpitude" is not listed; in the past it would have been. The General Counsel replied that definitions change over time. The intent of the present language is to tie dismissal to specific university related actions. Prof. Savage asked about the range of the incompetence referred to. The President pointed out that presently we have no guidelines on dismissal and the thrust of the motion is on the process. Prof. Morone asked if the FEC had considered involvement of departments in regard, for example, to perceived incompetence. The President said enough concerns about the motion had been voiced that it should be brought back to the Faculty next year. Some discussion on how to proceed followed. Prof. Morone moved that the matter be put in the hands of the FEC. The motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote.

Vice President Russell Carey reported on the putative H1N1 flu epidemic and Brown's response. No cases have turned up at Brown. Information is available at <http://emergency.brown.edu/>. It is unlikely that Commencement will be affected.

The President then made her report. She announced the formation of a Science Council. The Council will make recommendation about needs, help to formulate broad directions, and assess our competitive position in science.

She then turned to the NEASC visit. The visiting team was led by Amy Gutman, President of the University of Pennsylvania, and spent 2.5 days on campus. The President provided some highlights of the exit interview. Brown is one of the nation's great universities and is "finding its way to becoming a great research and teaching university." Brown can and must be a great research university and a great university-college. The spirit of Brown permeates its planning process, a process as strong as any they have seen. At "a critical juncture" Brown should focus on quality, not quantity. There is very little complacency at Brown. Tremendous progress has been made since the last decennial review.

In regard to specific areas the committee observed that a commitment to quality of assessment must be central to our goals. They perceived a general unevenness across majors and some especially large ones may be less demanding. The commitment to financial aid is commendable and the student body is excellent. Graduate student involvement in university governance is less than desirable. It is important to add younger members to the Corporation. They noted improvements to the Graduate School but cited the need for better common spaces for graduate students, more access to career services, and housing. They made a number of recommendations about undergraduate advising and writing. They observed the relatively low number of concentrators in the physical sciences (12%) and the existence of oversubscribed concentrations. They were concerned about areas that seemed to have minimal concentration requirements. They felt resources should be directed to what would make Brown more distinctive academically. Brown has moved aggressively in the past few years: we need to "tap lightly on the brakes" as we enter a period of greater congestion. (At the meeting, some discussion ensued about the meaning of "congestion" here.) They warned that the percentage of junior faculty being promoted is much higher than at peer institutions, although they noted that some of the faculty with which they had talked rejected the possibility that lower standards for tenure exist at Brown. At the end they returned repeatedly to the considerable progress since the last accreditation and they had extensive praise for all sectors of the university. Their emphasis was to focus on the highest priorities rather than trying to meet the needs of a large number of programs—"quality rather than quantity". The final report will probably not come until Fall and will be discussed then.

Prof. Dreier pointed out that the members of the committee come from institutions with a curriculum different than ours and such may color their impressions. The President replied that we should not be reactionary or driven by what our peers say or do. In regard to the observation about tenure rate we should be mindful of what we are trying to accomplish. We do not have to take the committee's suggestions. We do need to take off rose-colored glasses and reflect but we do not want to react hysterically. It is important that we be well regarded by peer institutions, partly because we want them to send us their best students. Prof. Wegner asked about the dynamics of working with the President of a peer institution, Amy Gutman in this case. President Simmons replied that situation was common and not a difficulty.

The President concluded by thanking Prof. Dreier. She said it had been a wonderful year working with Prof. Dreier. He is kind and very effective. She also thanked Prof. Cowill who has been a steadying force.

The Provost gave his report, starting with a list of construction projects planned for the summer: Faunce House, starting in June, finished in 2010, Rhode Island Hall, opening this September, Creative Arts Center, begins in June, completed fall 2010, Mind, Brain Behavior to go in

Metcalf, pending Corporation approval, begins June 2010, completed fall 2011, Medical Education Building at 222 Richmond Street, also pending Corporation approval, begin spring 2010, complete fall 2011, Lyman Hall renovation, summer 2009, and the Science Resource Center, starting this summer, open January 2010. He then announced the new Brown International Research Institutes, beginning this summer, which will bring to the campus more than 150 junior faculty from 60 countries to 4 two week institutes. The subjects are Global Humanities, Development and Inequality, Law and Global Governance, Technology, Entrepreneurship and Management. The Institutes will bring much attention to Brown University in many parts of the world.

The Provost then went to the planning process for FY2011. He pointed out that he has given this or a similar presentation to many groups on campus. The market value of the endowment is down and fundraising is expected to yield less. The E & G budget will have to be shrunk from \$695 Million to \$600 Million. The Division of Biology and Medicine budget must shrink from \$155 Million to \$145 Million. The Organizational Review Committee will have to reduce the budget by \$30 Million in FY 2011 and another \$30 Million in the period FY 2012-2015. The E & G budget revenue in FY2011 will be greater than FY 2010 by \$11 Million but increased financial aid will take \$7 Million and other expenses will take \$3 Million so only \$1 Million will be left for new efforts. Net tuition has been flat over the last few years as increasing tuition has been coupled with increased financial aid. The principal levers for reducing expenses are staff salaries and operations/programs. As part of the budgeting process the Organizational Review Committee will be expanded.

Ombudsperson Flora Keshgegian presented the report of the Faculty Ombudsperson. The report had been distributed with the Meeting Agenda. No questions were asked.

Prof. Burwell presented the report of the Academic Priorities Committee. The report had been distributed with the Meeting Agenda. No questions were asked.

Associate Provost Allen presented the report of the Diversity Advisory Board. The report had been distributed with the Meeting Agenda. No questions were asked.

Prof. Pelcovits presented the report of the Faculty Committee for the Campaign. The report had been distributed with the Meeting Agenda. Prof. Pelcovits said he wished to put in a plug for the Committee's fundraising initiative among faculty members for an endowed scholarship fund for undergraduates. No questions were asked.

Dean Bergeron presented the report of the Standing Committee on the Academic Code. She noted that this report also had also been distributed with the Meeting Agenda. No questions were asked.

No Old Business existed. Under New Business a question was asked about the action of the Mayor of Providence in discussing with undergraduate leaders a fee to be paid to the City. The President said the action was a deep breach of customary procedures. She is working with the administrations of other private universities to present a united position. She pointed out the burden of an additional fee on, especially, students receiving financial aid. She said the University and the City had reached an agreement a few years ago and now the City is back with a new request. Brown University is very important to this city. We must present our opinions

very forcefully. Marisa Quinn, the point person in dealing with the City, said the Mayor's action came as a surprise. The President noted we would continue to support Providence by, for examples, a recent grant to city public schools and the establishment of a center for entrepreneurship.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barrett Hazeltine  
Interim Secretary of the Faculty