

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

October 4, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. The conventional motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. was approved as were the minutes of the Special Meeting of September 6 (corrected for errors).

The faculty heard and acknowledged with the standing vote of respect memorial minutes for Professors Edwin Honig and Elmer Cornwell, delivered by Professors Stephen Foley and Linda Cook.

Professor Shank reporting for the FEC, noted service of Peter Monti on the current FEC (omitted in the report of September 6) and called attention to remaining FEC vacancies. Professor Savage supplied the details of those vacancies and other open slots. Professor Shank reported that the FEC would meet with members of the Board of Fellows on October 21. He announced that the Ombudsperson position was now open, with a job advertisement to be posted the following day. And he reiterated the openness and inclusiveness of the presidential search as outlined in the letter of Chancellor Tisch to the campus community. Addressing President Simmons on behalf of the FEC, he looked back to her installation as the eighteen president ten years ago, recalling his initial trepidations that as an associate dean for research that she was coming from Smith College and was a professor of French. He was delighted and surprised then by the boldness of the initiative for academic enrichment as it unfolded year after year and repeatedly exceeded expectations. He saluted the President on behalf of the faculty, citing the words of the Susan Colver Rosenberger Medal bestowed by the faculty upon her last May: “you led the University through a series of what had once seemed to be impossible goals — increasing the size of the faculty by over one hundred positions, transforming the physical landscape and facilities of the campus, providing essential support for research and teaching, investing in graduate and medical education, and establishing Need Blind Admission as the policy of Brown University. Determined to see these goals become reality, you led the most successful fundraising campaign in the history of Brown: The Campaign for Academic Enrichment.”

Professor Savage reported for the Committee on Nominations, announcing the following appointments:

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

College Curriculum Council (CCC)

Catherine Imbriglio (English) replacing Evelyn Lincoln (History of Art) to 6/30/14

Grievance Committee

Ruth Colwill (Cognitive, Linguistic and Psychological Sciences) replacing Michel-Andre Bossy (French Studies/Comparative Literature) to 6/30/12

Evelyn Lincoln (History of Art) replacing Linda Cook (Political Science) to 6/30/12

Tenure, Promotion and Appointment Committee (TPAC)

Oded Galor (Economics) replacing Lina Fruzzetti (Anthropology) to 12/31/11

President Simmons commented that Professor Shank was not the only one worried when she showed up, and she thanked him and the faculty for their support.

Her report focused upon three items. The first was her response to the Athletics Review Committee Report. She had suspended discussion and action on the recommendations of last year's Athletics Review Committee until the Fall semester. We have reopened that discussion and held a variety of meetings with members of Athletics teams, their supporters, the Athletic Director and Margaret Klawuun to whom Athletics reports, alumni, faculty, Corporation members and others about the proper scope and size of Athletics at Brown. Without providing a full outline of her report, she discussed some of the perspectives from which input and recommendations on this very sensitive subject have been evaluated. Our community understands little about the way that Ivy League Athletics functions. In particular, the basic principles of the League, while very clearly and consistently stated, are not well known or understood by many participating in this discussion. A 1954 Presidents Agreement amending the 1945 football agreement among Ivy institutions reaffirmed the first principle of Ivy athletics that "in each institution the academic authorities should control athletics." Just as importantly, the League sets forth these conditions for Ivy athletics: the ability of academic authorities to control athletics must be considered inviolate; players must be representative of the student body; players and coaches must not have undue strain as in professional contexts; and athletics must be in harmony with the educational purposes of the University. Using these principles as a guide, she has concluded that we are not yet sufficiently aligned with the aims of the League in several important respects:

1. Our academic officers and faculty do not generally see a role for themselves in setting goals and standards in athletics;
2. With the admission pool having changed significantly over recent years, the "representativeness" of Brown athletics should be examined closely to determine whether admission standards as set at Brown today for the admission of athletes appropriately conform to Ivy principles;
3. The League requires that "undue strain upon coaches and athletes should be eliminated so that they enjoy the game as participants in a form of recreational competition." She believes we should take care to review whether this is the case in each of our sports.
4. Finally, League guidelines provide that "in the total life of the campus, emphasis upon intercollegiate competition must be kept in harmony with the essential educational purposes of the institution."

She thus saw her first task as that of focusing on what we might do to ensure that "academic authorities" at Brown are in control of athletics. She will be making recommendations to address this issue because it is one of the most important factors in

whether we achieve the desired alignment of athletics with our educational purposes.

The second issue that she focused on was what it means for Brown to compete in this League. The truth is that the Ivy League is not an academic league; it is purely a sports league. If we were not in the Ivy League, we would have different standards for sports. But the value of our identity as an Ivy institution is immense and perhaps even priceless. Therefore, she is not sympathetic to those who complain about investments in sports and sports facilities. Competitive teams and facilities is the price we pay for membership in this sports League. Consequently, she will be supporting some investments in Athletics. At the same time, she is very concerned that so many are willing to overlook core academic needs in favor of investments in athletics. Her report will reaffirm that all budgeting should be done in the context of the central priority setting that occurs under the oversight of the Provost and with the participation of standing faculty committees that participate in resource allocation. Some have been concerned about the recent review process in Athletics. She expects to make the point that Athletics must be periodically evaluated in the same manner in which other programs are assessed. This is a standard long set at Brown and athletics should see itself as an integral part of this tradition. However, a clearer statement of the standards and long term expectations for Athletics is needed so that such reviews will be conducted fairly and in the proper context. "Representativeness" of athletes is an important standard in the League. How is "representativeness" determined? The Ivy League has established a measure for assuring that athletes are generally representative academically of the student body; it is called the Academic Index (AI). The AI formula is based on a student's SAT (or ACT) scores and GPA. 240 is the maximum AI. The AI of each Ivy school's matriculating athletic cohort must average no less than one standard deviation below the mean AI of the last 4 enrolling classes. (Approximately one-sixth of students would fall below one standard deviation from the mean.) No athlete with an AI below 171 (the floor) should normally be admitted. Of course, as the average AI rises for the student body, the floor should also rise and the average AIs of athletes should rise automatically as the League monitors and establishes the target AI sport by sport for each university. In recent years, the average AI for athletes has been trending upward at most of our peers, especially Harvard, Princeton and Yale. This places a burden on Brown to develop standards for where our average AIs should fall, independent of the floor and the League standard. Should Brown set higher standards than required by the League? She believes that we can and we should.

On the topic of competitiveness, she suggested, as earlier, that as a member of the League, Brown accepts participation in a competitive sports league. While this league has become synonymous with academic excellence, it is nonetheless an athletic league and if Brown is to be a member in good standing, it must seek to be competitive in a range of sports. Those who say that winning and competitiveness in athletics are unimportant are missing a very important dimension of our membership in the League. She believes that we should seek to be competitive in the context of our assets. She further believes that we should raise additional funds to support athletics and enable our teams to have the support required for increased competitiveness. She insisted that this cannot be at the expense of our central educational aims and that she believes there is ample room in our planning for the additional long term support called for in the Athletics Review Committee. She will recommend that the number of admission slots devoted to athletics be reduced somewhat to reflect the fact that the competition for admission to Brown has changed and to the

extent that we are recruiting a few athletes who may be less competitive academically in the pool, we should make some adjustment. She will recommend that we address the longstanding issue of non-competitive coaches' salaries as well as set more appropriate duty time for some part-time coaches. And she agrees that we should add some resources for matching competitive financial aid offers from other Ivy institutions. This is appropriate if the program of matching is carried out as called for in Ivy rules and monitored to ensure that it does not favor athletes over other students. She is in general agreement therefore with many of the enhancements proposed by the Athletics Review Committee. She will not make an announcement of the decision about the proposed team eliminations before the full report is issued.

On the subject of ROTC, since this is the first opportunity for the faculty to discuss the ROTC report, she summarized three items.

- 1) That we accept the 1969 resolutions as a sound basis on which to reconsider Brown's relationship with ROTC. That essentially means that ROTC faculty should not be considered a curricular but rather an extra-curricular program and that instructors in the program should not purely by virtue of their office, hold a faculty appointment.
- 2) That rather than establish ROTC units on the campus, Brown should continue its cross- institutional arrangement with the ROTC program at Providence College.
- 3) A majority but not all members recommended exploring similar Naval or Air Force ROTC arrangements but that any proposal to create new arrangements of this type should be brought back to the Faculty.

The president stated that she would be happy to receive further comments about the Committee's report and recommendations. She hopes to be able to report to the Corporation in October on how we should approach this matter. She added that she found the report helpful and reasonable, particularly in its articulation of the reasons that the 1969 resolutions remain valid today.

Addressing her decision to step down at the end of eleven years of service, she offered thanks those who have written and to whom she hopes to respond over the next several months. She commented that when she heard the Provost make reference to the new president, she began to feel like the old president. And she stated that it is a rare privilege to be able to serve an institution like Brown, and she is grateful to be a part of this wondrous place. She will be here fully engaged for the duration of the year, after which she will take a leave before returning to teach. She noted in meetings that people are beginning to ignore her presence. She is already planning a move in the first week of June and is looking for a place to live. But she is here now.

Professor Elliott (Sociology) commended the President and the committee on the athletics report, asking if coaches might be helped to set institutional priorities right by scheduling practices that would not result in students routinely leaving class early; he also asked about minority positions on the ROTC committee. President Simmons addressed the range of positions explored by the ROTC committee—the total non-involvement of the university in ROTC, cross-institutional participation—with a bare majority supporting the exploration of further ROTC/Brown affiliations through other

institutions' she has failed to see a call for a ROTC presence on campus. Professor Elliott stated that he believed it useful for the community to hear on the full range of issues beyond discrimination as the view of the full committee, asking if there were plans to release a minority report. President Simmons said that she had been in communication with committee members, but the release of their views was their prerogative. Dean Bergeron, who chaired the committee, stated that most issues were cleared by the committee through a show of hands, and that only on the question of continuing the long relation with ROTC through Providence College was there a vote per se, with six yeas and four nays. The most discussed issue was discrimination against transgendered people. Professor Rosen, a member of the committee, spoke of the weakness of arguments against challenging the current arrangement, such as the consequences of noncompliance with the Solomon amendment, of the reasons for discounting the push mentality created by the actions of peer institutions, of the service of transgendered people in the military among our allies like Australia, Great Britain, Israel, and Canada and the clear conflicts between university and military policies. President Simmons asked committee members if they would like to make known points of views perhaps not reflected in full by the report. Professor Rockman (History) asked if there would be a faculty vote on any expansion of the ROTC relationship. President Simmons stated that she did not see it possible for an expansion without returning to the faculty. Professor Ahearn (Comparative Literature and French Studies) expressed concern that the question of whether ROTC would return to campus was up in the air, that it was possible that a negotiation with NROTC was under way. President Simmons said that any discussions were informational only. Professor Ahearn asked if there would be a motion on this matter. President Simmons stated that a motion would come forward only in the event that a change in the status quo was being asked for. She commented that to her tying the status of ROTC programs to proof of loyalty to country was misleading; that she had long contemplated and experienced discrimination against minorities and was opposed to wrong and unlawful conduct, but that in practice one often finds oneself participating in actions with those whose practices one condemns and opposes, thus raising complex questions of where the line is to be drawn. She would like to see the university take a stand against this and other forms of discriminations; she believes that the values of the 1969 report still apply today. She has heard a range of arguments, and she finds that the faculty prerogative over curricular matters to be a decisive factor. She does not believe we should be unduly influenced by the policies of other and different institutions, and that under the current arrangement students are free to choose a ROTC affiliation. Professor Ahearn thanked the President for saying so much, finding this response personally gratifying. He recalled the affirmation of "faculty approval" in the 1969 agreement.

Provost Schlissel announced that Professor Alcock (Classics and Anthropology) will chair the search for a director of the Watson Institute, joined by five faculty members and two members of Board of Overseers. A search firm will be retained, and the selection of that firm is close. A draft of job description has been written, calling for a practitioner on the global stage from the world of diplomacy or non-governmental organization who has knowledge of a field like international with some academic experience. One goal is to make the Watson different than an academic department and thus to enhance its value to Brown community. The timeline is to finalize the description, advertise, and recruit and

interview in the winter recruit in winter, with the new director to start July 1.

The Provost's office is also involved in a search for the Associate Provost for Diversity, a replacement for Valerie Wilson who left for NSF. Prof. Lina Fruzzetti has been serving as acting officer for institutional diversity. The administration has assembled a search committee chaired by Professor Braun (Africana Studies; Pathology); member of STS Program), who will be joined by faculty, staff, and student members. A job description is forthcoming with the appropriate advertisement, called for an inside or outside candidate with a PhD or other terminal degree with faculty / academic experience. Asked if the Watson post would be tied to a tenured position in Public Policy/Political Science, the Provost replied that there would not be such a limit. He also stated in the response to a question that the full membership of the committee had not been selected. Professor Cook (Political Science) asked for the rationale of the emphasis on a practitioner. Provost Schlissel responded that he was following the balance of the advice he has received, although there was no unanimity on such questions either here or at other institutions. The wish to create a filter between the academic and the larger world seemed to indicate a preference for someone with outside experience, academics already being available on campus. He seeks a synergy that is capable of moving beyond what we already do well. Professor Savage asked if the mission of the Watson had been redefined, and the Provost said it had not and would continue to emphasize contributions to global security. Professor Shank commented that the advertisement for the associate Provost position has been brought up to date and was ready for placement within a day.

On matters of tenure he and the deans of the faculty and the medical school have been asked to report to Corporation at October meeting on our progress with this issue. In particular, what metrics do we propose to track and report to the Corporation to assure them that the modified policies are having their intended effect. He recognizes a pledge to consult with the faculty and thus initiates this discussion and shall see others. As a new member of community, he thinks that Brown has its tenure policies and procedures well aligned with its goals. The privilege of tenure should be granted only to outstanding scholars and teachers in their disciplines who will help fulfill the mission of Brown and help continue to enhance the University's academic standing. Ideally, for Brown to become an even better and ever more significant university, the potential of each newly tenured faculty should exceed the norm in their department. The challenge for us is the rigorous application of these policies and procedures. And it is very difficult since the senior faculty hires and mentors their junior colleagues making it profoundly challenging to be honestly critical with something as life altering as the grant or denial of tenure. We plan to use and report measures that have been discussed thoroughly here before: the tenure ratio; (percentage of tenured faculty), the cohort tenure rate (promotion to tenure in relation to the total entry group of untenured faculty); the tenure decision rate (success rate of those who come up for tenure). We have compared Brown's numbers with those of our peers in the Ivies and other highly competitive private universities. The tenure ratio is 50-80% across this group with us at 80%, down to 75% with PAE hiring.

We propose a 70-75% range. The levers include tenure review, but also hiring practices such as junior vs. senior hires. His commitment to junior faculty is to assure that each case gets judged one at a time on its own merits without a focus on numerical targets. But he also has a commitment to be rigorous in the application of a high standard for lifelong

tenure based on excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service to the academic community. A big part of our report to the Corporation will include a discussion of enhanced mentoring and annual reviews of untenured faculty. He signaled the presence of Deans McLaughlin and Wing to join the discussion.

Dean McLaughlin outlined a comprehensive picture of how his office would work with four groups of people to put enhanced practices in place: 1) with the Corporation of measurement; 2) with the faculty through the FEC and a Faculty Forum on guidelines for best practices; 3) with departments on Standards and Criteria so that they clearly implement the new guidelines—the relative paucity of cases to be heard this year being an opportunity for TPAC to fulfill its charge to reviews standards documents; 4) with junior faculty to hear their concern.

Professor Shank asked if there was a target for the tenure rate, and Provost Schlissel said that there was not set number but a goal of having our rate make sense in relation to those of our peers, taking into account both institutional parallels and differences. Professor Shank asked the same of the cohort tenure rate and Dean McLaughlin said the rate had to remain flexible to allow for the play of all hiring factors. The Provost reiterated the importance of tenure as granted at all levels to the figures, and Professor Vohra joined him in stressing the comprehensive interpretation of the tenure data. Provost Schlissel observed that the data of our peers also changes depending upon many factors, and that he was confident that we would arrive at practices that were both rigorous and fair to individuals. Professor Zimmt asked the role of retirement incentives in the mixture, and Provost Schlissel commented that financial incentives were not the only factor, with matters of identity and self esteem as important.

Professor Breuer called the attention of the faculty to the report of TPAC and invited questions. Professor Valles asked if Professor Breuer believed in the recommendations that report makes of departments for narratives of teaching and mentorship. Professor Sanes, as former chair responsible for the report, said that the report represented a consensus reflecting his three years of service on the committee. Professor Breuer said he was in agreement. Professor Breuer and Professor Wetle (Public Health) spoke of statistic and narrative elements of the summaries called for, and Dean Bergeron suggested the usefulness of the new online course evaluations and presented some data on their use. Professor Shank asked if there had ever been a negative TPAC case that the Provost reversed. Professor Vohra said that there had been. Professor Sanes spoke to the approval rate of 45%, asking that its effectiveness be gauged. Dean McLaughlin said that the raw data also needed to be examined in relation to other factors like discipline and department.

Dean Klawunn presented the report of the Campus Life Advisory Board, and Vice President Davis the report of the Human Resources Advisory Board. There being no old business and no new business, the meeting adjourned 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley
Secretary of the Faculty

Memorial Minute for
Edwin Hornig, Professor Emeritus of English

Presented at the Faculty Meeting
October 4, 2010

Think of an old friend who died
Now turn in your chair and he's there
filling the doorway smiling

Rise and he walks straight towards you
Leave the room and he sits in your chair
waiting for you to enter smiling.

These are Edwin's words, written for his friend Nicanor Parra, the Chilean mathematician and poet, and published here in Providence by Rosemarie and Keith Waldrop at the Burning Deck Press. We take the occasion now to fill the doorway of this room for Edwin, smiling.

A mercurial man, Edwin wielded a smile that could embrace and wound, the outward sign of a generous irony that navigated the world for him, and through his example, for us. His smile embraces the generations of students like me who enjoyed it, the readers of his many volumes of poems and essays, and the home that he built for writers at Brown, first in the department of English, then in Creative Writing and in Comparative Literature, now in Literary Arts.

The house is one of Edwin's figures of inclusion, looking back to the Brooklyn apartments of his childhood, where a grandfather produced a leatherette bag of fruits culled from a relief agency as a children's grab bag and a Sephardic grandmother opened invitations beyond:

And the savor of turbans and princes and spices welled
From her smile like a promise of Turkish delights withheld;
For her heart was a mediterranean cradling the earth
With her wishes that tumbled like fish and golden sea fairs
Where pirates were drowned and angels were spared by her
prayers...

Edwin was lured to Brown from Harvard by Barnaby Keeney and planted as a young poet and critic in a department of English that was not quite prepared for just how creative Edwin was. I speak as a repeat offender department chair when I say that Edwin's skills as an administrator are legendary: in a single year as department chair in English Edwin appointed a professor for whom there was no salary line and

who eventually rose through the tenured ranks on the strength of Edwin's crafty promise. Edwin and his co conspirators--the Waldrops, Jack and Sophie Hawkes, Jim and Margot Schevill, Michael Harper-- put the department on the literary map of the arts in the post war era, with presses and readings and performances that spread in the protecting shadow of Edwin's beloved Copper Beech, the name his own press shares with Vergil:

Tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi.

Edwin held bachelor's and master's degree in English literature, from Wisconsin, and from the start of his work he produced important documents in literary history and criticism, often returning to the theme of *Dark Conceit*, his work on allegory as a mode of writing. As an undergraduate at Brown with a poetic imagination and the compensatory affliction of scholarship, I found his language of critical description compelling.

Edwin read allegory as a continuous mode from Spenser and Bunyan to Hawthorne and Lawrence, a place for the location of transcendent ideals in the fictional relief language always inscribes. His work as a critic stands. His translations from Spanish, the language of his beloved Nona, launched an English language trajectory for the work for Garcia Lorca, on whom he wrote an early critical study published in 1944 eight years after Lorca's death in the Spanish Civil War and during Edwin's own military service in Europe. He was an influential English translator of the works of the great 20th century Portuguese poet, Fernando Pessoa. His translations of Golden Age Spanish drama, like Lope's *La Dorotea* and of six plays by Calderon have often supplied the text for performance on the stage, and his essays on *Calderon and the Seizures of Honor* look to existential conditions of life and art.

As Edwin wrote of Calderon's *Life is a Dream*:

is life worth living? by a further implication, if honor is an illusion, so is life, and if this is true, how does one cope with such a vast and fearful discovery?

For such vast and fearful discoveries, Edwin was twice knighted, once by Spain and once by Portugal, and the memory meeting the knight striding across the Green, a fair lady by his side, proud of his bemedalled investiture in ceremonies conducted at the JCB, is a bright snapshot my memory of this place.

Edwin's dimension was only large. Neither overweight nor giant, he filled his body with presence just as his bold eyes filled his face and his sweeping hair neither entirely a youthful blond nor a senescent white deserves the adjective leonine. His voice gave weight to the peculiar diphthong of the word "poem."

In his lifetime of poetry, Edwin circles around a moment of loss on a Brooklyn street in 1925:

My blond and foolish brown-eyed brother
lugging his fretful love
shambles after me
as the cunning Mack truck
lurching out of nowhere
cuts him down.

He's a long dead almost-three.
I'm a long lived five
just turned sixty-one
still running in a dead heat
with the rolling cab that swooped him up
heading for the vanished hospital.

In celebrating Edwin's life, let us cherish the powerful run of his "dead heat." In this phrase Edwin allows language to discover itself as a form of life, to light in darkness, to awake dreaming, to warm the coldness of loss, to come to the house and find someone home waiting:

Somewhere I'll be
riding home, lights
let me
round an old darkness
to the children
sleeping in the house
my coming rouses.

Madam President, I move that the Faculty adopt this Minute by standing vote of respect, and that the Secretary of the Faculty be instructed to enter the Minute into the permanent records of the Faculty and to send copies of it to members of the immediate family.

Professor Stephen Merriam Foley
Department of English

Memorial Minute for
Elmer Cornwell, Professor Emeritus of Political Science

Presented to the Faculty on
October 4, 2011

Elmer Cornwell, who died March 25, 2011 at age 86, was an emeritus professor of political science. Growing up in central Massachusetts, Professor Cornwell received his BA from Williams College in 1948, and his MA ('51) and PhD ('53) from Harvard University. After serving briefly as Instructor and Teaching Fellow at Williams, Harvard and Princeton, he came to Brown in 1955, contributing to this institution and community for half a century.

Elmer made his reputation early as a Presidency scholar, publishing numerous books and articles on the Presidency, foremostly the administrations of Wilson, Coolidge, Roosevelt, Truman, and Johnson. But probably equally important were his enduring contributions in the field that is sometimes called "state and local politics", a topic area in which he authored or co-authored six books and more than twenty articles. He chaired the Political Science department for most of the period 1962-1974.

Elmer had a great deal of real world experience that richly informed his teaching and scholarship. For more than fifteen years he served as Parliamentarian of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, and served concurrently as moderator of the Little Compton annual meeting. Elmer also chaired the three-day-long Brown faculty meeting in 1969 that legislated, so to speak, the "new curriculum." This speaks to Elmer's considerable talent for understanding "process" and having a well earned reputation -- in the university and the State -- for intelligently and honestly implementing it.

Many graduate students came to Brown to work with Elmer, and were variously engaged in his funded study of state constitutional conventions. Throughout this career Elmer combined academic life with community involvement. For many years he was a well recognized Rhode Island institution. The *Providence Journal* once spoke of him in these terms. He knew (and was trusted by) almost everybody in state government; one of his former students was briefly speaker of the RI House; many others made academic careers.

Elmer drove old cars, early on rode around Little Compton on a bicycle, and lived in a somewhat rustic house in Little Compton that he had largely built himself. I believe he bought the property from Brown President Keeney, who summered next door. He seemed to have no particular material ambitions or desire for wealth, yet before his death he contributed a substantial fund to support a Brown scholarship.

Elmer's long-time colleague, Newell Stultz, notes that he has been "increasingly impressed at how many individual careers of all sorts of people in different roles it has taken to make Brown the grand institution it is today. Most of these individuals have loved Brown deeply, often had deep roots in RI, generally got on well together, and did not seek publicity or authority for themselves. In general they were decidedly non-ideological. Elmer was such a person, and I esteemed him greatly." As do we all.

Madam President, I move that the Faculty adopt this Minute by standing vote of respect, and that the Secretary of the Faculty be instructed to enter the Minute into the permanent records of the Faculty and to send copies of it to members of the immediate family.

Professor Linda Cook
Department of Political Science