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Academic Program Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;E</td>
<td>Advisory &amp; Executive Committee: a subgroup of the Brown Corporation responsible for decisions regarding estate purchases and sales, faculty appointments, and other time sensitive matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Academic Priorities Committee: responsible for overseeing the direction of academic programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCC</td>
<td>Brown University Community Council: serves as a university-wide representative forum for discussion, debate, and advisory recommendations on a wide spectrum of issues and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>Computing Advisory Board: provides advice on strategies and directions for information technology in domains of research computing, instructional technology, and foundational services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>College Curriculum Committee: responsible addressing review and maintenance of the academic program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV</td>
<td>Center for Computation and Visualization: explores and provides computing, visualization, and storage resources to the academic community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>Center for Digital Initiatives: creates digital repositories to facilitate scholarship and share information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Computing &amp; Information Services: the division of the university devoted to technological infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAB</td>
<td>Campus Planning Advisory Board: responsible for informing the campus planning process with information from community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Committee on the Residential Experience: examined the objectives for undergraduate education outside of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Departmental Computing Coordinator: employees who provide computer support within individual departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Study: faculty member responsible for a department’s graduate program and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUG</td>
<td>Department Undergraduate Group: organized groups of concentrators (or interested students) that foster collaboration, discuss research, explore career opportunities, study, and fund-raise for field trips and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Faculty Advisory Committee: advises the administration on faculty compensation, benefits, and leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEC</td>
<td>Faculty Executive Committee: responsible for informing and representing the faculty, instituting and amending faculty rules, and providing advising and consulting to senior academic administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRR</td>
<td>Faculty Rules and Regulations: the handbook that provides guidelines for faculty activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC</td>
<td>Graduate Student Council: responsible for representing the interests of graduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Institutional Research: responsible for collecting and analyzing university data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITG</td>
<td>Instructional Technology Group: provides technological support for instructional technology by creating course websites, wikis, and other tools to enhance pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITPRC</td>
<td>Information Technology Project Review Committee: evaluates all significant IT projects for approval, funding and staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFEC</td>
<td>Medical Faculty Executive Committee: responsible for informing and representing the medical faculty, instituting and amending faculty rules, and providing advising and consulting to senior academic administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MML</td>
<td>Multimedia Lab: provides equipment and assistance for projects that are enhanced by the use of visual and audio content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>Medical Student Senate: responsible for representing the interests of medical students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCRA</td>
<td>Online Course Reserve Access: system that enables faculty to electronically select library materials and make them available to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>Office of Sponsored Projects: responsible for overseeing the administration of funds and activities related to grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVPR</td>
<td>Office of the Vice President for Research: responsible for enhancing research activity throughout the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAE</td>
<td>Plan for Academic Enrichment: the university’s current strategic planning document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Professional and Academic Skills for Students: offered collaboratively by the Writing Center, Library and CIS, this program provides workshops on research, writing, and computer skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>People Against Waste: system for providing students with limited free printing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>President’s Leadership Council: responsible for advising the president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLME</td>
<td>Program in Liberal Medical Education: joins undergraduate and professional studies in medicine in a single eight-year program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>Innovation Management and Entrepreneurship Engineering: a masters degree program focusing on the development of innovative, embryonic ideas in science and engineering to prepare students to more efficiently navigate the complexities of our highly competitive technology-driven economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOC</td>
<td>Public Safety Oversight Committee: advises the vice president for administration and the chief of police regarding practices, policies and procedures of the Department of Public Safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Research Compliant Network: responsible for assessment of current compliance; outreach and training to faculty, students, and staff engaged in research and research administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>Risk Management Committee: responsible for identifying, assessing, reducing, monitoring, and reporting business key risks that might impair the achievement of Brown’s strategic goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUE</td>
<td>Resumed Undergraduate Education: a small number of students either 25 years of age or older, or who have not studied at a high school or college for the previous five years, admitted to Brown on a full or part-time basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Student Technology Assistant: run by the Instructional Technology Group with the goal of offering assistance to faculty and graduate TAs in the creation of digital course material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STG</td>
<td>Scholarly Technology Group: explores the critical new technologies that are transforming scholarly work and helping to maintain its longevity: data and metadata standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPAC</td>
<td>Tenure, Promotions, And Appointments Committee: responsible for reviewing and approving each academic unit’s written criteria for contract renewal, promotion and tenure; reviews recommendations concerning renewal of appointments, promotion of ranks, and awarding of tenure to untenured faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URC</td>
<td>University Resources Committee: responsible for recommending annual operating and capital budgets to the President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This form is to be completed and placed at the beginning of the self-study report:

Date: January 15, 2009

1. Corporate name of institution: Brown University
2. Address (city, state, zip code): Providence, Rhode Island 02912
   Phone: (401) 863-1000
   URL of institutional webpage: www.brown.edu
3. Date institution was chartered or authorized: 1764
4. Date institution enrolled first students in degree programs: 1765
5. Date institution awarded first degrees: 1769
6. Type of control: (check)
   Public
   ☐ State
   ☐ City
   ☐ Other
   Private
   ☒ Independent, not-for-profit
   ☐ Religious Group
   ☐ Other: ___________________________
   (Specify) ___________________________
   ☐ Proprietary
   ☐ Other:
   (Specify) ___________________________
7. By what agency is the institution legally authorized to provide a program of education beyond high school, and what degrees is it authorized to grant? Brown operates under a charter issued by King George III of England to the Colony of Rhode Island. A copy of the charter is found in Appendix I. (Attach a copy of the by-laws, enabling legislation, and/or other appropriate documentation to establish the legal authority of the institution to award degrees in accordance with applicable requirements.)
8. Level of postsecondary offering (check all that apply)
   ☐ Less than one year of work
   ☐ At least one but less than two years
   ☐ Diploma or certificate programs of at least two but less than four years
   ☐ Associate degree granting program of at least two years
   ☐ Four or five-year baccalaureate degree granting program
   ☒ First professional degree (MD)
   ☒ Master’s and/or work beyond the first professional degree
   ☐ Work beyond the master’s level but not at the doctoral level (e.g., Specialist in Education)
   ☒ A doctor of philosophy or equivalent degree
   ☐ Other ___________________________
   Specify ___________________________
9. Type of undergraduate programs (check all that apply)
   □ Occupational training at the crafts/clerical level (certificate or diploma)  □ Liberal arts and general
   □ Occupational training at the technical or semi-professional level (degree)  □ Teacher preparatory
   □ Two-year programs designed for full transfer to a baccalaureate degree  □ Professional
   □ Other _____________________________

10. The calendar system at the institution is:
    □ Semester  □ Quarter  □ Trimester  □ Other _____________________________

11. What constitutes the credit hour load for a full-time equivalent (FTE) student each semester?
    a) Undergraduate  3, 4 or 5 courses is full-time, 4 is the norm
    b) Graduate  4 courses is the norm
    c) Professional  5.5 course credits per semester is the norm

12. Student population:
    a) Degree-seeking students (Fall, 2008):

    |                        | Undergraduate | Graduate | Total |
    |------------------------|---------------|----------|-------|
    | Full-time student headcount | 5851          | 2079     | 7930  |
    | Part-time student headcount | 23            | 67       | 90    |
    | FTE (FT + ½ PT)         | 5862.5        | 2112.5   | 7975  |

    b) Number of students (headcount) in non-credit, short-term courses: ____________

13. List all programs accredited by a nationally recognized, specialized accrediting agency. List the name of the appropriate agency for each accredited program:
    Chemistry – American Chemical Society
    Education – Rhode Island Department of Education
    Engineering – Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET)
    Medicine – Liaison Committee on Medical Education
    Association of American Medical Colleges
14. **Off-campus Locations.** List all instructional locations other than the main campus. For each site, indicate whether the location offers full-degree programs, 50% or more of one or more degree programs, or courses only. Record the FTE enrollment for the most recent fall semester. Add more rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full degrees?</th>
<th>50% or more?</th>
<th>Courses only?</th>
<th>FTE Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. In-state Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Out-of-state Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. International Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Degrees and certificates offered 50% or more electronically:** For each degree or certificate, indicate the level (certificate, associate’s, baccalaureate, master’s, professional, doctoral), the percent that may be completed on-line, and the number of matriculated students for the most recent fall semester. Enter more rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of program</th>
<th>Degree level</th>
<th>% on-line</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **Instruction offered through contractual relationships:** For each contractual relationship through which instruction is offered, indicate the name of the contractor, the location of instruction, the program name and degree level, and the percent of the degree that may be completed through the contractual relationship. Enter more rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of contractor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name of program</th>
<th>Degree level</th>
<th>% of degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. List by name and title the chief administrative officers of the institution. (Use the table provided on the next page.)

18. Supply a table of organization for the institution. While the organization of any institution will depend on its purpose, size and scope of operation, institutional organization usually includes four areas. Although every institution may not have a major administrative division for these areas, the following outline may be helpful in charting and describing the overall administrative organization:

a) Organization of academic affairs, showing a line of responsibility to president for each department, school division, library, admissions office, and other units assigned to this area;
b) Organization of student affairs, including health services, student government, intercollegiate activities, and other units assigned to this area;

c) Organization of finances and business management, including plant operations and maintenance, non-academic personnel administration, auxiliary enterprises, and other units assigned to this area;

d) Organization of institutional advancement, including fund development, public relations, alumni office and other units assigned to this area.

Brief Organizational charts follow this form and more detail can be found on our website at: http://www.brown.edu/Administration/President/org_charts/tree.php?id=1

19. Record briefly the central elements in the history of the institution:

Brown University is one of the most esteemed universities in the nation, providing a superior undergraduate experience as well as excellent programs in graduate and medical education. It achieved preeminence by hewing to a collaborative university-college model in which faculty are as committed to teaching as they are to research, and by embracing a unique curriculum that requires students to be architects of their general education. As the third oldest college in New England and the seventh oldest in America, Brown was the Baptist answer to Congregationalist Yale and Harvard; Presbyterian Princeton; and Episcopalian Penn and Columbia. At the time of its founding, it was the only college that welcomed students of all religious persuasions. Brown has long since shed its Baptist affiliation, but it remains dedicated to diversity and intellectual freedom.

Founded in 1764 as the College of Rhode Island, the school enrolled its first students in 1765. In 1804, in recognition of a gift from Nicholas Brown, it was renamed Brown University. With the establishment of the Women’s College in 1891, the University began admitting women. For the next eighty years, the Women’s College and Brown University provided a coordinated program to educate women within the University. The Women’s College was later renamed Pembroke College, and ultimately merged with Brown in 1971. The graduate program began in 1887. Brown’s medical school program, originally instituted in 1811, was suspended in 1827, but since 1975 has offered an excellent medical education. Accredited by LCME, the school was renamed the Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University in 2007.

Today, Brown enrolls nearly 6,000 undergraduates from all 50 states and from 63 countries around the world. Graduate school enrollment is close to 2,000 and medical school enrollment is 300.
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Preface

Introduction

This decennial review is occurring at an important moment in Brown’s long and distinguished history. The university is five years into implementing the Plan for Academic Enrichment, an ambitious strategic plan designed to enhance academic offerings at Brown. The occasion of reaccreditation provides an opportunity to take inventory of our progress and to set goals for addressing continuing challenges.

The preparation of this document was served immensely by an extensive review of the Plan undertaken in parallel with the self-study process. The review of the Plan and thus the self-study was further complemented by the work of the Task Force on Undergraduate Education and the Working Group on Graduate Education whose charges were to provide insight into the current strengths of our academic programs and to make recommendations for continued improvements.

Overall we have learned that Brown continues to attract excellent undergraduate and graduate students and the combination of a dedicated faculty and a challenging curriculum provides our students a first-rate education. Our faculty contribute in significant ways to the world of scholarship and carry out important research programs in a variety of disciplines and in emerging areas of interdisciplinary study. We have graduate programs that are well respected and, in some cases, global leaders. Indeed, Brown is a leader in the country and the world in developing and sustaining a very special university-college model of teaching and research.

The self-study also reveals that recent strategic investments in faculty, resources and programs provide continuing support for excellence in our undergraduate program and are helping to cement our place as a nationally ranked research university. These investments have led to increases in the size of the faculty and have provided essential resources to advance scholarship, research and teaching. We have been able to establish need-blind admission and strengthen financial aid for undergraduates and greatly enhance fellowship support offered to graduate students. Attention to our physical plant has resulted in an enhanced campus infrastructure that is providing the space and technology needed to compete with the best universities.

Our planning process has supported our ability to implement improvements strategically and conduct ongoing assessments of our progress. That process has also identified goals and challenges for the coming decades.

Process

The self-study process, which began in 2007, included formal committees composed of faculty, students, and staff and, in the case of the Steering Committee, alumni and
Corporation representation. To further ensure broad participation, we held both small and large forums to solicit valuable feedback from the community.

The work of the self-study occurred in five phases. During phase one, in the fall of 2007, the Steering Committee and subcommittees drafted content in response to each of the NEASC Standards. In the second phase, we spent the spring of 2008 reviewing and revising the drafts with various faculty and student standing committees. The summer months of 2008 involved incorporating and synthesizing the various analyses and comments. In the fall of 2008, we posted the draft document on a secure intranet for further review by the Brown community. These comments were also incorporated into the final self-study document, which was discussed and approved by the Brown Corporation at its October, 2008 meeting.

We have benefitted greatly from the self-study process. That the drafting of this document occurred in a year of several parallel processes of reflection aided immeasurably in ensuring that the document is an accurate and thorough review of the current state of the institution.

Steering Committee Members

Brenda Allen, Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Diversity
Tracy Barnes, Coordinator for Institutional Research
Katherine Bergeron, Dean of the College, Professor of Music
Sheila Bonde, Dean of the Graduate School, Professor of History of Art and Architecture and Archaeology
Ashwin Cadambi ’11, Undergraduate Student
Russell Carey, Senior Vice President for Corporation Affairs and Governance
Nitin Jadhav, Graduate Student
Huajian Gao, Walter H. Annenberg Professor of Engineering
Susan Howitt, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning
Elizabeth Love, Project Analyst
Kathleen McSharry, Associate Dean of the College
Guy Sanchez, ’80, Alumni Representative
Margot Saurette, Executive Assistant/Data Analyst
William Simmons, Professor of Anthropology
Richard Spies, Executive Vice President for Planning and Senior Advisor to the President
Kathryn Spoehr, Professor of Cognitive and Linguistic Sciences
Shelley Stephenson, Assistant Provost
William Twaddell, Corporation Member
Rajiv Vohra, Dean of the Faculty, Ford Foundation Professor of Economics
Overview

Brown University is one of the most esteemed universities in the nation, providing a superior undergraduate experience as well as excellent programs in graduate and medical education. It achieved preeminence by hewing to a collaborative university-college model in which faculty are as committed to teaching as they are to research, and by embracing a unique curriculum that requires students to be architects of their general education. As the third oldest college in New England and the seventh oldest in America, Brown was the Baptist answer to Congregationalist Yale and Harvard; Presbyterian Princeton; and Episcopalian Penn and Columbia. At the time of its founding, it was the only college that welcomed students of all religious persuasions. Brown has long since shed its Baptist affiliation, but it remains dedicated to diversity and intellectual freedom.

Founded in 1764 as the College of Rhode Island, the school enrolled its first students in 1765. In 1804, in recognition of a gift from Nicholas Brown, it was renamed Brown University. With the establishment of the Women’s College in 1891, the University began admitting women. For the next eighty years, the Women’s College and Brown University provided a coordinated program to educate women within the University. The Women’s College was later renamed Pembroke College, and ultimately merged with Brown in 1971. The graduate program began in 1887. Brown’s medical school program, originally instituted in 1811, was suspended in 1827, but since 1975 has offered an excellent medical education. Accredited by LCME, the school was renamed the Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University in 2007.

Today, Brown enrolls nearly 6,000 undergraduates from all 50 states and from 63 countries around the world. Graduate school enrollment is close to 2,000 and medical school enrollment is 300. Brown has 34 research centers and institutes, many of which were established in the last decade. Recently ranked 16th among national universities by U.S. News and World Report, Brown was ranked 26th among leading research universities by Arizona State University’s Center for Measuring University Performance.

Brown has many distinctive features. Its small size relative to most other leading research universities allows members of the University community to interact on a meaningful personal level and to develop relationships that enhance the teaching and research of the University. We are also focused as a university on the arts and sciences, without a large number of professional schools. The staff of the professional programs that we do offer through the Division of Biology and Medicine and the Education and Engineering departments, engage heavily with our undergraduate students and work closely with related departments throughout the University.

The human scale and extensive personal interaction that occur at Brown support and reinforce the sense of community as a defining feature. With a culture of faculty-student collaboration that is unusual in universities organized around departments and disciplines, and with an institutional culture that fosters innovative interdepartmental majors among undergraduates, Brown excels at lifting conventional intellectual
boundaries. The resulting learning environment fosters innovative, multidisciplinary approaches to intellectual problems of all kinds, and exploration of unique approaches to teaching and research.

In 2002, Brown embarked on the **Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE)**, an ambitious program that seeks to build on traditional strengths and establish new benchmarks for excellence in research, education and public leadership. With excellent leadership from the faculty and the Corporation, and an experienced administrative team, the campus achieved consensus in support of shared values and a common vision for advancing an already successful institution to a new level.

The planning process confirmed the historical excellence of Brown’s undergraduate program and considered how new investments might continue to support this goal while cementing Brown’s place as a nationally ranked research university. The resulting Plan provides the strategic vision for accomplishing the stated goals including increasing the faculty size, expanding research opportunities, improving support for faculty advising and expanding financial aid and graduate stipends. The plan also calls for allocating more resources to programs and ideas that enhance the University’s engagement with global concerns.

Over the past five years, Brown has made significant progress towards its PAE goals. The Plan has had demonstrable effects on all aspects of the undergraduate experience. The Plan’s addition of 79 new teachers and scholars has significantly improved the quality of undergraduate education, allowing us to introduce a first-year seminar program, to increase the number of courses and to provide more opportunities for student-faculty interaction. The increase in the number of faculty, combined with the addition of new academic programs, has increased student involvement in primary research.

The PAE has had a significant impact on undergraduate education. Channeling more resources into undergraduate financial aid has made Brown’s admission decisions “need blind” and allowed financial assistance for more international students. This has helped to improve both the quality and size of the undergraduate applicant pool in recent years, and puts Brown in the enviable position of selecting and enrolling an increasingly talented, diverse and accomplished student body. Recently launched efforts to evaluate and enhance the Brown curriculum are designed to assure that Brown’s course offerings and curricular infrastructure are optimally aligned to meet students’ needs. Similarly, Brown’s investment in campus life initiatives has made the physical environment more conducive to undergraduate learning and interaction with peers and faculty. During the 2007-2008 academic year, two ad hoc committees identified additional strategies for further enhancing the undergraduate experience at Brown. The Task Force on Undergraduate Education made recommendations for improving curricular offerings, focusing notably on global education and student advising. They have also developed plans for more directly assessing student learning outcomes. The Task Force recommendations were incorporated in the Area of Emphasis segment of this report. The second ad hoc committee, the Committee on the Residential Experience, has offered
many recommendations for enhancing learning at Brown through the use of residential education, campus programming and non-academic centers for activity outside of the classroom.

The PAE’s commitment of resources to the Graduate School has yielded measurable results, as evidenced by record numbers of top-quality applicants and our growing competitiveness. The faculty expansion mentioned above has also benefited the Graduate School, by enabling it to create new master’s and doctoral programs and strong partnerships with other institutions and research organizations. The Working Group on Graduate Education, established during the 2007-2008 academic year, developed a strategic plan for continuing the progress made in recent years and providing for growth in areas of special strength. The plan calls for exploration of some new programs in emerging fields and enhanced programmatic and financial support for students as they prepare for careers inside and outside academia.

Expanding Brown’s faculty, providing additional resources in support of their teaching and research, and enhancing faculty excellence are central focus points of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. The tangible, positive effects of increasing the size of the faculty – currently the largest it has ever been – are visible in all aspects of academic life. The student-faculty ratio has been reduced to 9:1, permitting us to increase the number of small classes offered to undergraduates, including the First Year Seminar Program. The target-of-opportunity program has allowed Brown to attract a diverse group of outstanding teachers and scholars from around the world. Expansion of our faculty provides us with more flexibility to support research initiatives and a more generous sabbatical program. The Plan’s commitment to improving faculty compensation is enabling Brown to be more competitive with peer institutions in recruiting and retaining the very best faculty. Start-up fund levels are at an all-time high, and we have substantially increased our support for faculty and student research through outside funding, improved facilities, and new partnerships.

In the coming years, as revenue improves, we will continue to concentrate on faculty growth, and on supporting and funding excellence in teaching and research. We will also add faculty to support the focus on global education at Brown and increase faculty size in some of our strongest departments.

The Plan for Academic Enrichment called for a high standard of “leadership” for Brown’s programs in the life and health sciences. Over the past several years, the Division of Biology and Medicine has made significant progress toward meeting this standard. The medical school is reviewed through a separate reaccreditation process; nevertheless, since the Plan was implemented, Brown’s Medical School has improved its reputation significantly, and now stands at the threshold of the top quartile of all U.S. medical schools. The Program in Biology has 14 new faculty members. The Program in Public Health has recruited eight new faculty members, building its capabilities in teaching and research and positioning the Program for accreditation as a professional school.
Among the unique features of Brown are its open curriculum, which encourages students to take risks and to cross disciplinary boundaries, and its emphasis on creating and fostering interdisciplinary courses and research opportunities. The Plan for Academic Enrichment has furthered this tradition of multidisciplinary collaboration, learning, and knowledge by supporting the establishment of new programs and centers in the humanities, life sciences, physical sciences and social sciences. These include a dual degree program at Brown and the Rhode Island School of Design, a program in Commerce, Organizations and Entrepreneurship and the Environmental Change Initiative. We will work to ensure that the centers and programs retain and strengthen their relationships with the associated academic departments.

The goals of the PAE have received unprecedented financial support from alumni, government funding sources, corporations, foundations, parents and friends. Boldly Brown: The Campaign for Academic Enrichment is a comprehensive fundraising drive, designed to support the University’s strategic objectives. By all measures, the Campaign has been an impressive success and has fueled many of the critical, early objectives of the Plan. It has raised approximately $1.3 billion and is poised to exceed its $1.4 billion goal. The Campaign has also succeeded in increasing the size of gifts and grants from each of Brown’s constituencies. The total number of gifts to Brown during the Campaign has exceeded 83,000, a 40% increase over the number of gifts received in the four years prior to the Campaign. New gifts and pledges to the University during the Campaign to date, which is considered the most accurate measure of any university’s fundraising progress, have almost tripled over the four-year period prior to the Campaign. Brown is now averaging more than $235 million a year in new gifts and pledges, and $144 million a year in cash receipts. The Brown Annual Fund, a critical funding mechanism for the PAE, has set a new record each year.

Thanks to the diligence of the Corporation Committee on Investments and a talented investment office staff, Brown has experienced considerable success in the management of its endowment fund, notwithstanding the recent decline in endowment value. Sponsored research funding has also grown despite ever-increasing competition. We have also made difficult decisions to redirect resources to high priority academic areas.

While we are proud of these many accomplishments, we have continued to challenge ourselves to maintain focus and channel momentum toward accomplishment of the priorities most relevant to Brown today. Accordingly, during the 2007-2008 academic year we launched a comprehensive review of our PAE goals, objectives, and priorities. The PAE Phase II affirms the relevance of the original plan’s goals and objectives and identifies the new objectives noted above, including a continued effort to strengthen the undergraduate program, enhance opportunities to engage globally and continued support of department and program toward worldwide excellence.

Brown is in a strong position today. The excellence of our academic programs remains our primary goal. Our concurrent improvements in governance, process, infrastructure and resources have facilitated this goal. The process of preparing the self-study, which benefited greatly from the parallel reviews we conducted for the PAE, the undergraduate
program, the graduate program and the residential life experience, reinforced for us the value of ongoing review and evaluation to these priorities and goals. The insights we have gained not only illuminate our progress to date, but have also helped us to identify new challenges for the future.
Standard One: Mission and Purpose

Overview

Since its founding in 1764, Brown University’s mission of liberally educating young men and women in the vernacular and learned languages in the liberal arts and sciences has remained stable. Academic excellence is the cornerstone of the mission. Intellectual and scholarly goals are set high towards preparing students to participate in a global society with integrity and purpose. Civic and social responsibility are additional values of import to the University and fuel the sense that there is no greater privilege than to use a superior liberal education in the service of others.

Brown’s mission encompasses the belief that students have voice and must be active agents in all aspects of their education. Brown’s open curriculum demands that students take unusual responsibility for framing their own educational goals. Although students are expected to play a key role in charting their academic path, faculty involvement in this process is essential. Curriculum and support structures are therefore designed to lend students maximum access to the faculty as they grapple with these concerns.

Also reflected is the idea that the academic experience of all students is intricately linked to the intellectual pursuits of the faculty. Research and teaching are viewed as complementary activities important to the learning of both undergraduate and graduate students. At Brown, there is no separate graduate faculty: all faculty are actively involved in undergraduate and graduate instruction. Moreover, students at all levels participate in research activities and are exposed to the methods that faculty use to pursue new knowledge.

Description

The Brown Charter contains the original statement of Brown University’s mission:

“Institutions for liberal education are highly beneficial to society by forming the rising generation to virtue, knowledge, and useful literature, and thus preserving in community a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation.”

In 1998, the faculty and the Brown Corporation approved a more descriptive statement of its mission, one that updated the language of the charter while preserving its basic principles:
The mission of Brown University is to serve the community, the nation, and the world by discovering, communicating, and preserving knowledge and understanding in the spirit of free inquiry, and by educating and preparing students to “discharge the offices of life with usefulness and reputation.” We do this through a partnership of students and teachers in a unified community known as a university-college.

Appraisal

Brown’s mission is presented as a major “Fact About Brown” on the Brown web site. The mission statement is also included in a wide range of Brown publications, such as the Catalogue of the University, various Admission Office brochures, Corporation documents and other pertinent University publications.

Brown’s mission statement influences the most important activities undertaken by the University. Its effectiveness in guiding University goals was tested in the development of key principles for the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE), Brown’s current strategic planning document. The PAE’s most notable principles are:

1. Brown's self-definition as a university-college must be a continuing feature of all plans to improve Brown. It is that context that must guide decisions about the relative size of the different student groups, the priorities of planning, and the allocation of resources.
2. The empowerment of learners wherein they are partners and primary architects of their intellectual itineraries in a research-rich context differentiates Brown from other leading universities. This distinction must be maintained, protected, and enhanced.
3. The opportunities for graduate and medical students to participate more fully in the broad scholarly and learning community are exceptionally promising. We must extend the collaborative model and shared experience which characterizes undergraduate education at Brown to these important groups.

These principles, on which a Brown education has been based for many decades, underlie the new goals set by the PAE. Key to achievement of the university’s mission is the plan’s focus on enhancing undergraduate and graduate education and supporting excellence in teaching and research. While the specific details of the plan, and our progress towards achieving the goals, are described in this self-study document, several areas are worth noting here, because they highlight the relationship of the plan to the mission. These include increasing the size of the faculty, expanding research opportunities, improving support for faculty advising and improving financial aid and graduate stipends. The plan also calls for allocating more resources to programs and initiatives that enhance the University’s engagement in global concerns.
Projection

Brown’s mission has served us well in guiding the University’s efforts to enrich our academic offerings. We must now consider how to incorporate equivalents of Brown’s mission at multiple levels. Divisional, departmental, and concentration (“major”) missions, for example, will guide the work of individual units of our organization, thereby benefiting the University as a whole.

The Dean of the College, in response to recommendations from the Taskforce on Undergraduate Education will work with the College Curriculum Committee to devise a plan for reviewing concentrations. This effort will guide departments and programs in producing their own statements of mission and goals. This work began in the fall of 2008, with a goal of completing reviews of all concentrations by AY 2010-2011.

The president will initiate suggestions for a periodic review of the University’s mission and for revising the mission as appropriate. The plan for implementing this process will be completed by the Corporation Office by Spring 2009, and then be submitted for review and acceptance by the University’s governing bodies.

Institutional Effectiveness

The mission of Brown has guided its direction for centuries. The priorities outlined during the most recent planning process are no exception. For two years, Brown conducted a thorough, highly consultative, wide-reaching review of its purpose, needs, overall aims and priorities. Members of the Brown community, including students, faculty, staff, and alumni, helped to guide the planning process and shape both the general directions and the specific recommendations. Through this process, the University assured itself that the mission is strong and that the university’s contemporary efforts continue to serve this end.
Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Overview

Brown’s commitment to planning and evaluation is comprehensive. Over the past 15 years, three strategic planning initiatives have been undertaken to align long-term goals with resource needs and priorities. The third of these is the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE), launched by President Simmons’s administration in 2002. This comprehensive, integrated plan defines University goals, communicates priorities and identifies required resources.

Through the PAE, Brown has significantly developed and enhanced its institutional planning and evaluation. While the last NEASC evaluation cited a lack of clear vision and focus as a weakness, the PAE has met that challenge, serving as a guiding force that affects virtually all aspects of the University. Because the PAE is designed to link Brown’s long-term strategic goals with its ongoing planning and evaluation processes, it has brought focus, a clear sense of priorities, continuity, and integration to Brown’s planning and evaluation procedures.

Description

Planning

University-wide comprehensive planning

Since 2002, Brown’s primary planning and evaluation activities have been guided by the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE). Derived from the University mission to educate and prepare students in a unified university-college community, the PAE provide direction through specific objectives and proposals for all academic, research, student life, financial, campus (physical), and community planning. Although planning and evaluation occurred prior to the PAE, the comprehensiveness, integration, coherence, and implementation of the Plan now guide virtually all aspects of Brown’s efforts to fulfill its mission. The PAE is led and catalyzed by the President and Corporation, but is implemented and supported by the Brown community.

The PAE addresses ten areas - five directed toward academic excellence, and five designed to create the environment and resources to achieve those academic goals (ten strategic goals). The PAE identifies additional, specific priorities that seek to establish and balance educational and research goals for undergraduate, graduate, and medical education. A summary of the inclusive process that was used to create the PAE is in the supporting documents. Each of the PAE’s ten major areas has specific objectives and proposals, and designates senior administrators and faculty committees as responsible for leading, planning and evaluating efforts to achieve the goals. The Plan’s Table of Needs,
which is updated regularly, estimates the financial requirements of goals and lends discipline to the University’s fundraising efforts.

Weekly meetings of senior administrators (the president’s staff and cabinet; and monthly in the case of the executive committee) are held throughout the academic year to maintain communication and discuss major issues. Discussions at these meetings regularly cover university-wide planning and evaluation. These meetings also provide forums for sharing the proposed goals, plans and resources for any area of the university with colleagues from the other areas, ensuring their integration into the PAE.

As part of the PAE initiative in 2002, and to facilitate the creation and implementation of the Plan, including integration with existing planning efforts, the University created the position of executive vice president for planning. Reporting to the president, this new, senior-level role provides leadership for coordination of day-to-day planning efforts. As a member of all senior planning bodies, this position provides consistency, integration, continuity and communication to strategic planning processes, helping to ensure that plans and decision making conform to PAE objectives.

**Academic Planning**

Although the PAE provides broad direction for academic planning, the Provost, as the chief academic officer, has the specific responsibility to lead the planning efforts for all academic programs and activities within the College, the Graduate School, and the Division of Biology and Medicine, including those located in departments, interdisciplinary programs, academic centers, and institutes. Led by the Provost, the senior academic officers and their support staff and committees carry out planning and evaluation functions. Specific academic goals and plans are developed by the Deans of the College, Graduate School, and Biology and Medicine in concert with the academic departments. Like the President, the Provost has weekly meetings with senior academic officers to discuss the status and effectiveness of initiatives and to coordinate academic planning issues.

To further enhance planning coordination, the Provost chairs both the Academic Priorities Committee (APC) and the University Resources Committee (URC), the two deliberative bodies for academic planning and budget allocation. The APC is composed of six senior administrators and six faculty members. The URC members come from the senior administration, faculty, staff and student bodies. Each of these committees sends its recommendations to the Provost’s office for presentation to the President. In the case of academic initiatives, full faculty consideration is also required.

Plans and proposals for new undergraduate courses, modifications to degree programs, and periodic changes to concentrations are typically planned by individual faculty and departments and authorized by the College Curriculum Council (CCC). Similar to the CCC, the Graduate Council and Medical Curriculum Committee (MCC) are responsible for the review and approval of plans for new courses and modification of degree
requirements in the Graduate School and Medical School respectively. A joint subcommittee of the CCC and Graduate Council meets to approve course proposals that are open to both undergraduate and graduate students. Each of these committees is chaired by the senior academic officer responsible for the area and is comprised of faculty, students and staff. Each has approval authority for certain of the plans, but they submit major initiatives and changes to the APC for consideration and approval. The deans are responsible for ensuring that these processes are coordinated and that all ideas and proposals are raised and addressed by the appropriate overseers and done so in a timely and effective manner.

An important factor in academic planning at Brown is the degree to which the senior academic officers work together. As officers of a “university-college” where the same faculty teach both undergraduate and graduate students, the Provost and Deans for undergraduate, graduate and medical education meet frequently to coordinate priorities, discuss resource implications and create plans that work for Brown as a whole.

**Financial Planning**

Financial planning is also a comprehensive and integrated process driven by PAE priorities. Each year the EVP for Finance updates a financial plan. The plan is a ten-year forward projection of revenue and expenditures including general operating expenses and costs related to capital projects. After the President and Corporation approve the operating budget recommendations of the University Resources Committee (URC), the new budget is incorporated in the Plan’s current year data.

The University Resources Committee (URC) (detailed discussion in chapter nine of this document) is the primary planning group responsible for establishing Brown’s operating budgets. While the URC focuses on the upcoming year, it also has responsibility for considering the long-term health and implications of funding decisions. Chaired by the Provost and comprised of faculty, administrators, students and staff, the URC has a well-defined process and rigorous schedule for developing the annual financial plan. After receiving recommendations from senior officers responsible for major budgetary units and other campus departments, the URC and Provost develop budget recommendations for the President. Again it is guided directly in these decisions by the Plan for Academic Enrichment. To communicate goals and priorities, the URC issues an annual report to the President detailing the recommended allocations of resources.

**Capital/Physical Planning**

Driven by goals set by the PAE, the University maintains a capital project plan that identifies construction and project budgets, and annual operating costs for new building construction, renovations and infrastructure investments. Revenue sources for funding capital projects (fundraising, operating revenue and debt) are identified and incorporated into the annual operating budget and long-term financial plans. Estimated costs and
schedules of capital projects are developed by Brown’s Facilities Management Planning and Design department. Because most capital projects can be financed through fundraising, Brown’s Advancement department plays a role in the planning of large projects, and campaign planning is also closely integrated with the Financial Plan.

When the PAE was first proposed, it was clear that a significant level of new construction and renovation would be needed to provide the facilities and environment essential for achieving its academic goals. Based on the work done by planning consultants Kliment & Halsband, the Corporation adopted the Strategic Framework for Physical Planning at Brown University in October 2003. The Strategic Framework was the result of intense study and community involvement over an 18-month period to assess Brown’s physical campus and to provide guidelines for where and how to improve and expand the campus. The framework informs all capital project planning and was the foundation, along with the PAE, for our Institutional Master Plan. A requirement under the Providence zoning ordinances, the Institutional Master Plan is a five-year plan for new building projects and major renovations. This plan also requires an assessment of the impact of building plans on the community and a summary of any efforts to mitigate problems created by construction. The Campus Planning Advisory Board (CPAB), comprised of faculty, staff and students, meets throughout the academic year to review capital project plans and to provide input on planning issues related to the physical campus. A critical role of the CPAB is to ensure that the community has had input at all stages of the planning process before finalized plans move into the implementation phase.

Evaluation

University-wide comprehensive evaluation

When the Plan for Academic Enrichment was approved, the Corporation requested that a set of meaningful performance measurement tools be developed to track progress against PAE goals and objectives. The result was the Strategic Indicators and Measurement Report, a report that is submitted annually to the Corporation and is shared among senior administration and faculty leadership. This report provides data and analysis of current and historical performance across the University in relation to PAE goals, peer institutions or other relevant benchmarks. The Strategic Indicators Report is coordinated by the Provost’s Office and prepared by senior academic officers and the Office of Institutional Research.

Corporation and Senior Administration Retreats

In addition to the Strategic Indicators Report, Brown employs periodic retreats as a tool in evaluating and reflecting on goals, plans, and performance. The Corporation typically has a retreat each year. At the most recent retreat in February 2008, the Corporation discussed and then endorsed the findings and recommendations resulting from the review of the PAE. In February 2007, the Corporation retreat focused on a strategic plan for the Medical School in conjunction with an in-depth discussion of a more ambitious financial
plan to support the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Similarly, the President leads a retreat each year of the Deans, Vice Presidents and other senior administrators focused on larger issues and significant challenges or opportunities. The Provost’s Office, the Dean of the College and the Office of Campus Life and Student Services also conduct regular retreats.

Centralized Institutional Research Function

Since the last NEASC self-evaluation, Brown has significantly increased the efficiency and quality of its institutional evaluation and reporting capabilities in the Office of Institutional Research (IR). The IR office reports to the Provost, providing better coordination with and access to senior academic officers. IR is responsible for the centralized, systematic gathering, analysis, and reporting of institutional data, including data on performance against commonly used student outcome indices (See Historic Data Tables for Enrollment, Instructional Patterns, and Grade Reports.) Brown’s IR also coordinates the input for and analysis of data submitted to higher education reporting organizations and consortia such as IPEDs, Common Data Set, COFHE and AAU, and administers student and alumni surveys. These surveys help us to better understand student and alumni perceptions of Brown’s performance, and they provide valuable data for academic decision making.

Academic Department Reviews

Brown regularly evaluates its academic departments, centers and institutes. “Cluster reviews” of all departments were completed between 1999 and 2003. These evaluations included both internal assessment and extensive input from external reviewers. In 2006-07, Brown launched another round of departmental reviews, with a long-term plan to review four to eight departments and programs per year, using external reviewers. The current plan is for a ten-year cycle for reviewing all departments. A set of external review guidelines was created to provide a structured process and suggest self-study questions. Brown also provides a set of standard data items including the report from the prior cluster review, to each department at the outset of a review. In 2006-07, Hispanic Studies, History and Psychology participated in the review process. In 2007-08, external reviews were completed for the departments of Africana Studies and Comparative Literature as well as Program in Dance, the Master’s of Art Teaching Program and the Pembroke Center.

The Graduate Council conducts a review of each graduate program on a five-year rotating schedule. Beginning in 2008-09, these graduate program reviews follow the External Reviews of departments and focus on forward-looking plans resulting from the feedback in the External Review and departmental self-study.

Regular Evaluation and Feedback Processes

To further strengthen the academic evaluation and planning processes, department chairs meet with the Dean of the Faculty and Provost. Each spring the Dean of the Faculty
meets with each department chair reviewing general departmental activity and each faculty member’s performance. The Dean of the Graduate School meets with the Directors of Graduate Studies and the chairs each fall. Multidisciplinary and other academic centers are required to provide an annual report to the Provost. Faculty committees also submit annual reports addressing goals and work accomplished over the year. The reports are presented to the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) for discussion and feedback and are then presented to the full faculty. In 2006-07, FEC surveyed all faculty committees to assess effectiveness, efficiency and ideas for improvement.

**Appraisal**

This section provides an assessment of Brown’s planning and evaluation activities described in the previous section. Because the activities are now fully integrated, this section appraises them in toto, rather than individually.

**Successful University-wide planning**

The Plan for Academic Enrichment has clearly addressed the gaps and shortcomings in our planning processes that were pointed out in the 1998 NEASC visiting team report. As a comprehensive plan that provides a vision of how Brown seeks to fulfill its academic mission, the PAE has provided structure, focus, and broad community participation and support for a set of strategic goals and decisions. In short, the Plan has given overall direction to the many planning and evaluation efforts, organizations and processes that have existed for years. The Plan’s role is reinforced regularly in senior administration (President’s Staff, Cabinet, and Executive Committee) discussions, where decisions and priorities are often tested to see how they advance or fit into the PAE.

What may be less clear for some at Brown is how individual aspirations and ideas within a department get formalized into proposals and make their way through the organization to get approved. There is a documented process, for example, for proposing a new undergraduate course through the College Curriculum Committee, whereby the proposal undergoes a screening process. If the proposal overlaps with Graduate School activities, the Graduate School Council is brought into the discussion. The Deans of the College and Graduate School are working together to ensure that, whatever path is followed, the decisions are all based on the same criteria, serve the goals of the Plan, and are coordinated with other actions being taken to implement the Plan.

This particular system – and effectiveness of the Plan – depends on effective communication and coordination among the deans and administrators. Through leadership, organization and a common vision, the major planning functions – academic, financial and campus planning – now are tied together. The best indication of this unity is the number of improvements made or under way since 2002, by developing and adhering to the Plan.
A factor contributing to the success of the PAE is that, from its inception, the planning process was inclusive and iterative, involving intense, broad-based community discussion and deliberation. More than five years into the PAE, Brown continues to rely on it as the foundation for University-wide direction and decision-making. As discussed in detail in the Financial Resources standard, PAE investments to date are substantial and consistent with the priorities of the Plan. The Plan, URC Annual Reports and the Table of Needs provide substantial detail to support the assessment of available resources, financial commitments and priorities.

Another demonstration of the success of the Plan is that record levels of financial support have been generated by the Campaign for Academic Enrichment and, the overwhelming majority of the resources in the Campaign have been directed toward the priorities established in the Plan.

Brown’s new faculty sabbatical policy illustrates how university-wide goals and planning can have a major impact on the institution. To better recruit and retain faculty and promote research, there was an acknowledged need for a more liberal leave policy. However an augmented leave policy could not be implemented until the faculty grew to a size sufficient to provide adequate academic offerings, class sizes and student advisors. As net growth approached the PAE goal of 100 new faculty, the new sabbatical policy was launched in the fall of 2007.

Detailed information about the Plan and how it is being implemented are regularly evaluated and communicated to the Brown community through PAE Status Reports. These Status Reports are issued once per semester and distributed to all students, faculty, staff, alumni leadership and Corporation members, and are posted on the PAE website. These status reports not only provide the community with information on how we are doing, but also serve as a regular reminder to all members of the community that the PAE is a relevant, vital and critical centerpiece to Brown’s planning and evaluation activities.

Commitment to ongoing, periodic assessment

Brown’s planning processes are better coordinated than they were five years ago, but the University’s evaluation efforts continue to undergo improvements. We now have sufficient results under the PAE to begin in earnest the evaluation and revision phases of the work. The details of this effort are described in the “Evaluation” and “Institutional Effectiveness” sections.

An example of how periodic assessment informs University-wide planning is the 2006-07 external review of the Psychology Department. Based on an earlier analysis, the Department of Cognitive and Linguistics Sciences department was slated to occupy a new building that was being planned for this purpose. The reviewers performing the external review of the Psychology Department pointed out the potential advantages of using this building project to bring together Cognitive and Linguistic Sciences (CLS), Psychology, and our young but strong Brain Sciences Program. More importantly, the
review process advanced the concept of combining Psychology and CLS into a single, unified academic department. As these ideas gained momentum, a planning effort was launched that resulted in a decision to combine the two departments and include them with the Brain Science program in a larger new building. The enlarged department and building will expand our capacity to excel in research and better serve students. Although the departments will not formally unite until 2010, planning is already under way as they begin to coordinate curriculum and reduce overlap. This department review and decision in turn triggered adjustments in academic, capital and campus plans.

Other examples of Brown’s commitment to reassess institutional effectiveness are the reviews of the Plan for Academic Enrichment, the undergraduate curriculum and the Graduate School conducted during the 2007-2008 academic year. Each was led by senior administrator with a defined structure and process, broad representation, and openness to new ideas. These reviews have helped to define changes in goals, strategies and measurement. All three reviews involved soliciting input from across the Brown community to ensure that diverse opinions and suggestions are considered.

As discussed in the Organization and Governance standard, Brown conducted a major review of its Corporation and faculty-based committees to improve their effectiveness. This review resulted in a significant reduction in the number of standing committees and the adoption of more current, relevant charges. In addition, a number of advisory and community councils were established, with internal and external membership to advise on current institutional issues and to help assess the effectiveness of planning and evaluation activities. These councils, which meet regularly throughout the academic year, have provided valuable input to the President and senior administration.

**Making better use of institutional data**

While much progress has been made in Brown’s planning and evaluation efforts and a great deal of work is under way, this self-assessment process has helped identify a number of important areas for attention that can help Brown better fulfill its planning and evaluation functions.

Over the last ten years Brown has substantially improved its collection and analysis of institutional data. Through the creation of the Office of Institutional Research, Brown has a centralized department responsible for this vital function. However, the broader Brown community does not yet take full advantage of available information. Many department chairs are not aware of the wealth of information on course enrollment, grade distribution, sponsored research success, and student satisfaction that could be incorporated into departmental planning. We recently took steps to provide some of these data to department chairs on a regular basis. Once there is more awareness and utilization of standardized reports, better planning, goal setting and performance evaluation can advance.
Brown only recently completed a major upgrade of its student records system by instituting BANNER. This multiyear project consolidated multiple stand-alone systems, which should increase considerably the quality and timeliness of available data for evaluation purposes. Improved reporting is a major goal of the conversion although much work remains to be done to build interfaces and train so that Brown can take full advantage of data available in the new system. Through improved reporting from BANNER, IR and the academic units can more quickly and independently retrieve, report and analyze myriad data such as class enrollment, grading, teaching assignments, and concentration trends. With BANNER, Brown has the potential to produce better data to departments, but must give time and attention to precise reporting initiatives to ensure they are implemented in the near-term.

**Disciplined implementation of the department review process:**

We are also working to formalize the department review process that is being reinvigorated. Effective leadership, planning and evaluation at the departmental level are essential to Brown’s success in implementing its plans and achieving its goals. The Provost is working with department chairs to set leadership expectations and outline ways for chairs to establish vision, assess strengths and weaknesses and make difficult decisions. As departments better understand their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement, they will push for positive change and increased resources. Potential changes in resource funding for space allocation, faculty positions, and other improvements provide incentives for departments to make a case, since resources are typically allocated to departments who make a compelling case and take a proactive approach. Regular, documented departmental evaluations and plans to address areas of weakness will go a long way toward better understanding of curricular needs and resource planning. Brown had a good start in 1999-2001 with the cluster reviews and is using the data and lessons learned in that process. We expect that the departmental reviews that began in 2006-07 will be even more valuable.

The departmental review process should be designed to include a certain level of standardization to ensure thoroughness and quality. Reviews normally start with a self-study by the department. The self-study includes a compilation and analysis of common data, such as courses offered, grade distributions, number of concentrators, and research funding, evaluations of undergraduate concentrations and graduate programs, and a common set of questions to address. Also, as occurred in the cluster reviews, external, peer evaluators are included in the process.

**Projection**

With the recently completed review of the Plan for Academic Enrichment and the reviews done by the Task Force on Undergraduate Education and the Working Group on Graduate Education, Brown has committed itself to meaningful and productive evaluation, discussion and planning efforts.
The Plan for Academic Enrichment - Phase II has resulted in strong support for the original goals but also a clear set of priorities as we move forward. The Phase II recommendations include specific goals and objectives to further improve our undergraduate education, increase our global offerings and presence and strengthen targeted academic departments. These areas of focus are consistent with the findings and recommendations from the Task Force and Working Group. We now need to integrate recommendations, draft implementation plans and develop measurements to gauge progress. The Provost will develop a process towards these goals by working with the senior academic deans and other groups throughout the 2008-2009 academic year.

Brown has much to be proud of in the design, implementation and initial success of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Through the PAE, Brown has successfully integrated its mission, vision, and strategic planning with the more established functions of academic, financial and campus planning. As we move to the next phase of the PAE, the in-depth evaluations of the undergraduate curriculum and Graduate School should yield more detailed priorities and goals for the next five to ten years. Brown will find ways to better develop and incorporate institutional data in its evaluation processes, improve the communication and distribution of data that already exist, develop a more disciplined and structured departmental review process, and seek and incorporate external perspectives in planning and evaluation efforts. In 2009, the provost will charge one of the associate provosts with oversight of these tasks.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

Three major assessments of Brown’s goals, plans and outcomes were launched in 2007-08. All three were designed to provide an essential feedback mechanism for the Brown community to discuss our effectiveness as an institution, what we should do differently and what plans and resources are necessary to accomplish our most important goals.

In the spring of 2007, the University launched a comprehensive review of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. When the Plan was adopted, Brown committed itself to periodic assessment of the Plan’s success, and identification of any adjustments needed to meet the evolving and growing needs of the institution. The review was completed in January 2008, and the findings and recommendations were endorsed by the Corporation in February 2008. The Plan for Academic Enrichment – Phase II is under way and features a refined set of priorities for the coming years. This review process not only confirmed the original goals and objectives of the Plan, but also provided specific areas on which to focus, in order for Brown to reflect current priorities and to adjust to changes in higher education.

The Task Force on Undergraduate Education was charged in 2007 with assessing and making recommendations on general education, advising, concentrations, and pedagogy and assessment. The recommendations which are discussed in the Area of Emphasis
section of this report call for a variety of proposed changes and in the coming months and years.

The Graduate School also embarked on a comprehensive evaluation of its immediate needs and long-range plans. The Working Group on Graduate Education evaluated the size of the Graduate School, offerings, curricular strengths and weaknesses, resources provided to graduate students, and the ways the graduate students contribute to teaching at the College. This evaluation process was informed by Phase II of the Plan and has provided the basis for creating a long-term plan to advance and support the Graduate School at Brown.

All three of these reviews were comprehensive evaluation processes with specific charges, organizational structures, and timelines. Faculty, students, and alumni involvement are incorporated through various committee work associated with these initiatives and public meetings and surveys.
Standard Three: Organization and Governance

Overview

In 1998, the final report of the evaluation team representing the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges made the following recommendation:

"As noted in the section on Planning and Evaluation, Brown's planning and governance structures are involved and complex. One of Brown's comparative advantages is its relatively small size and the ability to respond quickly that small size often permits. A streamlining and simplification of its governance structures will allow the university to exploit this advantage more fully."

In late 2001, the President addressed this recommendation by encouraging a restructuring of Faculty and Corporation governance. By 2003, Brown had streamlined the governance of its Faculty, the Corporation and the administration. The restructuring process sought to ensure that Brown University's governance is transparent, credible, effective, efficient, and participatory. During the 2007-2008 academic year, Brown reviewed the effectiveness of this restructuring and its findings prompted it to further streamline its governance.

Overall, Brown finds that these measures have resulted in clarified responsibilities and improved communication across its governance structure.

Description

Corporation

Brown is governed by the Brown University Corporation, composed of a twelve-member Board of Fellows with the President as presiding officer, and a forty-two member Board of Trustees, headed by the Chancellor. The Corporation’s powers and duties are set forth in its charter, granted in 1764 by the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. The Corporation’s standing committees perform oversight and advisory functions and provide guidance and advice to the Corporation.

The Corporation has four main committees: Academic Affairs, Advancement, Budget and Finance, and Campus Life. Each member of the Corporation must serve on one of these committees; the President, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Treasurer, Secretary and the Chair of the Nominating Committee may serve on more than one of these committees. The Corporation’s remaining responsibilities are assigned to the Facilities and Design, Audit, Investment, Medical School, Nominating, Trustee Vacancies and Advisory and Executive Committees. Chairs are appointed by the Nominating committee for one-year terms, which are
renewable for a maximum of six years. One-year terms permit an annual assessment of performance, and the six-year limit ensures periodic change of leadership. Specific committee responsibilities are defined in the Corporation’s bylaws and in the Trusteeship article *Restructuring for Good Governance.*

The Corporation meets three times per year. It has final authority and responsibility for all policy and strategy. Its bylaws, known as statutes, define its committees and charges. The full Corporation approves all major strategic initiatives, such as the Plan for Academic Enrichment, the University budget, and capital projects. The Board of Fellows approves all degrees and academic programs. They meet twice a year with Faculty leaders. Members of the Corporation interact regularly with students.

The Advisory and Executive Committee meets quarterly and as needed between Corporation meetings to act on items that need timely approval or cannot wait until the next Corporation meeting. This Committee has no other charge but serves to advise the President on formal matters that may arise between Corporation meetings.

Each of the Corporation’s standing committees meets at least three times annually and submits an annual report to the Corporation. A committee may invite senior administrative officers to its meetings to report on specific areas. Items requiring Faculty review must first be submitted to a faculty committee, and cannot be initiated and submitted solely by the administration. For example, the budget must be submitted through the University Resources Committee (URC), tenure recommendations through the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC) and new academic programs through the Academic Priorities Committee (APC). This ensures that the proper constituencies are heard and that the established process is respected. All items requiring approval are first submitted to the administration’s Corporation Office, which reviews them to ensure that the proper process has been followed.

The Corporation appoints its members internally. Of the 42 trustees, 14 are elected by alumni pursuant to an agreement between the Corporation and the Alumni Association. These 14 trustees include the current and two past Brown Alumni Association chairs, and eleven others elected to six year terms. Careful selection of internally appointed trustees and those elected through the alumni ensures that Corporation members have the professional and personal backgrounds needed to meet their fiduciary and oversight responsibilities. Each member signs a conflict of interest statement placing them under a continuing obligation to disclose any real or potential conflict that exists or may arise. The new members’ orientation program reviews for them the organization of the Corporation, its mission, governance reforms, committee functions, and the conflict of interest policy.

The Corporation appoints the President, whose performance is reviewed annually by the Senior Administration Committee. The Committee composed of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Treasurer and Secretary meets with the President at the end of the academic year to set goals for the coming year.

Immediately upon the conclusion of each Corporation meeting, the President distributes campus-wide community notices detailing the actions taken by the Corporation in its business meeting
and providing a sense of the matters and issues discussed by the committees and the Corporation as a whole during the weekend. This ensures the transparency of the actions taken.

Faculty

Brown views Faculty governance as including not only the management of matters affecting the Faculty, such as Faculty appointments, promotions, tenure, creation and abolition of academic units, evaluation of Faculty merit and salaries, and academic budgets, but also Faculty participation in the process of setting Brown’s academic priorities. The Faculty’s authority and responsibilities are detailed in the Faculty Rules and Regulations (FRR), approved and updated regularly by the Faculty. The Faculty meets monthly during the academic year. Its business is supervised by the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), whose principal tasks are a) to investigate and report on matters of concern to the Faculty not in the purview of other committees, b) receive, discuss and forward to the Faculty reports of these committees, c) set the agenda for Faculty meetings with the President and Secretary of the Faculty, d) periodically review Faculty governance, and e) serve as a conduit between the Faculty and the Administration, Corporation, and students concerning Faculty issues. In this last capacity, the FEC meets monthly with the President, the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty and twice a year with the Corporation and with undergraduate, graduate and medical students.

The Faculty uses its committees to maintain the integrity and quality of academic programs. The most important of these is the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC), which makes recommendations to the Provost concerning individual Faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure cases. The Faculty supervises the curriculum through the College Curriculum Council (CCC), chaired by the Dean of the College, and the Graduate Council, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Faculty advises the Administration on Faculty compensation, benefits, and leave through its Faculty Committee on Equity and Diversity (CFED). The CFED, also advises the Faculty generally on practices relating to diversity and non-discrimination.

The Faculty participates in the process of setting priorities for the University through its Academic Priorities Committee (APC), chaired by the Provost. The Committee has six Faculty members and six senior members of the Administration. The Faculty advises the President concerning the university budget through its membership on the University Resources Committee (URC), which is chaired by the Provost and whose membership also includes student and staff representatives. Members of the Faculty advise senior members of the Administration through membership on Administrative Advisory Boards.

Medical curriculum matters are addressed by the Biomedical Faculty Council, the Medical Curriculum Committee, and the Biology Curriculum Committee. All decisions to adopt new or abolish existing programs, or change the status of existing programs must first be approved by the APC, and then referred to the FEC and scheduled for action by the Faculty.

Academic departments initiate tenure decisions and submit them to the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee (TPAC). If the TPAC confirms a tenure decision it submits it to the
Provost for approval. If the Provost approves a recommendation from TPAC, he/she forwards it to the President for Corporation approval. Medical Faculty appointments to Associate and full Professor ranks, while not tenured, are submitted to the Committee on Medical Faculty Appointments (CMFA), whose members include campus-based medical Faculty. If the CMFA confirms the appointment decision, it submits it to the Provost for approval. If the Provost approves the recommendation, he/she forwards it to the President for Corporation approval.

The Administration appoints chairs of academic departments. Chairs participate in a half-day orientation session at the start of each academic year. Chairs and department managers also attend an annual workshop on hiring, annual reviews, contract renewals, tenure, and promotion. The Provost holds monthly meetings of Department Chairs and Directors of Centers, Programs and Institutes.

Administration

President Simmons is assisted by her staff, composed of the Provost, the Executive Vice President (EVP) for Planning, the EVP for Finance and Administration, the Senior Vice President for Corporation Affairs and Governance, the Cabinet, composed of 18 members of the senior administration, and by the Executive Committee, composed of the Cabinet and 15 members of the senior administration, including the Chairs of the FEC and the MFEC. The President meets weekly with the Senior Staff and Cabinet and monthly with the Executive Committee.

The Cabinet holds a two-day retreat every August to discuss long-range strategic planning with the President. From these discussions the President and Cabinet determine the planning agenda for the remainder of the year. This agenda guides much of the year-long work of Corporation committees and administrative planning.

The Provost is the chief academic officer of the University, whose direct reports include the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences. Between them, the Deans of the Faculty supervise all of Brown’s academic departments. Other Deans and officers reporting to the Provost are the Deans of the College and Graduate School, the University Librarian, the Vice Presidents for Research, International Affairs, and Computing and Information Services, the Dean of Admissions, and the Director of Financial Aid. The senior deans supervise the undergraduate and graduate curricula and handle academic discipline and advising. The Dean of Admissions and the Director of Financial Aid supervise undergraduate admissions and financial aid, respectively. The Dean of the Graduate School carries out these duties for the Graduate School. The Vice President for Research supervises the Office of Supported Programs as well as the intellectual property rights staff.

The Provost meets regularly with academic department chairs, the Academic Priorities Committee, the URC and all other committees of which he is Chair. The EVP for Finance and Administration convenes the administrative leadership monthly to discuss topics of interest and to hear presentations from other administrators or Faculty.
The President meets frequently with members of the Brown community. She chairs monthly Faculty meetings during the academic year, and meets monthly with Faculty officers and officers of the Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS). She also meets once per semester with the UCS executive board and attends at least one open UCS meeting per semester. The President meets annually with the Staff Advisory Council and, upon request, with the Medical Student Senate, Graduate Student Council and Medical Faculty Executive Committee. President Simmons has also established the Brown University Community Council, a broad-based group of Faculty, students, administrators and alumni which meets three times per semester. The Council discusses issues that are of current interest and concern to the community at large.

**Student Government**

Three organizations - the Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS), the Graduate Student Council (GSC) and the Medical Student Senate (MSS) – constitute Brown’s student governance structure.

UCS consists of a seven member elected Executive Board and over 40 representatives committed to serving Brown's undergraduate community. Every member of the undergraduate student body who obtains the signatures of a certain number of the members of the undergraduate student body on a Petition of Election shall become an At-Large Member of the UCS, as long as the student maintains a good attendance record.

Student members serve one-year terms. The UCS has seven subgroups: the Internal Affairs Committee, the Academic and Administrative Affairs Committee, the Admissions and Student Services Committee, the Campus Life Committee, the Student Activities Committee, the Appointments Committee and the Communications Committee. The UCS meets weekly each semester and interacts regularly with the administration, the Corporation Committee on Campus Life, and the Officers of the Faculty Executive Committee.

The Graduate Student Council (GSC) is Brown’s political and social organization for over 1,700 graduate students. It has representatives from each department who elect its officers from the graduate student population. Its goals are to foster a sense of community among graduate students across departments and to offer a voice for Brown’s graduate student population within the University and the Providence area. The GSC meets monthly, interacts regularly with the Deans of the Graduate School, and meets once a semester with the Officers of the Faculty Executive Committee.

The Medical Student Senate (MSS) represents Brown’s medical students before the University administration and coordinates activities between student advocates and the medical student population. It serves as a forum for student political and social activities and is responsible for establishing task forces to investigate pertinent issues. It maintains communications with University committees, monitors and distributes funds acquired from student activity fees, and coordinates elections of committee members and Student Senate committee members. Senate membership includes, but is not restricted to, its four elected Executive Committee officials, class representatives, elected committee representatives, appointed committee members, an
MD/PhD representative and a representative of the Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME).

Students serve on many of the university committees whose work directly affects them or their interests. These include the Campus Planning Advisory Board, the College Curriculum Council, the Library Advisory Board, the URC, the Commencement Speakers Committee, the Faculty Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admissions Committee, the Diversity Advisory Board, the Campus Life Advisory Board, the Computing Advisory Board, the Campus Life-Subcommittee on Athletics and Physical Education, the Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies, and the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees. Students also serve on the President’s Brown University Community Council, the University Creative Arts Council, and the University Disciplinary Council.

Appraisal

Since 2001, when President Simmons took office, Brown has undergone comprehensive reviews of its Corporation and Faculty governance as well as of its administrative structure. The resulting changes have streamlined operations, improved communication and strengthened accountability.

President Simmons encountered a proliferation of committees, vague expectations and a lack of accountability. In 2002-2003, the Corporation undertook a comprehensive review of itself. Its officers and selected other members led a study group that reviewed best practices at similar institutions, interviewed current and emeriti members and drew up a set of recommendations, which were approved by the Corporation in May 2003. This major governance restructuring resulted in a number of significant changes, including reductions in the number (from 21 to 11) and size of the various committees to ensure greater levels of engagement and accountability among the members for the work of their committees; a reorganization of the meeting schedule to allow more time for meaningful strategic discussions; and the creation of advisory and leadership councils to engage more former members of the Corporation, alumni, and friends in the life of the University. The goals of the 2003 changes enabled the Corporation to be more effective as a governance body, provide more time during the year for strategic, policy-level discussions, and provide individual members of the Corporation with a rewarding and meaningful volunteer experience. That structure has now been in place for five full academic years. We do believe that it has had a significant positive impact on the ability of the Corporation to carry out its responsibilities and make the best decisions.

Following the reorganization of Corporation committees, Brown adopted term limits for Trustees and Fellows. Trustees may now serve only two non-consecutive six-year terms and Fellows one eleven-year term. This provides more flexibility for service in the Corporation and ensures that Brown regularly receives new perspectives. As part of the periodic charter review and goal setting done by Corporation committees, last year the Audit Committee and Budget & Finance Committee charters were updated and revised to reflect current operations.
The Corporation continually assesses its performance and functioning. Chancellor Tisch continued that self-reflection last year, the first year of his term as Chancellor. At its May meeting last spring, the Corporation discussed its own governance on which input and opinions had been received from members of the community. It concerned input received from the Undergraduate Council of Students, which met with the Chancellor earlier in the spring regarding the idea of a young alumni trustee, and the Faculty leadership, which meets regularly with the Board of Fellows. Coming out of that meeting, the Corporation decided to undertake a review this year of its governance. This review is not intended to replicate the in-depth self-examination and significant restructuring undertaken in 2003. Rather, they are undertaking an interim review with a particular focus on two questions:

a) How should the Corporation organize itself to acquire the information it needs to make the best decisions?

b) Is the Corporation conducting its business in a manner that leads to well-informed decisions?

Over a period of many years Faculty governance had also seen a proliferation of committees with overlapping responsibilities. Many Faculty members spoke of a lack of transparency, which in their view reduced opportunities for broad-based, meaningful participation. In February 2002 the FEC created the Task Force on Faculty Governance, an ad hoc committee charged with recommending changes to the Faculty Rules and Regulations and administrative procedures that would restore to the Faculty its important and appropriate role in the governance of Brown University. The Task Force, which finished its work in 2003, recommended a streamlined committee structure. It replaced 44 committees with a mix of 15 committees and 9 administrative advisory boards designed "to advise a senior administrator (who is its Chair) on resources and priorities for which the senior administrator has responsibility."

This streamlining process, by reducing redundancy among Faculty committees, eliminated a source of frustration in those Faculty members who believed their contributions were unimportant since they were replicated elsewhere. Reducing the overall number of Faculty seats on committees also made it easier to identify motivated participants. The reorganization clarified the roles of the committees, set clear expectations and established lines of accountability. For example, the URC reports to the President, who uses those recommendations as the basis for her recommended budget to the Corporation Budget & Finance Committee.

The Faculty recently conducted an interim evaluation of its governance, which was mandated by a resolution introduced by the Task Force on Faculty Governance. The purpose of the review was to evaluate the impact of the re-organization completed in 2003. In March 2008 it received a report from the FEC making various recommendations for greater Faculty participation and changes to committee structures. The FEC found that some committees overlapped and that others have been superseded. There are currently nineteen Faculty committees.

In May 2008, the Faculty adopted several of these recommendations. The Faculty Affairs Committee, Committee on Diversity in Hiring and Committee on the Status of Women were merged to form a new Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity. The University Curriculum Committee was abolished and its responsibilities allocated to a joint sub-committee of the
College Curriculum Council and the Graduate Council that approves program proposals that overlap both programs. Other recommendations in the report are still undergoing review and discussion.

The addition of several new senior level administrative positions has improved efficiency and clarified responsibilities. Brown has appointed senior officers dedicated to planning, investments, research, international education and diversity. These officers provide leadership and guidance in their areas of responsibility as well as serve to coordinate the many activities within the University that support particular goals. In addition, the reorganization of Alumni Relations under the general workings of the Office of Advancement has improved the coordination of outreach and fund raising. All of these changes have resulted in more effective decision making and have reduced redundancy in functions. The creation of the Executive Vice President for Planning has made the planning function more prominent, by investing the position with responsibility and accountability. For example, the incumbent has been able to move quickly to facilitate the University’s growth through a series of real estate acquisitions adjacent to the campus and in nearby neighborhoods.

**Projection**

Organizational restructuring and governance changes are not one-time efforts. Not only do they require strategic thinking and endorsement from various constituencies, but they also require re-assessment. In this regard, there are several ongoing projects.

The recent governance review identified areas in need of greater Faculty and Administration consultation. Among these are clarification of the proper processes for making policy changes that affect the Faculty, establishment of procedures for better soliciting Faculty input on administrative matters such as Banner, and reassessing the balance of administrator and Faculty responsibility on committees and boards.

The FEC intends to launch a comprehensive examination of curriculum management, with the goal of creating a more collaborative environment, with greater dialogue and consultation between the Faculty and the Administration. Managing this process and coming to appropriate conclusions will be a challenge, especially given the wide scope of recommendations in the current Faculty governance review. Given its complexity, the review may not be complete until 2009.

The Corporation is experiencing more turnovers in membership than in the past. This is largely attributable to the term limits imposed by the recent review. This in turn requires us to revisit the content of our orientation and education programs for new members, especially in light of the recent economic and public policy pressures on higher education. In this complex environment, Corporation members will need more background information than previously if they are to make informed decisions.

The same consideration must be given to our Faculty. Due to rapid growth and normal turnover, significant numbers of Faculty members have arrived since the Faculty governance changes.
began. Educating them about their role in the governance process is important and requires further attention. The revisions to the outdated Handbook for Academic Administration, which the Provost will complete by Spring of 2009, will help us in this effort.

Acting promptly and appropriately on these recommendations, continuing to evaluate and assess governance at Brown, and identifying the right people for the right positions, as President Simmons has noted, are the challenges facing Brown in this area, as it moves into one of the most dynamic periods in its history.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

The university reviewed and revised its governance structure during a two-year process from 2001 to 2003. An assessment of these revisions is underway. The Faculty conducted an interim evaluation of its governance in 2007-2008. Several of the recommendations from that report were adopted by the Faculty in May 2008 and more are being considered. The Corporation is undergoing its own interim assessment of its governance. This review is not intended to replicate the in-depth self-examination and significant restructuring undertaken in 2003. Rather, they are undertaking an interim review focused on membership and organization, as well as business practices. These processes, and their recommendations, demonstrate the importance of periodic self evaluations and adapting university governance to reflect the evolving nature of an academic institution. It underscores the necessity and utility of a continued cycle of review, change and assessment to which Brown is committed.
Standard Four: Area of Emphasis: The Undergraduate Academic Program

Overview

Like many institutions dedicated to the liberal arts, Brown has traditionally encouraged its undergraduates to study broadly and deeply, to become self-reflective, and to develop a moral core. But twice in its history, the institution was challenged to do more. In 1850, Brown’s fourth president, Francis Wayland, argued for greater freedom in the undergraduate curriculum, so that every student could “study what he chose, all that he chose, and nothing but what he chose.” A century later, in 1969, another group of reformers — this time composed of students and faculty — outlined an even more ambitious plan to realize Wayland’s vision for a new generation. They called it the New Curriculum. Placing fresh emphasis on the “liberal” aspect of the liberal arts, the New Curriculum gave students the right to choose, the right to fail, and above all the freedom to direct their own education. For almost forty years this embrace of independence has defined Brown’s place in the landscape of undergraduate education in the United States.

A modern liberal arts education is defined in terms of a core curriculum comprised of several areas of knowledge. At Brown, rather than specifying these areas, we challenge students to develop their own core. Over their four years of study, our students sample courses in the humanities, the social sciences, the life sciences, and the physical sciences. But the real challenge is to make connections between those courses, using the perspective gained from one discipline as a window onto the next. The Brown curriculum is based on the belief that student choice, exercised in collaboration with engaged faculty advisors, fosters students’ abilities to think independently and from multiple vantage points, to practice habits of self-reflection and empathy, and to take responsibility for their educational development. The ultimate goal of such a curriculum is to create citizens who are at home in a world of multiplicity and change.

Description

Brown’s undergraduate college enrolls nearly 6,000 students. The College offers two types of four-year baccalaureate degrees: the Bachelor of Arts (A.B.) and the Bachelor of Science (Sc.B.). A combined five-year program enables a small number of students to graduate with both an A.B. and a Sc.B. Exceptionally capable students may combine their last year or two of undergraduate study with graduate study, resulting in the simultaneous completion of both a Baccalaureate and a Master’s degree.

Select groups of first-year students are accepted to the Program in Liberal Medical Education, which they complete before entering the Warren Alpert Medical School at Brown or the five-year Brown-RISD Dual Degree program, in which students earn an A.B. from Brown and a Bachelor of Fine Arts from the Rhode Island School of Design.
Students enrolled in these programs must meet certain requirements beyond Brown’s standard undergraduate degree requirements.

In order to graduate with a Brown baccalaureate degree, students must meet the following requirements:

1. Successfully complete at least 30 courses, 15 of which must be taken at Brown
2. Successfully complete a concentration (major)
3. Demonstrate proficiency in writing
4. Meet Brown’s 8-semester enrollment requirement
5. Be in residence at Brown for four semesters of full-time study during the fall and spring academic terms

Brown offers 95 standard concentrations (majors) that lead to either the Sc.B. or the A.B. degree. In keeping with the philosophy of the open curriculum, students may design an independent concentration if standard departmental offerings do not match their interests. Students may complete two concentrations during a regular four-year program; Brown does not offer minors. Descriptions of all standard concentrations are published in Brown’s Course Announcement Bulletin and on departmental web sites.

Written work that students submit for Brown courses is expected to meet baseline standards for effective written communication. Students whose work does not meet these standards are referred to the Associate Dean of the College for Writing, who guides each of them in working out a program to improve their writing skills. A student might take one or more English courses, enroll in a Writing Fellows course, or work with a writing associate at Brown’s Writing Center.

To maintain good academic standing in progress towards a degree, a student will ordinarily pass 4 courses each semester. Full-time students may enroll in a maximum of five courses per semester, and may take as few as three courses in a semester if doing so will not bring them below the level of good academic standing. Courses taken at Brown during the summer may improve a student's academic standing in the following semester.

To complete their degree requirements, Brown students must be enrolled full-time for the equivalent of eight semesters of instruction, four of which must be in residence at Brown during the fall or spring semesters. Up to four semesters of enrollment credit may be given for advanced placement credits, college-level work completed before Brown, or approved study completed post-matriculation during the school year at another accredited institution in the United States or abroad. Students who successfully complete four summer session courses at Brown may request a waiver of the eighth semester of the enrollment requirement.

At Brown, students design their own general education programs in consultation with faculty and other advisors who encourage broad inquiry and liberal learning. Two major publications sent to accepted students in May and June articulate the goals of a liberal education and explain students’ roles and responsibilities in the advising partnership.
They are *Guide to Brown* and *Planning Your Liberal Education*. Substantive emails sent weekly during the summer inform students about curricular advising programs and course placement for science, math, foreign language, and English courses. Once at Brown, students meet in small groups with their faculty advisors and student peer advisors to discuss their academic interests and to plan their course of study. Approximately 25% of the incoming class is paired with an advisor in the Curricular Advising Program (CAP), in which students elect to take a course taught by their advisor. Another 45 students successfully apply to participate in the University-Community Academic Advising Program ([UCAAP](http://www.ucaap.org)), which pairs students with faculty advisors whose academic work connects with service in the community.

Approximately 75% of Brown sophomores remain with their first-year faculty advisors, while the remaining 25% are assigned to new advisors or work with faculty advisors in the [Randall Sophomore Advisor Program](http://www.randallsophomoreadvisorprogram.org). Sophomores are also urged to seek out concentration advisors, with whom they can explore their interest in declaring particular concentrations. To gain admission to a concentration program, all sophomores submit a written proposal outlining their objectives in choosing the concentration and listing the specific courses they intend to take. This proposal functions as a contract, and is signed jointly by the student and the concentration advisor for the relevant department or program. Once the concentration form is signed, the departmental concentration advisor becomes the student’s advisor for the remainder of his or her time at Brown. Student learning in the concentrations is also supported by Department Undergraduate Groups (DUGs), which provide peer advising and build community among concentrators.

The University places a premium on opportunities for students to engage in independent work with faculty. Most academic departments offer independent research or reading courses. Students may also initiate, design, and execute independent study projects with the help of faculty advisors. Group Independent Study Projects (GISPs) allow students and faculty to develop credit-bearing courses that are not a regular part of the Brown curriculum. On average, 27 GISPs were completed in each of the last four years. The University also sponsors programs that fund student research, including student-faculty research collaborations. These include Undergraduate Teaching and Research Awards (UTRAs), the Royce Fellowship Program, the Howard R. Swearer Public Service Fellowship, and the Mellon Mays Fellowship Program.

Student learning is also supported by the Curricular Resource Center, the Writing Center, and the Writing Fellows Program. The Math Resource Center and the nascent Science Center, described later in this report, provide academic support, tutoring, and a network of faculty and peer advisors for students in math, science, and engineering. Brown’s [Women in Science and Engineering (WiSE) Program](http://www.wise.brown.edu) and [New Scientist Program (NSP)](http://www.nspbrown.org) recruit and retain women and students from underrepresented minority groups in the sciences. With an active membership of over 350 students and faculty from all fields of science, WiSE and NSP sponsor mentoring programs and affinity groups, help students access tutoring services and information about research opportunities, and partially fund students’ attendance at science-related conferences.
The Dean of the College oversees the undergraduate curriculum and plays a central role in the articulation, development, and continuing support of Brown’s educational philosophy and commitment to excellence in liberal arts education. Each academic department, program, and center is responsible for approving its concentrators’ academic plans and for periodically evaluating concentrators’ academic progress. These units also periodically evaluate their curricular cohesiveness and procedures as well as the nature, quality, and extent of student learning and achievement. Such reviews are timed to coincide with external program reviews. Departmental and concentration self-studies are forwarded to the College Curriculum Council (CCC), which is charged with evaluating existing programs and approving new academic courses and programs. The CCC submits annual reports to the Faculty Executive Committee for discussion and approval by the faculty at one of its monthly meetings.

Appraisal

Liberal Education at Brown

In April 2007, the Dean of the College convened a Task Force on Undergraduate Education to review Brown’s academic programs and to make recommendations for the future. Comprised of faculty, administrators, and students, the Task Force met in whole or in part nearly thirty times. A website launched in September 2007 kept community members informed of the group’s work, and the Task Force consulted broadly with faculty, students, and alums throughout the fall semester. A first draft of the report was released to the campus community in January 2008. Throughout spring 2008, community feedback on the report was solicited via campus forums and online feedback forms. This feedback was incorporated into the final report of the Task Force, which was released to the public in September 2008. The report issued by the Task Force forms the bases of the appraisal and projections made here for undergraduate education at Brown.

The Task Force on Undergraduate Education thought deeply about Brown’s open curriculum and liberal learning goals, guided by four sets of questions about liberal learning, the concentration, advising, and pedagogy and assessment. The Task Force noted that the concept of an “open” curriculum parallels recent developments in the academic disciplines, which are shifting and “opening” in ways that promote interdisciplinary modes of inquiry while presenting new challenges for pedagogy in general. How do we help our students develop programs of study that allow them to navigate these changes? How do curricular and co-curricular opportunities provide the breadth of experiences needed to master the educational challenges of today? How do we ensure that our students pursue educational goals relevant to the realities of increasing globalization? The Task Force felt strongly that Brown’s open curriculum enables the University to respond quickly to our students’ educational needs. At the same time, the Task Force saw a pressing need to rearticulate the core values of the Brown curriculum for the larger campus community and to clarify our vision of the kind of learning that can and should happen at Brown.
The result was “Liberal Learning at Brown,” a statement produced by the College Curriculum Council (CCC) in spring 2008 and sent to this year’s incoming class in June and to rising sophomores in August. It replaces “A Guideline for a Liberal Education,” a document produced by the CCC in 1990, following the last comprehensive review of Brown’s curriculum overseen by Sheila Blumstein, then Dean of the College. “Liberal Learning at Brown” articulates the areas of intellectual inquiry—and the modes of thought—that students are expected to build into their own core curricula. These areas include the ability to communicate effectively; the capacity to understand histories and differences among cultures; the knowledge of scientific methods together with the quantitative skills necessary to conceptualize and solve complex problems; and the appreciation of forms of representation in many kinds of expressive media. “Liberal Learning at Brown” states general goals to be pursued, not particular disciplines or bodies of knowledge to be mastered. As such, it provides a framework upon which students and their advisors can construct broad, intellectually diverse plans of study suited to each student’s interests and goals.

The University offers several curricular programs that encourage students to sample widely from the major disciplinary areas of the College. One such initiative is the First-Year Seminar Program, which was implemented in 2002 as part of Brown’s Plan for Academic Enrichment. Offered in all areas of the curriculum, first-year seminars help students develop their understanding of what constitutes college-level work—the types of assignments they might encounter, the need to prepare for seminar discussions, faculty’s expectations for written communication, and the ability to work independently. Last year, the College set a goal of offering enough seminars so that every incoming student could enroll in at least one. To that end, a spring 2008 grant program funded the development of twenty-four new seminars that emphasize writing, scientific thinking, global awareness, and instruction in a foreign language. The result is that seventy-six seminars were offered for the 2008-2009 academic year. The number of students enrolled in the program increased 25% compared to our highest previous enrollment in 2006-2007.

Brown’s Liberal Learning and Diversity Perspectives courses also help students explore the curriculum across their four years of study. Liberal Learning courses introduce students to the many ways of thinking and of approaching knowledge that comprise a liberal education. Derived from a 1958 interdisciplinary initiative known as the University Courses Program as well as the Modes of Thought Program introduced in the 1970s, Liberal Learning courses emphasize synthesis rather than survey and focus on the methods, concepts, and values employed in understanding a particular topic. Diversity Perspectives courses examine the ways in which disciplines, histories, and paradigms of knowledge are reconfigured by intellectual questions related to diversity. The Diversity Perspectives Rubric replaced the American Minority Perspectives designation in 2002, following the suggestion of a Visiting Committee on Diversity. The AMP designation, which was implemented in 1986, assisted students and their advisors in choosing courses that examined the experiences in and contributions to American society of African Americans, Latino Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. The new Diversity Perspectives rubric includes groups defined by race, ethnicity, gender, sexual
orientation, disability, or other salient characteristics and does not limit such explorations to an American context. Over the last four years, an average of 117 Liberal Learning courses and 95 Diversity Perspectives courses have been offered annually.

Overall, there is much evidence to suggest that Brown students achieve the skills gains associated with a liberal arts curriculum. Each year, the University analyzes the course selections of students who entered Brown as first-year students and who completed at least 22 credits at Brown. These course distribution studies reveal that our students sample widely from all areas of the curriculum. The distribution of course registrations for the class of 2007 is summarized in the following table. It shows that the vast majority of students complete two or more courses in each of the major disciplinary areas. Although the number of students taking more than one science course is not as high as in other divisions of the College, the data is still positive.

![Course Distribution Chart](image)

**Figure 1: Course Distribution**

When the data is controlled for concentrators, the findings are similar. For example, 99.4% of science concentrators in the class of 2007, who completed 22 courses at Brown, enrolled in one or more humanities courses. It is notable that the percentage of humanities concentrators who completed one or more courses in the sciences is somewhat lower.
This year the Office of Institutional Research reviewed the records of class of 2007 graduates who completed at least 22 credits at Brown for enrollment in quantitative classes. These classes were defined as courses in applied math, math, economics, or any course in another subject area primarily quantitative in nature, such as statistical methods. Results showed that 88.4% of these graduates either completed one of these courses or would have placed out of math because of a high AP score. Finally, we found that 48.4% of first-year students who entered in 2007 enrolled in a math or an applied math class. An informal survey of American Association of University peers showed this to be slightly above the median (47.7%) of the Universities (n=18) that responded.

Data from student surveys support the contention that Brown graduates acquire a broad liberal arts education and make good use of the open curriculum. On a biennial basis, graduating seniors are surveyed about their experiences at Brown. The survey includes questions about students’ perceptions of their development in 25 areas. (Appendix 4.1) In our analysis of the class of 2006, we grouped these abilities into six broad areas shown in the following table and compared Brown to a group of peer institutions. Rating their development on a scale of one to five, Brown students’ assessment of their growth in these broad areas is similar to that of seniors at peer institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration Area</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Concentrators)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences (475)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (295)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>85.08</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences (580)</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>91.72</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Concentrators by Area**

| Change in Abilities Since Entering College: Average Response on Grouped Items |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Brown vs. Peers             | Senior Survey 2006          |
| # of cases                  | Brown                      | Peers                      | Difference      |
|                              | 825                         | 6,986                      |
| Critical Thinking           | 3.07                        | 3.03                       | BU > Peers     |
| Self Awareness & Personal Responsibility | 3.02 | 2.95 | BU > Peers |
| Tolerance & Adaptability    | 2.95                        | 2.90                       | BU > Peers     |
| Breadth of Study            | 2.87                        | 2.88                       | none           |
| Gain In-Depth Knowledge     | 3.09                        | 3.08                       | none           |
| Quantitative Skill          | 2.68                        | 2.75                       | Peers > BU     |

**Figure 3: Change in Abilities**
Surveys of alumni ten years after graduation show similar results (Appendix 4.2). When asked which aspects of their Brown experience were most significant to them, a large percentage of alumni identified the open curriculum. In the ten-year post-graduation survey, a majority of alumni report the belief that they had made good use of the curriculum and had obtained a better education because of the freedom they had to chart their own educational path.

The Task Force on Undergraduate Education surveyed alumni about their experiences with the open curriculum, advising, and out-of-classroom experiences. Alumni reported that the curriculum encouraged critical thinking, increased their awareness of competing perspectives, and broadened their understanding of different phenomena and viewpoints. As a result, they were self-directed and self-motivated to learn, qualities that alumni report were crucial for their maturation as students and as human beings. The quote below from one alumna exemplifies the general tenor of alumni comments about the open curriculum.

*I cannot imagine having been at another institution locked into classes I was not interested in and not having to take chances on things and make decisions on my own, things which made me a more capable person in the end. Learning to understand my own likes and dislikes was just as important as learning the material in the classes I enrolled in.*

What comes through in the survey results is that the open curriculum by its very nature requires students to develop those skills that often fall under the “general education” rubric: the ability to consider options, to think critically, to solve problems, to communicate, and to take responsibility for their educational development.
While course distribution studies and student and alumni self-reports suggest that the majority of Brown students develop the skills associated with a liberal education, some Brown faculty worry that students can use the open curriculum to avoid some areas of study. In Task Force committee meetings and campus forums, faculty expressed concern that some students never take a math or science course or a course with a significant writing component. Alumni surveys conducted by the Teagle Working Group (a group of institutions with open curricula that met in the 2005-2006 academic year) and by the Task Force show that a few alumni avoided some subjects, especially in the sciences and math, but they also took courses in other areas of the curriculum, especially in the visual arts and social sciences, that were not included in their original plans of study. Responding to the concerns raised by faculty, the Task Force made recommendations for improving the number of students who pursue science and math and for strengthening writing instruction and support at Brown. These recommendations are described below.

**Science**

In the last few years, Brown has focused attention on the need to increase student interest and retention in science disciplines. Admission Office statistics suggest that our difficulties with science precede students’ matriculation to Brown. Brown’s yield is lowest for students interested in the physical and quantitative sciences. Some faculty have also expressed concern that Brown has limited success in recruiting top science students. In 2005, a task force established by then Provost Robert Zimmer submitted a proposal to the faculty for a program to improve science education at Brown. Although the committee’s proposed Integrative Science and Engineering Program, or “Science Cohort,” was not adopted, it did awaken significant interest in science education across the campus.

In 2006, Provost David Kertzer and Dean of the College Katherine Bergeron appointed the Undergraduate Science Education Committee to study ways to strengthen science education at Brown and to raise Brown’s profile as a science school. With no required science and math courses (except in particular concentration programs), Brown is particularly aware that the science curriculum needs to be made an attractive option for all students. The Committee recommended the creation of a fund to support curricular innovation in the sciences, and the Dean of the College has pledged support for developing more science courses for non-concentrators, including science-focused first-year seminars. The Committee’s highest priority recommendation, echoed in 2008 by the Task Force on Undergraduate Education, was the establishment of a Science Center that would provide comprehensive advising and study group programs, academic and research support, and career mentoring. A Science Advisory Board was created in January 2008 to plan the Center, and a provisional website for the Center was launched in April. New fundraising materials were created in June, and a new staff position to coordinate Science Center activities was created and filled in July 2008.
Writing

Brown’s expectation that all students demonstrate proficiency in writing has been another area of recent focus. Brown has had some form of writing requirement since the late 1880s. In the last forty years (the time of the new curriculum), the writing requirement has been structured in two ways. Prior to 1981, students with identified writing deficiencies met the requirement by taking English 1: The Fundamentals of Writing. From 1981-1983, several new checkpoints, programs, and services were developed to support students’ writing competency. Incoming students’ applications were screened for writing competency, and a field was added to course grade sheets that allowed professors to indicate concerns about students’ writing. The Writing Center and the Writing Fellows Program (a peer-to-peer writing program) were established to support all students in achieving writing competence. Students who received writing checks usually took a course in the English Department, although they could also take a Writing Fellows course or work intensively with an associate in the Writing Center. This multipronged approach to supporting student writers has remained essentially unchanged since that time.

Survey data suggest that the vast majority of Brown students not only write well but also experience significant growth in their writing abilities while at Brown. Results from senior surveys administered between 2002 and 2008 as well as a survey of all enrolled students conducted in 2007 show that at least 80% of students report that their written and oral communication skills are stronger or much stronger than when they began college study. When compared to their peers at other schools, however, the results are mixed. The 2002 Senior Survey shows that Brown seniors report writing skills gains at the same rate as their peers. In the 2006 Senior Survey and 2007 Enrolled Student Survey, however, Brown students reported writing skills gains at a lower rate than their peers at other institutions.

In a 2007 reorganization of the Office of the Dean of the College, a new area of responsibility was created for an associate dean who would oversee the development and implementation of a strategic plan for improving writing support at Brown. The first step taken was a more rigorous assessment of incoming students’ writing. In summer 2007, incoming first-year students were sent a “first-reading” book (Alain de Botton’s How Proust Can Change Your Life) and asked to use the book as a springboard for a letter to their first-year advisor. Students had written letters to their advisors in the past, but such letters had not been based on an assigned reading, nor were they read systematically with an eye toward flagging students with weak writing skills. The letters of students entering in fall 2007 were assessed by graduate student writing associates in the Writing Center, using a rubric developed by the Associate Dean of the College for Writing. Out of the 806 students who submitted letters, 7.5% (n=60) were determined to have weak writing skills. Letters were sent to the students’ academic advisors informing them of the writing assessment results. Advisors were asked to read their advisees’ letters carefully to determine whether or not they found their students’ written communication abilities deficient and to encourage the students to take a writing intensive course.
In June 2008, the sixty students who were judged to have weak writing skills before matriculation were compared with the rest of the first-year class on several different items, including SAT scores, course selection, and number of courses passed in the first year. The analysis showed that students with writing flags have lower verbal and writing SAT scores than other students. They also enrolled less often than other students in a first-year seminar or a writing fellow course. On the other hand, the flagged students enrolled more often in an English class, specifically English 0110: Critical Reading and Writing I. One plausible explanation for this is that advisors, having been alerted to the students’ possible deficiency in writing, encouraged them to take the course. This group of students will continue to be tracked for academic progress, and the same assessment is taking place with this year’s incoming class using a different book (Rory Stewart’s *The Places In Between*).

In fall 2007, a new College Writing Advisory Board was formed. Comprised of faculty, writing program administrators, Writing Fellows, and Writing Center associates, the Board has been charged with developing a strategic plan for improving Brown’s ability to support students’ writing competence. An important step in developing the plan took place in March 2008, when the Board and the Task Force on Undergraduate Education sponsored a faculty forum on writing. The thirty faculty participating in the forum agreed that Brown needs to develop a conceptual approach to writing that defines writing proficiency, assesses students’ writing more systematically, and provides faculty with more guidance on how to incorporate effective writing assignments into their courses. Faculty also agreed that Brown’s existing writing programs and support centers could provide an integrated system of support for all student writers, but that the programs and centers needed more robust support to achieve this goal.

In its final report, the Task Force on Undergraduate Education recommended that the College undertake an external review of Brown’s various writing programs and support services before it implements any major changes in these areas. That external evaluation occurred September 18-19, 2008. The evaluators submitted their report in early October, and the Campus Writing Advisory Board has already begun to implement some of its recommendations. The Board is in the final stages of producing a new statement of Brown’s writing expectations for students. The statement will be forwarded to the College Curriculum Council, which will review it and present a final version to the Faculty for approval.

**Internationalization**

Just as communicating in writing is a critical skill for our students, so is the ability to communicate across cultures and in another language. Education for global citizenry has become a critical outcome for liberal arts colleges. The Brown Corporation addressed this issue directly in its February 2008 meeting, when it resolved to “ensure that Brown is a truly global university.” To that end, the College has begun to expand study abroad offerings and increase international service opportunities through the Swearer Center for Public Service and the Undergraduate Teaching and Research Awards Program. A
strategic plan is under development to bring more international scholars to Brown, thus ensuring that the most important “globalization” will be done in residence at Brown.

Study abroad is one means by which many Brown students expand their understanding of different cultures. Brown’s Office of International Programs sends over 500 students abroad each year. Most students study abroad in their junior year, and by graduation, more than a third of students in a given class have studied abroad. In the 2006 Senior Survey, for example, 36% of graduating seniors reported studying abroad. In the 2007-2008 academic year, 64% of students studying abroad were in Europe, 12% in the Americas, 10% in Asia, 9% in Africa, 3% in Oceania, and 2% in the Middle East. 7% of these students have declared a foreign language concentration. Of the remaining 93%, 42% are concentrating in the social sciences, 34% in the humanities, and 17% in the physical and life sciences.

Brown sponsors study abroad programs in 14 countries at 53 different institutions. In addition, students can participate in any of 136 other approved programs in 47 countries. Students may also petition to receive Brown transfer credit from other program sites. In order to study abroad in any country for which French, German, Italian, Portuguese, or Spanish is the primary language, students are required to demonstrate foreign language proficiency prior to acceptance to the program.

New study abroad programs continue to develop that expand our students’ access to the broadest possible range of world cultures. This past year, 44 Brown students participated in a new study abroad program in Barcelona that also included students from the University of Chicago, Northwestern, Cornell, Harvard, and Princeton. In fall 2008, a new Brown semester-long abroad program began in Cuba. This program provides students with an unparalleled opportunity to examine key political, social, economic, and cultural issues affecting this island nation and its Caribbean and Latin American neighbors. Brown participants in the program are joined by a select group of Cuban graduate students, whose perspectives enhance the level of discourse in the classroom.

Last year, the University took steps to measure students’ cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development resulting from their experiences abroad. A pre-test of all students traveling abroad was administered in the spring. A post-test is currently being administered, the results of which will be compared with student scores on Larry Braskamp’s Global Perspectives Inventory. Brown is also participating in a longitudinal study to learn about the long-term impact of study abroad experiences on students’ lives. The year-long study is being conducted by researchers from the University of Minnesota’s College of Education and Human Development. Participating institutions include Brown, Purdue, Oberlin, Wofford, Pacific Lutheran, and Portland State University. Results from this study will be available in spring 2009.

Brown’s commitment to internationalization is illustrated by a number of other recent developments. In January 2008, a newly created position of Vice President for Internationalization was filled. During summer 2008, a new program funded fourteen international undergraduate research and teaching opportunities. This academic year,
discussions have begun to create an international track within selected concentration programs. These developments, along with the other initiatives described above, will help ensure that Brown students have the knowledge and experience necessary to be the global citizens that the University aims to produce.

The Concentration

An academic concentration is the focal point of a student’s undergraduate educational experience at Brown. Brown offers 95 standard concentration programs across the four divisions of the College. The table below shows the distribution of concentrations completed by students in the class of 2008.

![Figure 5: Concentration Distribution, 2008](image)

Concentration programs at Brown are of three types: disciplinary concentrations that are typically departmentally based; multi- or interdisciplinary concentrations that are typically interdepartmental; and independent concentration programs that are created by a student with a faculty advisor and in consultation with a faculty-dean committee. Each of these types of programs fulfills a critical academic and intellectual ‘niche’ in the Brown curriculum.

Disciplinary concentration programs build on faculty strengths and focus on areas of study that have long and important intellectual traditions. Multidisciplinary programs allow for the investigation of problems and questions that require the perspectives and methodologies of a number of disciplines. And independent concentration programs, one of the many innovations introduced in the Brown curriculum in 1969, provide a means for a student to develop a new approach to an area of study that cannot be met by a standard concentration program. Independent concentrations require close faculty collaboration and mentoring.

Brown’s size and intimacy provide a rich context for cross-disciplinary activity. This is seen most vividly in the number of interdisciplinary concentration programs offered at
Brown: Forty-eight of the ninety-five concentrations on offer are interdisciplinary. In 2008, 672 students completed interdisciplinary concentrations. In many ways, these concentrations have become a hallmark of the Brown curriculum and have set Brown apart from its sister institutions. The many opportunities for interdisciplinary study at Brown allow our students access to cutting-edge approaches to knowledge and knowledge production. On our senior survey, students consistently report high levels of satisfaction with opportunities to take interdisciplinary courses.

The various structures of concentration programs at Brown reflect the richness of our curriculum and the imagination and creativity of the faculty. At Brown, one size does not fit all, and it should not. Nonetheless, every concentration must meet the same standards of intellectual rigor, and hence needs to articulate clearly the rationale and basis for the content and structure of its program. Similarly, every concentration program must provide evidence that, upon completion of their concentration, students have acquired a deep understanding of the methods and substantive subject matter of an area of study, are able to integrate ideas across this area of study, and have developed independence of thought.

The College Curriculum Council completed a systematic review of its concentration programs just a few years ago. From 2000 to 2006, concentrations were reviewed in the brain sciences, physical sciences, and biological and medical sciences; the social sciences, the humanities, and creative arts; education, American culture, and the ancient world; and theatre, music, and visual arts. The reviews were often timed to coincide with departmental external reviews and were guided by a set of self-study questions developed by the College Curriculum Council. Departments were asked to identify the concentration’s learning goals, to describe and evaluate the organization of and rationale behind a particular concentration’s course offerings, and to explain how student learning is assessed in the concentration.

These reviews resulted in improved web and print communications about departmental missions, concentration requirements, and faculty research interests. Departmental websites now conform to a standard template that facilitates students’ ability to access information about concentration requirements and resources. But a review of departmental websites conducted by the Task Force in fall 2007 revealed that few concentrations offer rationales for the content and structure of their programs. Explicit statements about how required courses relate to general learning outcomes such as critical thinking, problem solving, writing, and quantitative skills are seldom included in statements of the concentration. Following the Task Force’s recommendation, the College Curriculum Council has initiated a new round of concentration reviews. Africana Studies, Comparative Literature, Development Studies, Education Studies, Hispanic Studies, History, International Relations, Physics, and Theater, Speech, and Dance are being reviewed in 2008-09. Departments are being asked to produce statements of concentration learning outcomes, to map required courses on to those outcomes, and to explain how the concentration meets Brown’s liberal learning goals.
When graduating seniors are asked what was most valuable about their Brown education, they point to independent studies, research in the lab or in the field, and other opportunities to work closely with faculty as among their most significant—and innovative—learning experiences. The concentration is often the place where such experiences occur. Our students report a high level of satisfaction with opportunities to interact with faculty in the concentration, as shown by the senior survey results displayed below.

**Senior Surveys Faculty Interaction Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% generally/very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 point Scale:</strong> 1=Very dissatisfied  2=Generally dissatisfied  3=Generally satisfied  4=Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with faculty availability outside class</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Class size</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with availability of faculty outside office hours in concentration</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction w/ availability of faculty during office hours in concentration</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction w/ helpfulness of faculty outside classroom in concentration</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6: Faculty Interaction Satisfaction**

The chart below shows the numbers and percentages of students in various graduating classes who enrolled in individual reading or research courses. The results are broken down by year, showing that the majority of students complete such courses in their senior year.
Students Enrolling in at Least One Reading and Research Course by Class Year First Taken
Graduating Class of 1996, 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in One-on-One</td>
<td>816 (54.1%)</td>
<td>835 (57.1%)</td>
<td>911 (60.5%)</td>
<td>880 (57.0%)</td>
<td>821 (55.1%)</td>
<td>813 (54.2%)</td>
<td>863 (55.7%)</td>
<td>823 (53.8%)</td>
<td>842 (54.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Enrolled</td>
<td>693 (45.9%)</td>
<td>627 (42.9%)</td>
<td>596 (39.5%)</td>
<td>664 (43.0%)</td>
<td>669 (44.9%)</td>
<td>686 (45.8%)</td>
<td>686 (44.3%)</td>
<td>708 (46.2%)</td>
<td>700 (45.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduates</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Enrollments in Reading and Research Courses

Many students complete their concentrations with honors, which requires a thesis, a research project, or another capstone project conducted in close collaboration with a faculty member. In 2007, 429 seniors were awarded honors in the concentration. From 1999-2007, nearly 30% of all graduating seniors were awarded degrees with honors in their concentration each year. As with research opportunities and individual reading and research courses, seniors report a high degree of satisfaction with the availability of these opportunities at Brown. Available peer comparison data show that Brown seniors are more satisfied than students at other schools with independent study and research opportunities with faculty.

Senior Surveys

% generally/very satisfied or agree/strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction w/ opportunities for research with faculty</td>
<td>a 76.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough opportunities for concentrators to work 1-on-1 with faculty</td>
<td>b 49.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with independent study or self-designed courses</td>
<td>a 87.6</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale:
(a) Satisfaction Items - 4 point Scale: 1=Very dissatisfied 2=Generally dissatisfied 3=Generally satisfied 4=Very satisfied
(b) Agreement items: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

Figure 8: Independent Study and Research

In its review of Brown’s concentration programs, the Task Force on Undergraduate Education affirmed the importance of independent learning experiences in our concentrations. Such experiences reflect some of the basic principles of our educational
philosophy, including academic choice, flexibility, student responsibility in partnership with the faculty, and education as a process rather than a static imparting of knowledge. Most concentration programs have sufficient resources to make independent learning experiences available to most concentrators, but a few of our larger concentrations have difficulty providing all concentrators with access to these experiences. The Task Force found that faculty are not always available to direct senior theses, the demand for senior seminars in some concentrations outstrips supply, and some concentrations have problems offering required courses from year to year because they lack core faculty members. The review of concentration programs begun in 2008 is designed in part to assess resources available to concentrations and the level of student interest in and faculty commitment to each program.

Despite some unevenness across the concentrations, Brown’s financial support of collaborative faculty-student efforts reflects our philosophy that students should be active participants in the learning process. For example, the Undergraduate Teaching and Research Awards (UTRA) Program enables students to work closely in teaching and research situations with faculty members. In 2007-2008, the College awarded 196 UTRA awards to undergraduates who applied to work as research assistants, to participate in international projects with faculty sponsors on site, and to help faculty to create or restructure a course. The Royce Scholars Program is another example of Brown’s support of undergraduate student research. Each year, the University awards twenty students a fellowship of $4,000 each to pursue a research project designed in collaboration with a faculty member. In addition to these endowed programs, various departmental and grant programs allow an additional 250-300 students to engage in on-campus research each year. A number of other students participate in research programs in Providence-area hospitals and universities and hospitals near their homes.

Our commitment to making such opportunities available to even more students is reflected in a recent internal assessment of Brown’s Plan for Academic Enrichment, which recommended increasing the dollar amount of University-awarded stipends for research in some areas as well as the number of University-supported student research projects. Ideally, funded research opportunities would be available for students in all areas of the curriculum. The table below shows that such research opportunities need to be increased in the humanities.
Undergraduate Summer Research Including Department- and Grant-Supported Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># Students Total</strong></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Students by Division:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Students by Sources of Support:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTRA</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Experience for Undergraduates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Funds</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Undergraduate Summer Research Support

While Brown is committed to ensuring that all students have access to one-on-one research opportunities, special efforts are made to encourage minority students to engage in extended research with a faculty mentor. Brown’s participation in the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program demonstrates this fact. Each year since 1993, Brown has awarded five Mellon Mays Fellowships to academically accomplished sophomores from historically underrepresented racial groups. Several associate student members are named each year as well. Although associate members are not currently funded by MMUF, many of these students secure University funding for independent research. This past year, fourteen Brown students were involved in Brown’s MMUF program. Eight new Fellows and Associates were selected in the spring, bringing the total number of students in the program for the 2008-2009 academic year to twenty-two.

A discussion of the Brown undergraduate experience would not be complete without some discussion of internships. Like their peers across the United States, Brown students are keen to secure internships that supplement their classroom learning with meaningful work or volunteer experiences. This is especially true for students in some of our larger concentrations, such as economics and international relations. Students find internship opportunities through Brown’s Career Development Center or by researching opportunities on their own. Brown also offers several summer internship fellowships through the Watson Institute for International Studies and the Swearer Center for Public Service. These include the Richard Smoke and McKinney Family Summer Fellowships, the Jack Ringer ’52 Summer Fellowship, and the Marla Ruzicka International Public Service Fellowship.
Like most other Ivy League schools, Brown does not grant credit for internships. Students do have the option of enhancing their internship experience by enrolling in a parallel independent study course with a faculty sponsor. Such independent studies are considered supplemental and are normally completed in the semester following a summer internship. This arrangement, however, is not acceptable to all firms, especially those that require students to receive credit for their internship work. The result is that in recent years some students at Brown have been unable to accept valuable internship offers. Graduating seniors report lower levels of satisfaction with internships than their peers. The College plans to review internship policies this year and consider modifications.

**Teaching and Learning**

Brown has a long-standing commitment to a professoriate that excels at both teaching and research. Brown professors are part of a common faculty who are expected not only to contribute to the graduate school and, in some cases, the medical school, but also to participate regularly in the life of the College.

Over the last decade, Brown has devoted significant resources to maintaining the quality of instruction for its undergraduates. Efforts have focused on decreasing the student-faculty ratio and increasing the number of small courses. In 1999, Brown’s student-faculty ratio was nearly 11:1. By fall 2007, that ratio had decreased to about 8.7:1. In 1998, 59.9% of the courses Brown offered enrolled twenty or fewer students. In the same year, 14% of courses enrolled fifty or more students. By 2006, courses with twenty or fewer students had grown to nearly 68%, and courses with fifty or more students had decreased to about 11%.

Brown’s First-Year Seminar Program has been instrumental in increasing incoming students’ access to seminar-size classes. In 2002, its inaugural year, the program enrolled 16% of first-year students in 23 different courses. In 2006-2007, 58% of the incoming class enrolled in 63 first-year seminars. This year, 73% of our first-year class is enrolled in 76 first-year seminars. Over a five-year period, we have seen the percentage of first-year students enrolled in at least one small course grow to a level nearly comparable to the percentage of upper-class students enrolled in at least one small course.

Our students report high rates of satisfaction with the quality of classroom instruction and overall satisfaction with their undergraduate education. These relatively high satisfaction ratings permeate every aspect of the Brown curriculum. In our 2006 senior survey, Brown students reported greater satisfaction than their peers with courses in the humanities, art, natural science, math, and social sciences. Brown seniors were also relatively more satisfied with opportunities to take multidisciplinary courses, to participate in independent study and self-designed courses, and to study off-campus and abroad. (Appendix 4.3)

While Brown student surveys report high rates of satisfaction with classroom instruction, we lack a systematic feedback mechanism that would allow comprehensive study of
teaching effectiveness in individual courses. Course evaluations currently used are so varied by department that our ability to gather, analyze, and disseminate student feedback is severely limited. In its 2006-2007 review of course evaluation methods at Brown, the College Curriculum Council made significant progress in creating a common course evaluation form that would provide individual departments with the type of feedback most useful to them (e.g. narrative responses vs. numerically scaled questions). Based on this review, an online course evaluation form was piloted in a few courses in spring 2008.

We asked participating students to comment on the new form and most who responded gave it high marks, commenting that the online format encouraged more thoughtful and productive feedback. Students also appreciated being able to complete the form outside of class. We revised the form based on the feedback we received; we also expanded it to allow departments to add their own, discipline-specific questions. This version was piloted in all Mathematics and Music courses in Fall 2008. A third phase of the pilot incorporating several more departments will take place in spring 2009.

Brown’s open learning environment features three types of innovative teaching: interdisciplinary instruction, team teaching, and peer-directed learning. In surveys submitted to the Task Force, Brown alumni report being challenged and engaged by courses employing multidisciplinary approaches and/or team teaching. Alumni said that such courses presented different views about the same concept and thus encouraged them to think broadly, critically, and objectively about an issue. Team teaching models for students the collaborative, cross-disciplinary model of learning that Brown espouses. It also fosters conversations that may lead to further collaboration among faculty from different disciplines, thus creating a greater sense of community among faculty. Several veteran faculty members of the Task Force observed that such experiences are more and more difficult to arrange at Brown. Departments are stretched to offer required courses, and department chairs are not always able to encourage their faculty to engage in these rewarding experiences. The Task Force thus recommended that the administration create a pool of funds to support cross-disciplinary team-teaching. The fund would not be tied to any department or program, and faculty from across the College would be able to apply for funds in any given year.

The Task Force also recommended expanding opportunities for peer-directed learning. Brown’s peer learning programs, which include Departmental Undergraduate Groups, Undergraduate Teaching Assistantships, the Writing Fellows and Meiklejohn Peer Advising Programs, and peer tutoring opportunities in the Curricular Resource Center and the newly proposed Science Center, are directly connected to the curriculum and involve the kind of student-to-student learning that we consider a hallmark of a Brown education. The Task Force thus recommended that each department identify current opportunities for peer-directed learning and consider ways to expand such opportunities in its discipline. It also stated that special attention must be paid to increasing peer-to-peer learning opportunities in STEM disciplines. The Science Center recommended by last year’s Undergraduate Science Education Committee will increase such opportunities through a range of tutoring programs. Another possibility is to replicate the Writing Fellows Program model in science and math courses.
Undergraduate Teaching Assistant programs present yet another opportunity for students to benefit from peer-directed learning. In the alumni survey administered by the Task Force, alumni reported that undergraduate TA experiences enabled them to master a subject in which they were concentrating. The Task Force report states that, if TAs are provided with mentoring and structured opportunities for reflecting on their experiences, such experiences could be included in Brown’s definition of capstones. If the University were to move in this direction, undergraduate TAs should still have the option of earning financial compensation rather than academic credit for such experiences. Training is a practical necessity for undergraduate TAs, and departments would need additional resources to compensate their TAs appropriately.

In August 2008, the College Curriculum Council created an online survey about undergraduate TAs that it sent to department chairs and program directors. Eighteen programs and departments reported using TAs, most commonly for facilitating discussion sections, leading study groups, running labs, and helping grade papers and exams. The survey results were discussed by the CCC, along with a set of guidelines produced by the same committee in 2001 to help departments employ undergraduate TAs effectively. The CCC determined that the guidelines for using TAs need to be revised in order to reflect the current range of undergraduate TA responsibilities. The updated guidelines will be sent to program and concentration advisors on a yearly basis.

While Brown has increased students’ access to seminar-size courses and to innovative learning experiences in the last ten years, feedback the Task Force received from faculty, students, and alumni suggests a deep concern about Brown’s ability to maintain its primary commitment to undergraduate education and teaching. The perception is that shifting priorities for tenure and promotion at Brown value research above teaching. This concern is not new, but it may have deepened in the last ten years. Brown’s 1998 reaccreditation self study discussed the need to strengthen its graduate programs and to attract the best scholars to Brown. The self study also observed that “the University needs to be cautious in not enhancing the quality of the graduate program at the expense of the undergraduate program.” Ten years later, Brown has made great strides in improving support for its graduate programs and in attracting top scholars. These developments cause some community members to worry that Brown is drifting from its historic commitment to undergraduate teaching.

The University is demonstrating its commitment to the undergraduate experience through such initiatives as the Science Center and the expanded Faculty Advising Fellows Programs discussed below. The Task Force on Undergraduate Education recommended that the University expand such efforts by finding creative ways to promote teaching that is demonstrably effective in achieving student learning outcomes. Students have expressed a particular desire for improved teaching in introductory courses, and all faculty would benefit from more structured opportunities to discuss teaching and learning. This is especially true for untenured faculty, whose reappointment, promotion, and tenure hinge in part on successful teaching. To that end, the Task Force on Undergraduate Education recommended that each department develop a plan to support,
assess, and improve instruction. The Task Force indicated that the plans should include clearly articulated learning outcomes as well as ideas for innovation in the classroom, especially with regard to independent study and laboratory projects. Best practices could be shared among departments through workshops and conversations sponsored by the Sheridan Center and other units on campus.

**Assessing Student Learning Outcomes**

When the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) was approved in 2002, Brown’s Corporation requested that a set of meaningful performance measurement tools be developed to track progress against PAE goals and objectives. The result was the Strategic Indicators and Measurement Report, which was developed in 2003 and is submitted annually to the Corporation and distributed to senior administration and faculty leadership. In the last year, two additional reports, “Campus Life and the Plan for Academic Enrichment: Strategic Indicators and Measurements” and “A Diversity Action Plan for Brown University: Strategic Indicators and Measurements,” were developed to meet the same goal. Measures of student learning outcomes are incorporated into these reports. Indirect measures of student outcomes such as self-reported skills gains, perceptions of diversity on campus, and self-report of post-graduation activity are included as well as more direct outcome measures such as performance on the GRE. Counts of scholarships and fellowships and admission rates to selective graduate, medical, law, and business schools are also included in these reports.

While these reports as well as analyses of other available data help guide planning and decision-making on campus, the majority of the measures are indirect. The Task Force and the NEASC self-study team combined efforts to propose methods for capturing more direct measures of student learning outcomes. The completion of the E and S forms provided by the Commission offered guidance for approaching this task. Much of the data for the S-forms, such as graduation rates, already exist and are compiled on a regular cycle. The E-forms, which require institutions to document specific learning outcomes by program, presented a challenge. After much debate, it was decided that combining several options among the E-forms would best capture both Brown’s unique curricular goals as well as the array of approaches to student learning assessment across the institution. The E-form allowing institutions to link learning outcome claims to concrete data provides a foundation for tracking general education outcomes in an open curriculum, while the E-form requiring institutions to list each program and its unique claims was adopted as a means for documenting learning outcomes in the concentrations and graduate programs (Link to E and S Forms).

The E and S forms helped to organize existing data and to highlight places where some assessment is already in place. The forms also brought into focus those areas in which more attention to direct measures is needed. These areas of concern were shared with the Task Force, which offered a number of recommendations for improving the collection of direct measures of student learning outcomes at Brown.

One such effort already in place is the evaluation of writing skills of the entering first-
year class (described earlier in this section). In addition to assessing students’ writing upon entering Brown, the office of the Dean of the College is collaborating with Brown’s Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning to learn more about how faculty are teaching writing in the First-Year Seminar Program. Here special effort has been focused on helping first-year seminar faculty teach and assess student writing. An analysis of first-year seminars in the 2007-2008 academic year showed that nearly all seminars required students to write at least one paper. To learn more about how faculty integrate writing into their seminars, the Sheridan Center and the Dean of the College Office are hosting a series of lunch meetings this year for seminar faculty. These meetings allow faculty from disciplines across the College to exchange ideas about how to incorporate writing into their seminars. A website for first-year seminar faculty is under development that will contain model syllabi, writing assignments, and assessment instruments. Future efforts to identify first-year students with writing deficiencies will center on the First-Year Seminar Program, and all seminar faculty will be asked to include writing assignments in their courses. These tools will provide additional direct measures of writing outcomes in the future.

Another effort focuses on the use of e-portfolios as an assessment tool. The Task Force discussed at length how best to document student learning and concluded that e-portfolios offer the best opportunity to capture the full range of learning experiences at Brown. The e-portfolios, which will be implemented for first-year students entering in fall 2009, will house documents that our students are already producing during their undergraduate years. These include concentration declaration forms, capstone documents, papers from courses, and media from creative works. Because learning experiences at Brown take many forms, often extending beyond the classroom into the community, students could also be encouraged to develop a reflective practice around such experiences, and include in their portfolios information about significant work undertaken during a semester or a year away from Brown.

The Task Force report observes that e-portfolios could also facilitate effective advising. Students could use them to reflect on what they expect of their advising relationship, or to write about their academic and professional goals and how these goals might have changed during their time at Brown. Such reflection could augment the current concentration declaration process, and the portfolio itself could facilitate communication between students and many different kinds of advisors. First-year advisors would be able to read their advisees’ files online at any time, multiple concentration advisors could read and comment on a student’s concentration plans, and capstone projects could be read by a number of concentration faculty.

If students were asked to include a small set of designated documents in their e-portfolios, they would also prove useful in academic program assessment. Departments could periodically review a sample of student portfolios to see how well students are achieving concentration objectives as well as Brown’s liberal learning goals. Reviews of departmental concentrations by the College Curriculum Council could also incorporate student e-portfolios. Each department could be asked to submit a sample of student portfolios along with other departmental materials to be reviewed by a faculty committee.
To facilitate comparative assessments with peer institutions, the committee could include a faculty member from another institution.

How to design, implement, and archive on-line student portfolios is a very large question that the College has been studying. In fall 2008, the College’s Web and Technology Manager collaborated with the Director of Brown’s Computer Information Services to begin choosing appropriate commercial software for the project and to design a portfolio system that will best serve Brown. Our goal is to launch a pilot online portfolio process for next year’s incoming class. Students’ summer letters to their advisors will be housed in the portfolios, and they will be asked to write to their advisors a second time in January, reflecting on their learning experiences in the fall and their hopes for the spring term. Semester by semester, the College will continue to build the system, so that by the time the Class of 2013 has graduated, a fully developed online portfolio will be in place.

The final recommendation centered on requiring departments and programs to be more explicit about expectations and learning goals. The wide range of courses and concentrations at Brown requires flexibility (and considerable care) in specifying how student learning is to be measured. The Task Force however recommended that each department develop periodic, systematic plans for evaluating their students’ success in meeting departmental learning outcomes and Brown’s liberal learning goals. Such plans will, of course, differ across disciplines and across the four major divisions of the college. But whatever approaches a department adopts, they should be basic enough to be repeatable on a regular cycle.

Advising at Brown

It is often said that Brown’s curriculum depends on a richer system of advising than traditional models of education, and it is easy to understand why. Given so much freedom to choose, students need a strong network of teachers and mentors who will help them make informed choices. Academic advisors provide long-term institutional perspective on educational options while informing, encouraging, and occasionally challenging students. Student peer advisors provide an experienced perspective on the ins and outs of course registration, course reputations, and prerequisites. For their part, first-year students are expected to present their academic plans and to articulate reasons for their choices while remaining open to suggestions. In doing so, they assume an active role in what Brown construes as an advising partnership.

The College educates students, faculty advisors, and peer advisors about their roles and responsibilities in the advising partnership in several ways. Prior to their arrival at Brown, incoming students receive materials about Brown’s curriculum and the critical role of advising in Brown students’ education. Faculty learn about the advising partnership through advisor luncheons in the spring, an Academic Advisors Handbook sent to them during the summer, and group advisor meetings during Orientation. In addition, Brown’s newly expanded Faculty Advising Fellows Program provides a ready source of information and advice for faculty advisors. In addition to receiving guidance
on general approaches to advising, faculty advisors receive information about academic support services, gateway courses to the most popular concentrations, common pitfalls of the first year, and ways to help students develop balanced course schedules.

Our Meiklejohn Peer Advisors receive focused training from the Associate Dean of the College for First-Year and Sophomore Studies and from a leadership group of upper-class Meiklejohn advisors. For two days during the week before classes begin, Meiklejohn student leaders train new Meiklejohns about course selection and academic resources, ways to collaborate with their faculty advisor partners and with fellow Meiklejohns, and best advising practices. Throughout the year, the leadership group meets weekly with the Associate Dean for First-Year and Sophomore Students, and each peer leader meets with his or her group of peer advisors to give direction, solve problems, and offer advice.

Approximately 30% of Brown’s faculty serve as advisors to first-year students. About 34% work in some capacity with sophomores and with junior and senior concentrators, and 6% are Directors of Graduate Study in their departments. While these numbers are respectable and suggest that faculty are fulfilling their responsibilities in the advising partnership, students report that faculty are not their primary source of advice. The 2007 Enrolled Student Survey indicated that roughly 75% of students obtain advising from their Meiklejohn peer advisor or another Brown student. Parents and other family members are the second most frequently consulted group. Only about 55% of students reported obtaining advising from faculty. Alumni surveys reveal a similar pattern. In the Task Force alumni survey, alumni reported that peer advising, especially from Meiklejohns, was more useful and accessible than advising from faculty. Yet these and other surveys show that Brown students are more satisfied with faculty interaction outside of the classroom than their peers at other institutions. It is therefore difficult to discern the exact nature of the dissatisfaction reported by our students. It may be that peer advisors provide more useful advice about course selection and individual faculty’s effectiveness as teachers, while faculty provide a more general mode of interaction that doesn’t fit students’ understanding of the term “advising.”

Advising was consistently identified as one of the top concerns in feedback the Task Force received from students, faculty, and alumni. Responses to a student survey created by student members of the Task Force illustrate the extent to which this is so. The survey, which was completed by 374 students in November 2007, asked questions related to concentrations, independent study, capstones, and advising. One open-ended question asked students to identify one issue that they would like the Task Force to address; another invited students to share anything on their minds. 40% of the students responding to both questions pointed to an advising issue. The concerns identified ran the gamut from advising for first-years, sophomores, and particular concentrations; for graduate school, law school, and careers; for internships and research; and for interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary concentrations. Availability of information and advisors’ knowledge of existing resources were also identified as concerns.
Student surveys show that Brown students’ concerns about advising are similar to those of students at other institutions. The data suggest that our students receive more effective advising than their peers in some areas, while in other areas our students are less satisfied. For example, 50.3% of Brown seniors in 2006 reported being satisfied or very satisfied with pre-concentration advising, a rating higher than that reported by our peer institutions’ students. At the same time, the survey data show that Brown students are less satisfied than their counterparts with advising during the sophomore year and in the concentration.

First-year and Senior Surveys

|                          | % generally/very satisfied
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 point Scale : 1=Very dissatisfied 2=Generally dissatisfied 3=Generally satisfied 4=Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-major advising</td>
<td>Satisfaction with pre-major advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with academic advising (First-year survey)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising in major</td>
<td>Overall satisfaction with academic advising in major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with quality of advising in primary concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial help</td>
<td>Satisfaction with tutorial help or other academic assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with avail. of tutoring/other help in the concentration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          | % agree/strongly agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 point scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising in major</td>
<td>Relied more on faculty other than advisor for advising**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could talk to faculty in concentration about post-graduation plans**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Asked of Brown students only, no comparative data available.

Figure 10: Advising Satisfaction

Just as advising is a top concern for our students, so is it for our faculty. Their concerns about advising, as reported to the Task Force on Undergraduate Education, focus on faculty workload, motivation for advising students, and rewarding faculty who excel in advising. The feedback echoed concerns expressed by some Task Force members that research and teaching responsibilities already stretch faculty to the limit. Alumni surveys received by the Task Force also raised concerns that Brown’s system of rewarding professors does not give enough weight to advising. They acknowledged that making advising more important to the faculty culture is difficult, given the nature of faculty work. One alumnus suggested giving advising awards publicly, at Commencement, as a way of demonstrating the critical role advising plays at Brown.

The majority of alumni concerns about advising centered upon the lack of common purpose, structure, and standards to which advisors are held. Many alumni report that they did not know what to expect from their advisors. A number indicated that their advisors seemed uncertain about their own responsibilities and lacked resources or knowledge of other academic areas. Alumni suggestions for improving advising include defining goals and expectations for both students and advisors. This is especially important for students who are confused or who tend not to be proactive. Reflecting the larger goals of establishing and encouraging student independence, alumni suggest that
students must assume an active role in advising and seek sources of information beyond that which advisors offer. This might include developing relationships with other faculty mentors and graduate students who could offer different perspectives on academic and career pursuits.

In the last two years, the College has implemented a number of changes designed to improve advising. Advising publications for first-year students, transfer students, and advisors were rewritten and expanded to help both students and advisors better understand how to create personally meaningful plans of study that also meet Brown’s liberal learning goals. Publications for sophomores and their advisors will be completely rewritten for the 2009-2010 academic. The Dean of the College website was revamped to include more information about the Brown curriculum and to incorporate a number of online procedures for selecting courses and communicating with advisors. Because advising during the sophomore year yields low student satisfaction rates, first-year advisors have been asked to follow their advisees through the sophomore year. In exchange, advisors are assigned about half as many entering students than had been the case previously. First-year advisors are now offered advising workshops focused on issues that sophomores ordinarily encounter as they move into their second year. Outreach to sophomores has also increased. In spring 2008, all rising sophomores were asked to indicate whom they wanted as an advisor for their second year. Students who wished to change advisors were assigned new advisors. In October 2008, a new Sophomore Advising Days program was implemented. The program featured advising sessions with the deans of advising for health careers, law school, and fellowships; and a concentration fair, at which sophomores met individually with concentration advisors.

Increased advising support for students from historically underrepresented racial groups is a special priority for the College, given the fact that Brown’s rates of academic suspension show racial disparities. Proportionately more African-American and Hispanic students are placed on academic suspension. In the case of African-American students, the ratio to white students is nearly 4 to 1. For Hispanics the ratio is on average 2 to 1. The disproportionate rate of academic suspension by racial/ethnic group affects all members of the campus community. African-American and Hispanic students comprise a relatively small proportion of Brown’s undergraduate population. From a diversity perspective, every student of color who must leave campus for academic reasons greatly reduces the opportunities for all Brown students to reap the benefits of engaging across groups. This pattern may signal structural weaknesses in the ways we support minority students, and perhaps students in general.

In 2006, a group of deans studied the academic and social challenges facing diverse groups of students, including first-generation college students and students from historically-underrepresented racial groups. Now called the Mentoring Advisory Committee, the group recommended new advising strategies that are more responsive to evolving student demographics. The 2008 reorganization of the Dean of the College Office included the creation of a new position, the Assistant Dean of the College for Diversity Programs, who is charged with implementing the Committee’s recommendations. In the 2008-2009 year, advising outreach efforts will be increasingly
informed by systematic review of institutional data. In collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of the Registrar, the Assistant Dean for Diversity Programs will review mid-semester reports each semester; data on student achievement, academic standing, and separation data twice a year after Committee on Academic Standing meetings; and data on student retention and graduation rates annually. If the assistant dean finds any inequities based on race and ethnicity, gender, financial aid status, or first-generation status, the data will be forwarded to the Dean of the College and the Office of Institutional Diversity. The assistant dean will produce annual reports on the academic success and retention of transfer students, Resumed Undergraduate Education students, and Sidney Frank Scholars.

The action plan for early and responsive advising for these groups includes the following:

- Sydney Frank, Transfer, Resumed Undergraduate Education (RUE), and Tougaloo College exchange students will be offered the same pre-arrival advising and academic planning support available to all incoming students (e.g., summer deans on call and individual advising appointments). Once on campus, each student will be personally welcomed to Brown by the Assistant Dean of the College for Diversity Programs. The dean will connect the student with another dean who specializes in the student’s areas of academic interests or professional aspirations. Group information sessions with staff from the Office of Financial Aid will also be scheduled.

- Several weeks into the semester, the Office of the Dean of the College will host a special welcome event for Sydney Frank, RUE, and Tougaloo Exchange Students.

- The Office of the Dean of the College will host additional events for Sydney Frank, Transfer, and RUE students to support them through the concentration declaration process.

- Mid-semester grade reports will be used to intensify advising efforts as soon as students begin to experience academic difficulty.

- Students will be contacted after receiving notations of no credit, warning, or serious warning on their transcripts. Students returning from academic suspension and all other students on serious warning will receive a schedule of appointments with an assigned advisor for the following semester.

In fall 2008, our capacity for advising increased with the inauguration of a newly expanded Faculty Advising Fellows Program. Faculty Advising Fellows are experienced academic advisors who advise students on any aspect of their college experience and assist other faculty on advising-related issues. Six residential fellows live on campus and open their homes regularly to students as well as faculty. Each house hosts about six events a month, ranging from informal study breaks with faculty guests to full-fledged orchestral performances on the Main Green. This year we have ten new non-residential Faculty Fellows affiliated with each house. These Advising Fellows help with a range of events, from small gatherings with prominent visitors to Brown’s campus, to specialized advising presentations by individuals such as our pre-med advisor and by the staff of the Career Development Center and the Office of International Programs. The Director of Co-Curricular Advising, a newly created position that was filled in summer 2008, will have primary responsibility for coordinating the academic, cultural, and social
activities of the Fellows. One of the special charges of the Director will be to track students who are identified by the Committee on Academic Standing as needing special support. The Deputy Dean of the College works closely with the Director of Co-Curricular Advising to ensure appropriate coordination and oversight of the Faculty Advising Fellows program.

*Markers of Academic Success*

Brown has been very successful in retaining its undergraduates. For many years, our first-year retention rates have hovered around 97%, consistent with the first-year retention rates reported by our peers. Moreover, Brown’s first-year retention rates are similar across racial/ethnic groups and between genders. Brown’s first-year retention rate has ranked in the top ten on *US News and World Report*, as has our average six-year graduation rate of 94%. Brown’s graduation rate is similar to our peers’ and much better than those of other four-year private not-for-profit institutions, which graduate about 63% of their students in six years. The six-year graduation rate at Brown is similar for women and men, at 96.1% and 95.5% respectively. African Americans, Hispanics, and international students have slightly lower six-year graduation rates ranging from 92% to 93%. This pattern is also similar to that of our peer institutions. The Dean of the College Office has begun to address some of these disparities by offering the programmatic strategies described above. A consultant will visit campus this spring to help the College develop a strategic plan for supporting students from groups with lower six-year graduation rates.

Brown students’ success upon graduation suggests that the overall quality of the undergraduate curriculum is outstanding. Surveys of graduates over the past four years (response rates range from 31% to 49%) reveal that about 65% of all Brown students are employed upon graduation. Another 25% attend graduate or professional school. Nearly 5% report that they are engaged in fellowship work, public service, and travel. Only about 5% report that they are seeking employment immediately after graduation. Surveys of our alumni ten years after graduation show that while many Brown alumni do work in the private sector, they are more likely to work in the non-profit and public sectors than graduates from our peer institutions. This is consistent with our stated mission to graduate students who lead lives of usefulness and purpose.
In surveys of the classes of 1989 and 1994 ten years after graduation, nearly 80% report that they have gone on to earn additional degrees. Brown graduates’ admission rate to medical school is far above the national average (82% vs. 45% in 2007); law school admissions for Brown students are 20 percentage points above the national average (86% vs. 66.4% in 2007). Our students also perform very well on the GRE exam for entrance into graduate schools, as seen in the table below.

Brown students’ success at winning prestigious fellowships is another marker of academic accomplishment. For example, 21 of Brown’s 69 undergraduate and graduate student applicants were named Fulbright Fellows in 2007-08, giving Brown the highest success rate in the Ivy League.

**Mean Scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE)**

Brown vs. National Norm

![Figure 12: GRE Scores](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Score Range:</th>
<th>Verbal (200-800)</th>
<th>Quantitative (200-800)</th>
<th>Analytical Writing (0-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11: Post-Graduation Employment**

![Type of Employment Ten-years post graduation - Class Comparison](image)

% distribution of alumni who report being employed
Nationally Competitive Fellowships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldwater</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasbey*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brown Internal Fellowships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucconi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker/Emery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Institutions are invited to apply every 2-3 years
** Does not require institutional endorsement

Figure 13: Awards and Honors

Academic Program Governance & Planning

The Brown curriculum is overseen by the College Curriculum Council, a body of faculty, students, and administrators charged with regularly reviewing and approving undergraduate curricular offerings at Brown to ensure quality and consistency. The Council consists of 18 members: the Dean of the College, who serves as chair; 8 faculty members, one of whom serves as vice-chair; 4 undergraduate students; 4 additional administrators (an Associate Dean of the College, an Associate Dean of the Faculty, an Associate Dean of Biological Sciences, and the Registrar); and the Council secretary.

Each year, the CCC forms subcommittees that are charged with addressing particular issues of business before the Committee. In 2007-08, the CCC formed a joint subcommittee on Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction, co-chaired by the Associate Dean of the College for Curriculum and the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, with members from both the CCC and the Graduate Council. This committee, which reviews new course proposals, replaced a body known as the University Curriculum Council,
which had formerly been charged with reviewing curricular issues relating to both graduate and undergraduate students.

Subcommittees for the 2008-09 include the following:

- Executive Committee
- Subcommittee on Concentrations
- Joint Subcommittee of the CCC and the GC on Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction
- Subcommittee on Curricular Development

**Projection**

In its final report, the Task Force on Undergraduate Education affirmed the University’s continued commitment to the open curriculum in particular and liberal learning in general. It identified areas of curricular and pedagogical strength and called for increased support for faculty advisors, new academic resources for students, and enhanced outreach for students experiencing academic difficulty.

The fifteen major recommendations (Appendix 4.4) issued by the Task Force are designed to ensure Brown’s continued success in providing students with a truly liberal—and thus liberating—education. Recommendations 1-5 reflect the College’s continuing commitment to the liberal arts in an open academic environment. Recommendations 6-10 aim to strengthen advising for special student populations, in particular areas of the curriculum, and across the four years. Recommendations 11-15 are designed to foster the innovative learning experiences made possible by the open curriculum and to enhance the effectiveness of all of our teachers at Brown—faculty and graduate students as well as our many undergraduates who support student learning in and out of the classroom. As a whole, the recommendations demonstrate our commitment to developing better methods for assessing the full range of student learning experiences at Brown.

The Task Force’s final report includes an action plan (Appendix 4.5) that identifies the steps the College will take to strengthen the undergraduate academic experience at Brown. For each recommendation, the plan specifies the actions needed, the progress already made in taking these actions, and target dates for implementing actions in the next few years. By implementing these recommendations, the College will continue to nourish the unique culture of learning that has defined the Brown undergraduate experience for decades. In so doing, we will fulfill the original Brown Charter’s objective to graduate students who are capable of moral discernment and able to discharge the duties of life with usefulness and purpose.
Institutional Effectiveness

Providing the highest quality education for our students is a top priority. Curricular innovations over the centuries have resulted in a unique approach to education that our students, past and present, identify as essential to their Brown experience. The work of the Task Force is the most recent example that demonstrates our commitment to continued self-examination through which we translate findings into actions that improve our ability to deliver a quality education to all of our students.
Standard Four: The Graduate Academic Program

Overview

Advanced-degree students play a vital role in university life at Brown. By participating in faculty research, they acquire proficiency in the research techniques specific to their fields. They provide teaching assistance, and in so doing are trained as future professors. As future faculty members, and as leaders in the academic and professional worlds, they help to reinforce Brown’s reputation and standing as a leading university.

Brown’s 1998 NEASC report identified a number of issues relating to the Graduate School: the absence of a strategic vision for graduate education, a disconnection between academic governing structures and program reviews, a lack of focus on multidisciplinary initiatives, inadequate program size, uneven program quality, insufficient financial support for graduate students, inadequate minority recruitment, and the absence of facilities for graduate students.

Almost all of these issues are addressed by the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE), as well as by the Working Group for Graduate Education, an initiative taken by the Dean of the Graduate School over the 2007-2008 academic year. The Graduate School was among the PAE’s original areas of focus. The February 2008 re-evaluation of the PAE, conducted to determine its second phase, identified the Graduate School as a major area of emphasis for the University. In May 2008, the Dean’s Working Group released its findings, which focused on the size and scope of the Graduate School and on the critical role of research in graduate training and support. These findings will help Brown to sharpen its vision and objectives for its advanced degree programs.

Description

Size and Scope

Brown offers doctoral-degree programs in 44 fields and master’s training in 24 fields. As of the fall of 2008 total enrollment in the Graduate School’s academic programs is 1,833; of these, 1,425 are enrolled in doctoral programs and 408 are in master’s programs. In 2007 the numbers of incoming master’s and doctoral students were, for the first time, equal. Approximately 35% of all graduate students are currently from countries outside of the United States. Brown awards approximately 150 Ph.D.s annually, although 205 doctoral degrees were awarded in 2008. The number of master’s degrees awarded annually has increased from 110 prior to 2001, to 190 in 2006 and 357 in 2008.
The Graduate School coordinates the admissions process for all advanced-degree programs at Brown, serves as the central point of contact for all graduate students, administers all student financial support, and processes the documentation for completion of all advanced degrees at the University. Since many of these functions are shared with other offices – the University Registrar, Computing Information and Services, the University Library, the Office of Student Life and the Office of Financial Aid – issues related to the Graduate School are covered by other parts of this self-study report and will be completed by offices other than the Graduate School.

Whereas the Graduate School oversees the academic aspects of all graduate programs at Brown, the financial management and administration of all programs in the Division of Biology and Medicine are handled by the Division’s Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

Brown’s Graduate School remains one of the smallest in its peer group. Of our Ivy-Plus peers, Princeton is the next smallest, with 2,200 graduate students. Brown’s individual graduate programs are also small relative to others in the same field, ranging in size from a dozen to more than 100 students offering our students the opportunity for closer mentoring relationships with members of the faculty.

**Coursework and Completion Requirement**

Graduate courses are numbered 2000 and above. The University also offers many advanced 1000-level courses that are open to both undergraduate and graduate students.
Brown’s seniors and early-year graduate students form an important cohort, often sharing ideas and educational opportunities in joint seminars and other learning experiences. Brown has no separate graduate faculty. In the 1000-level courses, faculty members normally require more advanced work from graduate students. Separate discussion sections of 1000-level courses are sometimes arranged for undergraduate and graduate students, allowing them to work at different levels while preserving the fruitful interaction.

The minimum requirement for a master’s degree is the successful completion of eight graduate-level courses. Individual programs may have additional requirements for the number of courses completed, including proficiency in foreign languages, successful completion of special examinations, or a thesis. Many programs have a “fifth-year master’s” option, allowing Brown undergraduates to prepare for master’s-level work in the course of their senior year. These students may count two relevant courses taken as a senior toward the master’s degree. All work used in fulfillment of the requirements for a master’s degree must be completed within five years.

The minimum requirements for a doctoral degree are three years of full-time study beyond the bachelor’s degree, advancement to candidacy, and successful completion and submission of a dissertation. Individual programs have additional requirements for proficiency in foreign languages, successful completion of special examinations, field work, or other work. All requirements for the Ph.D. must be completed within five years of advancement to candidacy.

Brown’s doctoral programs emphasize both research and teaching. Research quality is assessed by reviewing the dissertation. This review is performed by the principal advisor, the committee and sometimes also by a reader who is external to Brown (from another university) or simply outside the student’s graduate program.

Because most graduate programs include teaching experience in their degree completion requirements, nearly all Ph.D. students gain teaching experience as part of their training at Brown. Some programs offer a teaching practicum as a formal course, while others provide an introductory training session and on-the-job training and supervision. Institutional support for teacher training is provided by the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning, which sponsors a program of seminars and workshops on specific instructional issues and techniques, as well as a certificate program.

To support those international graduate students who have teaching appointments, English language training is offered each semester and in the summer as a non-credit course. Sections are available to strengthen the skills of non-native speakers in general academic English, and advanced sections provide training in the listening and speaking skills specifically needed for teaching. Before an international, non-native English speaker receives a teaching appointment, a panel of language acquisition professionals evaluates his or her spoken English. Those not certified to teach for language reasons must attend one or both of these courses and pass another panel evaluation before they are allowed to teach at Brown.
Exceptional accomplishments in teaching and research by graduate students are celebrated annually at the Graduate School’s commencement ceremony, and in special awards recognition ceremonies hosted by the Graduate School.

Admission and Financial Support

The size of each year’s entering cohort is determined by the Graduate School’s student support budget and historical trend for that program. Each program is given a target number for admission. The faculty for the program review applications according to its own admission standards. The application requirements include a personal statement; official transcripts from all colleges and universities previously attended; three letters of recommendation; general and subject tests of the GRE, depending on program requirements; and TOEFL or IELTS scores, for applicants whose native language is not English. Each program tries to assess the applicant’s academic potential and match their interests with available research opportunities.

The graduate programs each send the Graduate School a ranked list of the applicants whom they recommend for admission. These lists, and the applications themselves, are reviewed by the deans of the Graduate School for compliance with Brown’s minimum standards. Final acceptance letters, including financial award, are issued by the Dean. All doctoral students receive five guaranteed years of support, which may take the form of fellowship, teaching assistantship, research assistantship or proctor assignment. Master’s students may receive financial aid. These awards vary according to program.

Graduate School Admission Statistics, All Programs

![Figure 15: Graduate School Admission Statistics](image-url)
Administration

Each graduate program is administered by an academic department or center and is closely supervised by a director of graduate study (DGS), who is a faculty member in the program’s discipline. The DGS is responsible for the students in his or her program and is the program’s primary liaison with the Graduate School. The Graduate School meets at least once per semester with all DGSs and chairs and maintains a handbook of procedures and policies outlining their duties. The DGS often coordinates a program’s admissions process, although some of the larger programs separate this function, and the DGS often serves as the principal advisor to all first-year students, providing guidance on coursework and goals for the year. The DGS is responsible for ensuring that each student receives regular evaluations of his or her progress in the program.

Advising is an important element of graduate education. In doctoral programs, the most important advisor is the dissertation director, critical to the successful completion of the program. For this reason, both the program and the Graduate School carefully manage and track advisor selection. Academic advising in master’s programs is typically handled centrally, by the DGS or a designee. Although many master’s programs include research work, none requires a dissertation or long-term research project for completion of the degree. Academic advising for master’s students is more akin to that rendered to undergraduates: it focuses on successful and prompt identification and pursuit of interests, performance in coursework, and management of the administrative details of the completion process. For all graduate students, the deans form an important resource for information and advice on academic and other issues, and all deans at the Graduate School hold advising hours.

Graduate students are assessed at clearly defined intervals in their careers. Students receive grades for all courses. Programs are also required by the Graduate School to communicate in writing with every student on a regular basis. Students must receive written letters of evaluation clearly describing their progress in the graduate program at least annually. Models for such letters are published in the Graduate School Handbook.

Appraisal

Brown’s approach to graduate education, and the demographics of its graduate student population, have changed significantly since the last NEASC review in 1998. In general, the PAE has provided the resources for the Graduate School to address many of the issues identified in the 1998 report.
Admissions

Applications to the Graduate School have more than doubled over the last decade. From an average of roughly 3,500 per year through the 1990s to more than 7,200 in 2008, Brown’s graduate programs are now among the most selective nationally. The cohort starting in 2008 generated 7,237 applications, of which 1,240 (17%) were offered admission, with a yield of 41%. For the doctoral programs, selectivity was 13% (661 of 5,126) and the yield 41%. In MFA programs, selectivity was 4% (38 of 1036), while in other master’s programs, selectivity was 49% (518 of 1,051).

Brown has long sought to achieve diversity among its graduate students, knowing that this enhances the educational experience of all students. Currently 12% of our graduate students are members of American minority groups. Fifty-five percent of the doctoral students are male, but females are in the majority among our master’s students (54%). Overall, 35% of students are of non-U.S. origin; they account for 38% of students in doctoral programs and 11% of the master’s student population.

Competing for the best of the underrepresented students continues to present complex challenges. The most qualified minority applicants are often accepted at multiple institutions, making the need for effective, compelling recruitment strategies more pressing than ever. The Graduate School remains committed to its current practices of dedicating one associate dean to the recruitment effort. The Graduate School also fosters a Minority Students Association which holds several events every year. The Graduate School hosts monthly dinners for the Association, and also hosts an admission-yield event for minority students every spring. We continue to develop new strategies and materials to supplement these efforts.

Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students Entering Graduate School
(Percentages Shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Racial and Ethnic Distribution in the Graduate School

Program Review and Evaluation

Since 1998, Brown has improved its oversight and review of its graduate programs, to ensure that graduate students’ academic experiences are positive and that they are
receiving clear advice and direction regarding their course of study, their research, and the successful completion of their degrees.

Since 2006, assessment has been among the Graduate School’s areas of particular focus. At that time it participated in the National Research Council (NRC) Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs. Brown also made a successful proposal to join the Council of Graduate Schools’ Ph.D. Completion Project as a funded member in the spring of 2007 and began the Working Group on Graduate Education, which was formed in the fall of 2007.

The NRC survey, a national project involving 230 universities around the country, required the Graduate School to submit data and information for all of its doctoral programs, on faculty research and productivity, program demographics, size, admission, advising, degree requirements, time to degree, attrition, teaching requirements, extra-departmental programs and events, financial support, interdisciplinary initiatives and post-doctoral appointments. The survey was designed to measure the relative health of each doctoral program and its results, when released, will generate an updated national ranking of doctoral programs.

The Ph.D. Completion Project is grant-funded and addresses issues related to doctoral completion and attrition. The project involves 29 other research universities around the country. This project collects data similar to that gathered by the NRC survey, though with more depth and detail on issues related to attrition and completion. Participation in this project will allow Brown to share and review the data collected by other participating schools. The project will make it possible to publish an analysis and data set on national trends in doctoral completion.

The Graduate School’s most ambitious internal assessment and evaluation project has been the Working Group on Graduate Education. The Dean of the Graduate School formed the Working Group in order to evaluate each of Brown’s advanced-degree programs and to assess each one’s academic and fiscal health. The group’s final report was issued in May 2008.

The Graduate School’s other assessment tools include an exit survey of all completing Ph.D. candidates, soon to be extended to all master’s students; a student satisfaction survey coordinated by MIT, last administered in 2004 and repeated every five years; a fall 2007 survey of all doctoral students to gather data for the Ph.D. Completion Project; a fall 2007 survey of all students regarding their language-training needs; and surveys of all graduate students with teaching appointments in 2003 and 2005, regarding their expectations and satisfaction with their work in the classroom.

The Brown faculty has delegated to the Graduate Council full oversight authority for all aspects of graduate education except in the case of the Biological and Medical finance and administration. The details of the Council’s authority are described in Standard Three: Governance.
The Graduate Council’s charge includes a duty to review all graduate programs every five years. Although no review occurred during the past five-year cycle, it was resumed in the spring of 2008. This process takes place in conjunction with the University’s external review process. Each department submits to the dean and the Graduate Council the portion of their external review related to their graduate programs, with the program’s response and reactions to the review. The Graduate Council discussion focuses upon plans for the future program and curriculum design.

Some programs also require independent accreditation through other sources. For example, the Division of Engineering is reviewed every six years by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET).

*Multidisciplinary Initiatives and New Degree Programs*

Since 1998, Brown has facilitated many new multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary initiatives. These advances include new degree programs, new institutional partnerships, and new grants.

Most of the new master’s and doctoral degree programs launched since 1998 have an interdisciplinary aspect. Although the Graduate School has seen tremendous growth in new degree programs, this is not entirely consonant with Brown’s additions to the faculty. Some new programs result from combining aspects of existing programs, such as Biomedical Engineering. Other new programs, such as Biostatistics and Health Services Research, have resulted from the addition of faculty in new fields. Yet others have arisen from partnerships with external organizations, for example, the Brown/Trinity Repertory Theater Consortium.

Brown has new doctoral programs in Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Health Services Research, Biomedical Engineering, Modern Culture and Media, and Computer Music and Multimedia Composition. New master’s programs have been established for the Brown/Trinity Consortium, Innovation Management and Entrepreneurship Engineering (PRIME), Public Affairs, Public Humanities and Public Policy and Urban Education Policy.

New opportunities for graduate research also result from institutional partnerships. Brown has recently entered into a number of partnerships with important institutions, and this has contributed to the increase in interdisciplinary opportunities. Students admitted to one of six programs can work with researchers and receive training at the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. A similar arrangement is in place for students from a variety of programs who can now work with researchers at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. There are also discipline-specific examples: neuroscience students can now move back and forth between Brown and the National Institutes of Health campus in Maryland. Students in mathematics and applied mathematics at Brown and in France can work for academic credit through an agreement with Paris VI University. Brown’s recent hiring of a new Vice President for International
Affairs will lead to more and larger partnerships with other non-U.S. universities and to other opportunities for Brown graduate students.

**New Graduate Programs and Partnerships**

**Year Began and Number of Students Enrolled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD Programs</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09 (prelim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Culture and Media</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Marine Biological</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Program in Development</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Music and Multimedia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s Programs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Trinity Consortium</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs/Public Policy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Humanities</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education Policy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Exchanges</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Paris VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Math/Math</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang U. (China)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National U. of Singapore</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese U. of Hong Kong</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt U. (Germany)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamanca U. (Spain)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Santiago da Compostela</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spain)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Bologna (Italy)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 17: Enrollments in New Graduate Programs**

Over the past three years, the Graduate School has received several grants that facilitate interdepartmental exchanges. The Ph.D. Completion Project outlined above involves faculty and students from five programs. In 2006, the Graduate School was also awarded a special grant devoted to fostering an awareness of ethics in research from the Council of Graduate Schools. This has helped to fund a number of professional development and community-building initiatives. The Mellon Foundation has awarded several grants to the Graduate School to support interdisciplinary work of dissertation-stage doctoral students.
One of these grants was renewed in 2008 at three times its original rate for an additional six years.

**Funding**

Brown’s commitment to graduate education, as supported by the PAE, has strengthened the University’s standing among the most elite graduate schools in the world. Beginning in 2006, Brown has guaranteed five years of full financial support to all incoming doctoral students. “Full support” is defined as full tuition remission, free health insurance and access to University Health Services, and a stipend. To receive support, students are required to maintain satisfactory progress in their programs. Brown expects this guarantee to have a noticeable effect, over time, on the quality of the applicants it attracts to its doctoral programs and on their ability to complete their degrees successfully and quickly. The University has increased the stipend to a competitive level, and added financial resources to fully fund its five-year guarantee. The Graduate School has also initiated a new policy increasing the incentive to graduate students for securing external funding.

The Graduate School’s base academic year stipend has increased from $12,500 in 2000-01 to $19,000 in AY 2008-09. Brown has increased its subsidization of health insurance costs, from $1,788,367 in 2003 to $2,411,163 in 2008. It has expanded programs that assist students with the cost of research travel and the costs associated with attending professional conferences ($132,788 given in 2008). It has increased summer funding for students in the humanities and social sciences, from $182,409 in 2001 to 886,324 in 2008.

**Figure 18: Peer Comparison of Graduate Stipend**

*Note:* Light shading indicates peer schools with a stipend level lower than Brown’s stipend and dark shading indicates peer schools with higher stipends. Peer schools included in the chart vary from year to year.
Brown’s ability to guarantee five years of funding to all doctoral students assumes reciprocity by the graduate programs: The Graduate School expects graduate programs to engage in careful projection, budgeting, and oversight, as well as the promotion of effective communication with students. Successful and timely completion of degree requirements, especially among doctoral students, correlates highly with consistent communication and effective advising. The Graduate School will continue to monitor program engagement with and attention to their graduate students.

The Graduate School has been confronting the question of funding for students whose term of study extends beyond the five-year guarantee. In fields where fieldwork is the norm, graduate study nationally extends into a sixth year. Currently, post-fifth year funding is disbursed at the discretion of the dean, and is used primarily for teaching needs.

Administration

The Graduate School has dramatically refined and improved its management of student academic performance and, in the case of doctoral students, financial support. It now conducts an annual census of each program, requiring a report on the progress and status of each of a program’s students. In the spring of 2008 the Graduate School, in consultation with Computing and Information Services, began developing a new information management system for use in the census process. This will facilitate programs’ reporting responsibilities and the central management of standards and criteria by linking department reports to funding, admissions, and other processes that were historically administered on a program-specific basis. It will also allow the Graduate School to more systematically track attrition and non-completion, so that it can identify areas of efficiency and inefficiency in each program.

Guidance on determining a student’s status, and examples showing how to articulate all statuses to students, are now available in the newly revised Graduate School Handbook. As of 2008 all students in their first year, and any student on warning status, must receive a letter every semester advising them of their status and the requirements for its amelioration. In addition to completing the dissertation, students must complete various exercises (“milestones”) during their careers; for example, preliminary examinations, oral examinations, and advancement to candidacy. The requirements for degree programs, and descriptions of the nature and scope of assessment used, are published both on the web page for each program and for the Graduate School, and in program and Graduate School handbooks.

One area of particular concern is that of assuring adequate instructional support across the University. Graduate teaching assistants are one important component of a larger system that includes faculty and adjunct instructors, among others. The Working Group has made some specific recommendations for improving the allocation of graduate teaching assistants, and for relating these allocations to enrollment projections. The
challenges of serving undergraduate and faculty needs must also be balanced with the needs for professional development of graduate student teachers.

Communications and Community

The Graduate School has made tremendous investments and progress in communicating with students, faculty, alumni, and other constituencies. From the moment they commit to attend Brown until the time they graduate, students are given all of the information they should need about the process for successful completion of their degree requirements. Website improvements, revisions to the administrative handbook, and improvements to the orientation program have made Graduate School operations more transparent to university faculty, staff and students. The improvement and consolidation of service-oriented workshops on teaching, grant-writing, research ethics, and other topics have enriched our students intellectually as well as professionally, and increased the sense of community.

In the last three years, the Graduate School has directly invested significant resources and energy to cultivate a sense of community among its students. The School has a newly renovated home with conference rooms and centralized administration. It has completely revised its orientation program for new students, established a dinner-seminar series on ethics and scholarship in research, supported in part by the Academy in Context, and initiated a series of lunches for first-year graduate students with the deans of the Graduate School. All of these events seek to reinforce students’ self-conception as members of the larger Brown community as well as scholars in particular fields or disciplines.

The Graduate School continues to refine its strategies and tools for communicating a unified message effectively and efficiently to an audience with disparate objectives and goals, and spanning a wide range of disciplines, areas, and programs. The Graduate School works with other areas of Brown to address this issue.

Facilities

Since 1998, little progress has been made on facilities dedicated for use by graduate students. Some study areas in the Rockefeller Library are restricted to use by graduate students, and the Graduate Student Council manages a modest lounge and recreation space in the Graduate Center. Graduate student housing is available on campus, but is limited in availability and in its range of options.

The Graduate School views the lack of dedicated social and extracurricular space for graduate students, and the limited availability of housing options as a challenge, and continues to work with the University on behalf of graduate students’ needs in this area.
Projection

Vision

The final report of the Working Group on Graduate Education provides a clear picture of the current state of graduate education at Brown. It also sets forth best practices for programs to use in order to design and implement value-based growth, and provides a general sense of the direction in which Brown should proceed in both the near future and the longer term.

The challenges of the Working Group’s report, and of other initiatives, illustrate the nature of Brown’s self-conception as a university-college. Brown has a well-established niche as an exceptional college with a good graduate school. Many of the challenges identified in the report, however, reflect the need to consider additional ways in which Brown can sustain its overall excellence. We need to be an excellent college with an excellent graduate school. To increase its standing and reputation as a research institution, the University is revisiting its message and self-perception about the quality of its faculty research and the positioning of its advanced-degree programs. Excellence in faculty research is closely tied to the presence of graduate programs and the excellence of the students enrolled in them. Clear attention to the quality of graduate applicants and careful nurturing of graduate programs will reinforce the overall research mission of the entire University. All efforts that lift the standing of Brown’s departments reinforce the undergraduate experience and enhance the University.

Program Review and Evaluation

The processes that generated the data and evaluations for the Working Group have been converted to regularized reporting and assessment tools that the Graduate School shares with programs on an annual basis. The Graduate School remains vigilant in its oversight of programs’ completion requirements and ensures they adhere to the highest appropriate standards. The new census system as well as the data sets from the Working Group process will help the Graduate School in this process.

The five-year review cycle, and its connection to the external review process, must be fully implemented and maintained. This review process will also now benefit from the kind of data collection and analysis described above. Each semester, the programs that had external reviews in the previous semester will be invited to appear before the Graduate Council to discuss the future of their graduate program design.

Diversity
While Brown currently does a good job of monitoring language abilities and preparing our international students to serve as teaching assistants in the sciences, we must provide a fuller experience for all incoming international and minority students in all fields. To this end, the Graduate School is preparing a new “Early Start” program that would provide six weeks of intensive orientation for all interested incoming students with needs in language and skills-based training before the official start of classes.

**Multidisciplinary Initiatives and New Degree Programs**

The growth in master’s programs and master’s-level enrollment has changed the demographic composition of the graduate student population, requiring that the Graduate School continue working to address the specific concerns of master’s students.

As the Working Group’s report and the 1998 NEASC review both indicate, Brown’s Graduate School must continue to expand. In particular, Brown must keep pace with faculty hires that have been made through the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Through strategic deployment of growth, linked particularly to the availability of external funding, we can continue to increase the Graduate School’s profile without adding strain to existing resources and services. Brown will also be able to respond to new fields of inquiry in research and graduate education.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

Strengthening the Graduate School has been a priority at Brown for many years. We have seen an increase in the quality of our students since we increased support, expanded the faculty, created new multi-disciplinary centers, and improved facilities under the direction of the PAE. Encouraged by these initial results, we plan to build on these improvements by focusing on the recommendations of the PAE review and the Working Group on Graduate Education. We have developed a set of indicators for each graduate program, and these are now discussed with each graduate program annually, and are published on our web site. In this way, we will continue to engage in regular assessment of graduate education at Brown.
Standard Five: Faculty

Overview

When Ruth Simmons assumed the presidency in 2001, she discovered that many of Brown’s distinguished faculty members had received inadequate support compared to faculty at peer institutions. Faculty size had not changed in many years, and average faculty salaries were significantly below those at many of our peer institutions. Though under-resourced, Brown’s faculty nonetheless provided superb undergraduate teaching and excellent research programs in the Graduate and Medical Schools. But the lack of emphasis on general faculty support affected Brown’s overall reputation as a research university as measured by various national rankings. Moreover, Brown’s leading peer institutions had moved up in national rankings, and Brown was at risk of falling further behind. President Simmons argued that if Brown did not invest significantly in faculty expansion and support as well as in infrastructure and facilities, the University would be increasingly unable to compete with its peers.

The Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) had as a major strategic goal the support of faculty excellence in teaching and research by minimizing or removing the obstacles that hindered Brown from achieving greater national prominence. The PAE’s premise is that Brown’s ability to enhance the University’s academic enterprise depends directly on its ability to attract and retain the very best faculty and to provide the support they need, both to teach and to initiate and develop distinguished research programs. The Plan seeks to align the University’s research reputation with its reputation for undergraduate teaching by adding 100 faculty positions and by increasing faculty resources generally.

These initiatives, whose progress is assessed annually and goals adjusted accordingly, reveal that we have made significant progress. By building on the strength of the extant Brown faculty and adding faculty who bring new areas of expertise to the University, we have improved significantly Brown’s research profile in a short time.

Description

Brown has 689 regular (tenured and tenure-track) faculty. Professors comprise 52% of the faculty. Another 21% are associate professors, and 20% currently hold the rank of

---

1 The term regular faculty refers to all tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as lecturers and senior lecturers with appointments that are at least half-time. It does not include those appointed to various research, clinical, adjunct and visiting positions. Compared to many other institutions, Brown has a relatively small fraction of faculty outside the tenure system.
assistant professor. Lecturers and senior lecturers comprise 7% of the total. Thirty-three percent of the faculty are women, and 19% are minorities.

Brown faculty members belong to 42 departments embedded in four academic divisions. Thirty-one percent are humanists, 27% physical scientists, and 23% are social scientists. The remaining 20% are in the life and medical sciences division. The Dean of the Faculty oversees the faculty in humanities, physical sciences, and social sciences.

Faculty in the life and medical sciences, except for those in psychology and cognitive and linguistic sciences, are part of the Division of Biology and Medicine. This division is composed of the Warren Alpert Medical School; the Program in Biology, which includes undergraduate and graduate study; and the Public Health Program. The Division has five basic biology departments and fourteen clinical departments, and is affiliated with seven teaching hospitals in and around Providence. The Dean of Biology and Medicine manages the Division, assisted by two associate deans, who have primary management responsibility for the faculty in the biology departments and in the Public Health Program.

Most faculty are recruited through international searches. All searches are authorized by the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Biology and Medicine after a thorough assessment of the strategic, academic, and curricular needs of various departments and centers. Searches are conducted at the departmental level. They are jointly overseen at each stage, from the hiring ad to the short list to the final offer, by the Dean of the Faculty or Associate Deans for Biology and Medicine and the Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Diversity. This process is described in Faculty Hiring: Outline of Procedures.

The hiring of visitors, adjuncts, postdoctoral research associates, and research faculty is similarly overseen by the department and then jointly by the Equal Employment Office and the Dean of the Faculty. Along with the department chair, they verify jointly applicant credentials and define each appointee’s responsibilities to Brown. Each newly hired temporary faculty member receives an appointment letter from the appropriate Dean stating their rights and responsibilities, term of appointment, salary, research funds and laboratory space where applicable, as well as the University’s policies on conflict of interest and benefits. All newly hired faculty members are informed of the faculty rules and regulations, which define faculty rights and the faculty governance structure, and which set forth Brown’s policy, approved by the Corporation in 2005, on intellectual property rights, patent rights, and copyrights.

The chair of the department sends a separate letter outlining University expectations for teaching and research. Each department must communicate and regularly update its standards and criteria for tenure and promotion. These standards define the University’s expectations for all incoming faculty, and are tailored to each discipline’s definition of highest research accomplishments. The reappointment and promotion procedure, which occurs regularly and involves rigorous review by the department, by a university committee, and final approval by the Provost, is accompanied by annual reviews of each
junior hire until the year in which they become eligible for tenure, as well as a more in-depth reappointment review in the third year, which is usually combined with the annual review.

During the annual salary review process, the chair and appropriate dean assess each faculty member’s work on the bases of research productivity, teaching skills, and service to the University. Annual assessments and reappointments for lecturers are based on their contributions to teaching and service to the University community. Teaching evaluation tools vary by department, and every course is evaluated in some way by students. Some departments have also established a peer evaluation process. All of these teaching assessments figure prominently in discussions of salary, as well as in discussions of tenure and promotion.

**Appraisal**

**Hiring and Recruitment**

The PAE’s goal of expanding the faculty by 100 has been accomplished by allocating 75 incremental lines and 25 target hires. These exclude 17 additional positions in Public Health and 5 in the Division of Biology and Medicine. The PAE also calls for increasing resources available to all faculty members.

Brown uses the 25 target hires to identify distinguished candidates for faculty appointments and bring them to the University under more flexible terms of timing and availability. We want to enhance our ability to recruit women and minorities to the faculty. Because target hires are gradually incorporated into a department’s roster, those positions rotate elsewhere over time. This strategy helps to sustain and heighten the prominence of research areas in which Brown is demonstrably excellent. At the same time, new recruitment helps to solidify core disciplines in existing fields and clusters, while fostering the innovative trans-disciplinary links that emerge organically from Brown’s increasingly formal collaborations.

This strategic approach to hiring and recruitment has not only expanded the faculty by 20%, from 573 in 2001-02 to 689 in 2008-09, but has also served to diversify its composition. Of the 689 faculty members, 126 are members of minority groups and 229 are women. Women represent nearly 50% of all faculty hired since the beginning of the PAE. The total number of women faculty at Brown has increased by 36% since 2001-02, and the number of minority faculty by 45%.
Since 2001-02, hiring has taken place across all divisions. The Humanities faculty has increased by 24.6%, Life Sciences by 21.3%, Physical Sciences by 18.8% and the Social Sciences by 9.0%. The greatest percentage growth has been at the rank of assistant professor, where Brown has seen a 59.1% increase. The number of tenured faculty has increased by 12%.

Faculty expansion has decreased the need for reliance on adjunct positions, and has made it possible for Brown to provide smaller courses and more faculty-student contact. Brown is especially pleased to have increased the percentage of women on the faculty in the STEM disciplines. When the PAE was implemented, women comprised only 9% of the faculty in the Physical Sciences. In 2005, the Provost initiated a program targeted at hiring women in the STEM fields. The administration asked departments to be aggressive in identifying women for regular and targeted positions. The University offered department chairs enhanced resources to assist them in recruitment. In just one hiring season, the percentage of women faculty in the physical sciences moved from 9% to 12%, a 64% increase. Because women faculty remain underrepresented in these departments compared to our peers, we have sustained this effort.

Our current rate of expansion has created some tension among the faculty. In particular, some are concerned that increased faculty size will create a more impersonal culture.
concerned primarily with research rather than teaching, and thereby undermining our identity as a university-college. We take care to acculturate new faculty to the traditions of Brown and to articulate clearly our expectation that all new faculty will have responsibility for teaching undergraduates. We continue our efforts to manage these tensions as the University moves forward with the PAE.

**Faculty Retention and Professional Development**

In conjunction with the expansion of the faculty, the PAE sought to increase the resources available to faculty to begin and sustain research, train graduate students, and provide more professional development opportunities. Budgeted gross faculty salaries rose by more than 50% between 2001-02 and 2006-07, and salaries in all ranks are now competitive across the divisions with those of peer institutions. Brown now provides competitive start-up packages and research funds. The total budget for start-up funds in 2007-08, not including the Medical School, was $8.2 million. Despite our tremendous progress in aligning faculty salaries with those of our peers, especially at the full professor level, we intend to remain aggressive and vigilant on this point.

On July 1, 2008 we introduced a **new sabbatical policy**. All tenured faculty members will be eligible for a one-semester sabbatical, funded at 75% of their salary, after 6 semesters of teaching, or at 100% of their salary after 12 semesters of teaching. This enhanced policy will be phased in, to ensure minimal disruption of the curriculum.

The most recent Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) climate survey results indicate that our junior faculty members are the most satisfied of any among our peer institutions (Appendix 5.1). To ensure the continued satisfaction of its young and mid-career faculty, Brown has introduced family-friendly policies designed to attract and retain faculty who must care for dependents. We have established a travel fund for dependent care expenses associated with professional travel, paying up to $750 for the costs of dependent care at home or on a professional trip. We provide a semester of paid teaching relief for the primary caregiver of a new child. We have extended the probationary period for primary caregivers so that tenure extensions for the parent of a newly born or adopted child do not have to be requested but are automatic. We have joined the New England Higher Education Recruitment Consortium, which assists dual-career couples to find jobs in the region and provides other forms of assistance to faculty who are relocating to New England.

Despite our family-friendly policies and an overall sense of well-being among most junior faculty at Brown, concern persists over the unavailability of high-quality child care. A committee appointed in 2007 to study this problem made several recommendations for strengthening child-care support at Brown. Many of its recommendations, such as assisting with emergency care and increasing access to infant and toddler programs, were implemented in the fall of 2008 (Appendix 5.2).
Long-term associate professors are another area of concern. Of 126 associate professors, 41, or 32.5%, have been at that rank for a decade or longer. Of this group, 20 have been at that rank for 15 years or more. Although we are not entirely sure why this is so, we wonder if this number indicates an insufficient effort to encourage promotion after tenure, and thus whether we take sufficient measures to enhance faculty career development, or if there are other explanations. Recent revisions to faculty governance procedures have established a process by which associate professors are considered for promotion to full professor no later than their tenth year and every five years thereafter until promoted, with the option by the faculty member to defer consideration at any point.

Similarly, in making faculty appointments we strive for excellence in both teaching and research, and over time our expectations will continue to rise to match the University’s academic objectives. Because each tenured appointment is a long-term commitment both to the individual and to the field in which the appointment is made, we want our tenure process to be sufficiently rigorous to sustain our academic excellence over the long term. While departments and review committees agree on these principles, the faculty is currently engaged in an intense debate over tenure at Brown. Faculty are particularly concerned about perceived changes in the criteria for tenure, and how and whether such changes should be instituted. The faculty have also expressed concern that chairs and other senior faculty members have been insufficiently proactive during the probationary period of untenured faculty members.

Teaching and Advising

All faculty are expected to be active teachers and advisors; their effort carries significant weight in the determination of their annual raise, and is a component of consideration for promotion. While Brown’s academic culture is extremely supportive of joint appointments and interdisciplinary collaborations that help both faculty and students connect across disciplines, we have now developed more formal mechanisms for various types of joint appointments: for example, between centers and departments, between initiatives and departments, and between departments. These mechanisms include processes for affiliations and courtesy appointments, and afford faculty the flexibility to determine how to direct their intellectual interests. This permits them to advise the widest possible array of students.

The Sheridan Center for Teaching offers training and certification in pedagogy to faculty and graduate students, and the Office of the Dean of the Faculty funds teaching excellence awards each year to faculty in each division. Six professorships have been established to honor and support the teaching of exemplary Brown faculty. Appointments to a Royce Family Professorship in Teaching Excellence are made for a term of three years. Eight faculty members have so far received this appointment.

Brown’s faculty expansion has permitted it to introduce freshman seminars and reduce its student to faculty ratio.
Brown Student-Faculty Ratio as Reported to *US News & World Report*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Student-Faculty Ratio

Brown has also increased its focus on the role of pedagogy. The remaining challenges lie in these areas: there is a paucity of incentives for involving undergraduates in science laboratory research or to supervise independent research projects during the academic year. The relatively small size of Brown’s graduate and postdoctoral research programs, and the resulting lack of senior faculty available to supervise, makes it particularly difficult to bring highly motivated undergraduates into laboratory work. Although we have a five-year plan to update classrooms across campus to incorporate current technology, we remain far behind our goals. Faculty frequently teach in classrooms lacking sufficient technological, media, and other resources. For details, see Standard 8.

*Resources for Research*

The Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) was created in 2002 to support, enhance and expand the research environment of Brown. In FY 07 grants and contracts awarded to Brown totaled $133 million, an increase of 3.5% over FY 06, sustaining a trend in the increase in sponsored funding of 21% over the last five years. (For a breakdown of figures and numbers in areas, and for breakdown of sources of awards, see Appendix 5.3.) Some of this growth may be attributable to research incentives provided annually by the OVPR which include $305,000 in research funds for arts, humanities, and social sciences faculty; $400,000 in research seed funding; and $200,000 to fund Salomon awards across disciplines.

This overall growth demonstrates the success of Brown’s faculty in competing for research funding. For example, in 2006 Brown was awarded a $3.3 million ADVANCE grant from NSF for the hiring, promotion, and retention of women in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) fields. The grant funded 6 collaborative proposals from women scientists, averaging $15,000 for successful applicants. In addition, the National Children’s Study, a program of the NIH, awarded Brown $14.1 million in 2008 for the initial five years of a long-term epidemiological study examining environmental effects on children’s health.

The Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies received a U.S. Department of Education Title VI National Resource Center grant in August 2006 to support its activities. In 2005, Brown University received a $1.16 million grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support two-year postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities, humanistically-oriented social sciences, and new fields with close ties to the humanities. The Mellon grant allows the new Cogut Center to invite two postdoctoral fellows to Brown annually, each for a two–year term. Brown’s new Commerce, Organization, and
Entrepreneurship program has not only established an innovative undergraduate curriculum and recruited two senior positions in Engineering and Sociology, but has also secured $15 million dollars in external funds.

Using metrics such as external awards and large block grant funds, Brown faculty have received more Guggenheims and distinguished professional memberships in, among others, the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences in the past seven years than they have over the past twenty (Appendix 5.4). Brown also received two Mellon New Directions Fellowships from the Mellon Foundation in 2007-08, and several other fellowships, including three American Council of Learned Societies research grants and two Radcliffe Institute Fellowships. Brown continues to attract distinguished individuals to its campus as Professors-at Large, including the Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes, former president Fernando Henrique Cardozo of Brazil, former president Ricardo Lagos Escobar of Chile, and former UN ambassador Richard Holbrooke.

Faculty are encouraged to compete for grant opportunities. The Dean of the Faculty Office and OVPR jointly administer a process designed to assist faculty in this effort by keeping them informed of restricted grant opportunities and institutional nominations.

Going forward, the OVPR must address the low volume of research sponsored by the private sector, from which our peer institutions receive on average 5 - 7% of their sponsored funds. Brown’s private industry funding constitutes roughly 1% of its sponsored funding. The OVPR has created the position of Director of Research Initiatives to garner increased research funding from the private sector. The OVPR must also pursue improvements to our research facilities and equipment, regarding both capacity and deferred maintenance. See Standard 8 for details.

Multidisciplinary Initiatives

Brown continues to offer its renowned multidisciplinary approach to education. Since its last accreditation review, it has entered into new internal and external partnerships, including relationships with area hospitals, and with laboratories such as the Marine Biology Laboratory at Woods Hole. New multidisciplinary programs are in place with the Trinity Repertory Theater and the Rhode Island School of Design. Internally, new multidisciplinary initiatives include a program in Commerce, Organizations, and Entrepreneurship, the John Nicholas Brown Center for the Study of American Civilization, the Cogut Humanities Center, the Environmental Change Initiative, the Initiative in Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences (S4), the Center for Computational Molecular Biology, the Center for Genomics and Proteomics, and the Institute for Archaeology and the Ancient World. In 2006-07, Brown created the Center for Vision Research under the auspices of the Brown Institute for Brain Science. The Institute for Molecular and Nanoscale Innovation, the Center for Nanoscience and Soft Matter, and the Rhodes Center for International Economics are also recent additions.
Despite the remarkable success of many of these initiatives, we must continue to assess performance in fundraising and grantsmanship and in the effectiveness of bringing faculty members together in ways that would not be possible in a conventional departmental structure. We must also continue to assess the University’s progress in supporting the concentrations within these programs, and the faculty’s effectiveness in delivering the various curricula associated with their affiliated departments and programs. Where we find overlapping efforts, we may combine some initiatives and eliminate any that are not demonstrating their effectiveness. Our current mechanism for these assessments is an advisory committee to the Provost, which monitors the strategic plans and budgets of all research centers to determine whether they are fulfilling their goals. Because this process is new, its effectiveness will be evaluated over time.

**Internationalization**

It is already the University’s expectation that every faculty search is an international one. Searches typically attract an international pool of applicants, and indeed the numbers of Brown faculty of international origin have grown in recent years. Many of Brown’s faculty teach and research in international subject areas, across the disciplines, even if they are not themselves of foreign origin. Faculty share their skills and experience with both undergraduate and graduate students in venues around the world, and they regularly publish in, or are translated into, other languages, and receive international fellowships and awards that allow them to expand further the international boundaries of their teaching and research. Faculty research activities in the international realm account for over $20 million in research grants at Brown. A large number of international research collaborations already exist at Brown, which is to be expected since research today is inherently international and the advent of electronic communication has made these activities much easier. International research collaborations also give Brown a strong international profile and help attract top students and faculty.

The Office of International Affairs, established in 2007 in response to the President’s call for university internationalization, is in the process of establishing guidelines for developing a “global faculty,” fully engaged in the world. Individual goals include expanding new endowed chairs in key international areas, increasing the number of international visiting faculty, and developing an institutional mechanism for ensuring that internationalization objectives are considered as strategic decisions are made about faculty growth.

**Projection**

Our assessment of progress under the PAE during the 2007–2008 academic year revealed significant progress in attaining the level of support needed to attract and retain outstanding scholars. Nevertheless, given improved salaries and leaves, expanded and improved facilities, new buildings and laboratories, and increased research support and other improvements, we will have to continue up this steep trajectory in order to meet
intense competition for the best faculty. As we near our goal of adding 100 net faculty, recent experience has revealed that our efforts to date must be conceived as the beginning of our goal to sustain faculty competitiveness. Brown continues to lag behind most of its peers in faculty-student ratio and in its overall investment in faculty resources. The PAE Phase II, the major outcome of the review of the initial PAE, offered many recommendations for continued progress in this area.

In order to more rapidly address the staffing needs of departments and programs, we must continue to increase the size of our faculty over the next decade. This will require a continued emphasis on endowment of faculty positions. The current campaign Table of Needs has set a target of $250M for endowed professorships. We expect to reach this goal by 2010, when the Boldly Brown campaign ends.

Brown has several excellent departments that have already benefitted from the Plan for Academic Enrichment or have made proposals for ways to increase their strength. These proposals include requests for additional faculty positions, for more graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, and for essential resources to support faculty and student research, including facilities and equipment as well as library and technology support. To sustain and improve Brown’s academic excellence, in 2008-2009 the Provost will add resources to academic departments or programs that promise to be among the best in the world.

The many multidisciplinary centers initiated over the last five years as part of the PAE provide a focus for research activity by faculty and students at the frontiers of important fields. They are essential to Brown’s research profile and reputation and help us attract top faculty and students. We must maintain our support of these activities and integrate them more fully with our efforts to strengthen academic departments. Moreover, Brown must support its research programs. Strength in these programs assists the faculty in attracting and retaining outstanding scholars. In 2008-2009, the Provost will initiate a process by which the focus of these many investments will be reviewed and directed, to be completed in the fall of 2009.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

Brown’s ability to realize the goals of the Plan for Academic Enrichment is directly dependent on its ability to attract and retain the very best faculty and to provide the support they need to teach and conduct research in distinguished programs. Significant attention has thus been given to sustaining and increasing the quality of our faculty and providing far better support to enable faculty and students to do the very best work possible. Assessment of the Plan reveals that we are making significant progress towards our stated goals and that the strategic process employed for decision making ranks the concerns of the faculty as a top priority.
Overview

To ensure that all of its students succeed, Brown University has launched new initiatives in undergraduate admissions and financial aid and in student services. Instituting new programs for students with high financial need, eliminating the need for student loans, and using targeted recruiting strategies are among Brown’s new techniques for managing its undergraduate applicant pool and maintaining its selectivity and retention rates and students’ academic success. Nevertheless, given the volatile national financial aid environment, maintaining competitive financial aid awards will continue to be a challenge for Brown in the years ahead. Since the last accreditation review, our successful implementation of Banner, an integrated student information system, has significantly streamlined operations in our admissions and financial aid offices, as well as in our other student services offices.\(^3\)

To achieve its Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) goals for student services, Brown has developed careful plans for improving campus facilities, and strives to ensure a rich co-curricular experience for students. The Division of Campus Life and Student Services, established in 2000, is committed to progress on the PAE’s goal to build a “shared sense of community,” and is beginning an assessment project to evaluate its specific programs.

The Division of Campus Life and Student Services, in collaboration with the Office of the Dean of the College, has initiated new projects, now under way, to better integrate students’ classroom learning with their co-curricular activities. The Division has also focused on efforts to ensure student health and safety. Through careful planning, Brown seeks to balance its work on short-term improvements to campus buildings and student programs with its work on long-range projects.

\(^1\) The term ‘student’ in this section refers largely to undergraduates unless specified. These issues for Graduate Students are covered in Standard Four.

\(^2\) For details on Brown’s undergraduate retention and graduation rates, and an analysis of and plans for academic advising and resources, see the Area of Emphasis Report.
Description

Admissions and Financial Aid

The selection of students for each class entering the undergraduate program is the responsibility of the Office of College Admission, which reports to the Provost. The admissions staff engages in an annual routine of travel and outreach, application review and deliberation, admission decisions, and recruitment. Throughout the admissions cycle, staff seek to identify those students who have best demonstrated an ability to thrive academically at Brown and to make a positive impact on the University community. Consonant with the University’s curriculum, the Admissions Office seeks self-motivated students who are comfortable with decision making and with self-directed, collaborative learning.

Brown’s admissions process remains largely the same as it was at the time of our last accreditation review. Each application is read in its entirety by at least two admissions officers, then discussed in committee, before a decision is reached. The University does not offer on-campus interviews but does give applicants the opportunity for an alumni interview in or near their home town. Nearly 90% of applicants avail themselves of this opportunity. The process of admission, and admission policy, are jointly overseen by the Corporation Committee on Academic Affairs and the Advisory Council on Admission, both of which provide regular, valuable comments and suggestions.

Brown remains an early decision institution. The University is mindful of the intense pressure that this places on many high school seniors and their families and, as do our peer institutions, we continue to monitor the effects of this policy.

Brown University is a need-blind institution. Its financial aid program makes it possible for all accepted students to attend the University, regardless of their financial circumstances. Undergraduate student financial aid draws on the combined resources of the student and his or her family, the federal and state government, and the University itself. Financial responsibility lies in the first instance with the student and his or her family. In cases where that is not possible, the University provides financial aid, based solely on financial need. Brown does not offer financial aid based on academic achievement, athletic ability, or any other merit. The Office of Financial Aid is audited annually by both the federal government and by external auditors. Brown also conducts internal audits annually, to ensure compliance with federal law and regulations and with university policy and procedure.

Student Services

To ensure an outstanding educational environment for all students, Brown provides a range of student services through a variety of offices. Many of these student services are
offered through the Division of Campus Life and Student Services, whose deans, doctors, faculty fellows, coaches, chaplains and staff help students to lead healthy, productive lives. The division was established in January 2000 to unify most student support services under the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services.

The division has twelve departments, including the department of Athletics and Physical Education, the Office of Student Life, the Office of Student Activities, Residential Life, the Third World Center, the Sarah Doyle Women’s Center, University Dining Services, the Faculty Club, Health Services, the Office of the Vice President for Campus Life, Psychological Services, and the Office of the Chaplains and Religious Life. Each of these departments is led and staffed by experienced professionals with formal training, qualifications, and, where applicable, certification and licensure. They offer a broad array of resources enabling students to extend and deepen their learning through civic engagement, cultural and religious examination, and participation in and leadership of an active network of student-initiated projects, organizations and leadership opportunities. The departments in Campus Life work closely with each other and with other University divisions and departments to provide a safe, supportive, intellectually stimulating, and enjoyable campus environment for student learning. The professionals who lead and staff these departments are guided by the Plan for Academic Enrichment, the policies and procedures of the University, and the professional and ethical standards of their professions.

Student rights and responsibilities are clearly articulated in the Academic Code and in the Standards of Student Conduct. Policies and procedures for handling alleged violations of either are described in the Student Handbook. The grievance procedures available to undergraduate, graduate and medical students are prescribed in their respective student handbooks, and grievance procedures for certain academic matters are described in the Faculty Rules and Regulations. (These policies are discussed more fully in Standard Eleven of the document.)

Appraisal

Admissions and Financial Aid

Undergraduate admission to Brown University is a highly selective process. For the class of 2012, a total of 20,633 students applied; 2,828 were accepted (14 percent), and Brown’s yield resulted in matriculation of 1,550 students. These students reflect the diversity of the nation and of the world. Among the class of 2012, 47% are male, 53% are female, 34% are students of color, 14% are the first in their families to attend college, 59% attended public schools, 33% attended private schools, and 8% attended parochial schools. The students are from 49 states and 51 nations, and 10% are international students.
As competition for the best students intensifies among elite institutions, those pressures manifest themselves in individual admission decisions, financial aid packages, and recruitment. The continuing growth of national and international interest in Brown makes it increasingly difficult for the University’s admissions office to devote optimal time and attention to each application. As campus visits by prospective applicants increase, the University has devoted increasing resources to providing tours, information sessions, and positive on-campus experiences for each applicant and family member.

The University has made significant progress in its financial aid policy in recent years. It has implemented need-blind admission, eliminated loans for the neediest students through the Sidney E. Frank ’42 Scholars Program, and increased aid for transfer students, Resumed Undergraduate Education (RUE) students, and international students. In February 2008, the University announced new financial aid policies that eliminated loan requirements for students whose family income is below $100,000, eliminated family contributions from most students whose families earn below $60,000, and reduced the need for loans for students in all other income categories. With these new policies, Brown expects to spend $70 million on institutional aid in 2008-2009, compared to $25.2 million in 1997-1998. Since the start of the PAE, Brown has increased its funding of financial aid programs by 130%.

Currently about 40% of undergraduates receive need-based aid. Forty-three percent of the class of 2011 received financial aid, the University’s highest level ever. Fifty-seven percent of the student population receive financial assistance through the Office of Financial Aid. The Office’s staff members work closely with each of these students throughout their four years.

Improvements similar to those being made in our financial aid program are also occurring at the institutions with whom we compete. Many have adopted need-blind admission for international students. Although it is our long-term goal, Brown does not currently offer need-blind admission for international students. In recent years we have invested significant incremental funds in international student aid. We are under pressure to increase aid for transfer students and resumed undergraduates, and face difficult decisions and trade-offs given our other budgetary priorities. Ensuring that the University’s financial aid awards are competitive will continue to be a challenge for Brown in the years ahead. The Office of Financial Aid continues to look for ways to align the University’s financial aid packaging policies more closely with the needs of students and their families.

Since the last review, successful implementation of Banner, an integrated student information system, has streamlined operations in the admissions and financial aid offices, as well as in other offices providing student services. The Banner student information system replaced eleven independent data systems, many of which were inadequate, outdated, and/or difficult to maintain. The Banner information system now supports undergraduate, graduate and medical admission, financial aid, student billing and all aspects of records and registration, including the course catalogue, scheduling, transcripts, registration, and academic history. Students and faculty have online, 24/7
access to academic and personal information. Academic administrative offices can rely on an integrated database for analysis and reporting. Improvements to the system are ongoing and we expect to realize its full potential for serving students over the next several years. University policies in the Office of the Registrar and elsewhere, guided by FERPA and other applicable laws and regulations, govern the information which can be placed in student records, as well as the security, retention, and confidentiality of records.

**Student Services**

The University carefully applies its resources to the achievement of goals set by the PAE. In improving student services to enrich and expand students’ education, Brown is targeting areas that are both high-need and have the highest impact on students’ educational and residential experiences. Brown’s initiatives in this area are generally well-received and favorably evaluated by students and their families. This is evident in the steady increase in applications for admission to Brown and in the student and parent satisfaction levels reported in the results of institutional surveys in which the University routinely participates with other COFHE schools.

Over the last decade, Brown University seniors surveyed in alternate years from 2000 through 2006 have consistently reported exceptionally high overall satisfaction with their undergraduate education (88.3% to 92.3% being generally or very satisfied), as well as a high likelihood that they would encourage a high school senior to attend Brown (85.1% to 92.5% saying they probably or definitely would encourage a student to attend Brown). In the first survey of parents, conducted in 2007, 92% of parents reported being generally or very satisfied with their child’s undergraduate education, and 77% said they definitely would encourage a high school senior to attend Brown.

The Division of Campus Life particularly focuses on the PAE objective of building a shared sense of community. Results of the 2007 enrolled student survey confirmed anecdotal reports that first-year students are most satisfied with the sense of community in residence; that sophomores evidence decreased connectedness, satisfaction and perceived support; and that all students desire more opportunities to interact with faculty outside the classroom. New initiatives to address these needs beginning 2008-2009 include increasing the number of residential peer leaders in sophomore residences, planning residential programs and services to focus more carefully on the tasks for specific class years, and revitalizing the Faculty Advising Fellows program to increase the engagement of faculty in the residential program.  

Programmatic innovations and improvements figure prominently in the improved delivery of student services. Recent improvements include increased funding for residential programs, such as the Late Night Fund to provide alcohol-free programs for students on campus; evening and weekend professional staffing in Student Activities;  

---

4 See the Area of Emphasis Report for additional discussion of the Faculty Advising Fellows program.
identification of deans in Student Life and the College who have diversity responsibilities and increased resources for program initiatives; strategic investments in those staff and programs that provide direct services and benefits to students, including a Muslim Chaplain position (the first in the Ivy League); increased weekend custodial coverage in the residence halls; a new University Scheduling Office providing centralized intranet contact for scheduling space usage by the majority of student organizations; initiation of a ZipCar rental program; and free access to Rhode Island Public Transportation Authority (RIPTA) bus or trolley lines. Additional funds have been invested in Residential Peer Leaders, Minority Peer Counselors, Third World Center, Health Education, Sarah Doyle Women’s Center and the LGBTQ Resource Center – investments that also promote safe and healthy social functions. These resulted from careful reviews and recommendations from task forces, all of which included student representation. For more information, see Social event policies and procedures review, 2006; and Alcohol and other drug policy review, 2006. Brown has also increased staffing, programs and technology for a safe and secure campus environment, including resources for Psychological Services and for Brown’s full-service, professionally licensed and nationally accredited Department of Public Safety.

Facilities and infrastructure are central to the promotion and building of this sense of community, and require not only a shared vision, goals and priorities, but also staffing and other resources to provide the program and maintain the facilities in which this shared sense of community can flourish. Prompted both by institutional concern and low student satisfaction with all facilities, as reported in our institutional research, several long- and short-term facilities projects are designed to markedly improve the student experience. Completed projects in the last ten years include satellite fitness centers in three residence halls, serving students in each residential area; three artificial turf fields at the Erickson Athletic Complex, providing all-weather playing surfaces for many intercollegiate, club varsity and intramural teams and recreational athletes; creation of several safe, twenty-four hour study spaces for students, the largest of these being the Friedman Study Center in the Sciences Library; extensive fire and life safety upgrades in all residence halls; flooring, paint and common space improvements in various residence halls; new exterior accessibility ramps and sidewalk improvements at several residence halls; complete renovation of Verney-Woolley, one of the main student dining areas; and installation of an accessible entrance, elevator and lighting improvement in Sharpe Refectory, another main dining area.

The Smith Swim Center has been demolished due to structural deficiencies, and a temporary pool has been built for use while the University plans a new aquatic facility.

The J. Walter Wilson building, which previously housed biology laboratories, classrooms and faculty offices, reopened in the fall of 2008 as a new center for student services and curricular resources, housing many student services offices as well as eleven new seminar classrooms which are also available for night and weekend use by student groups. The planned transformation of Faunce House into the Stephen Robert ‘62 Campus Center will provide a new “campus living room” at the heart of Brown’s campus. The University is planning a new facility to address the fitness and recreational needs of the community.
The facility will likely include basketball courts, dance studios, cardio-fitness and weight training rooms, and a strength and conditioning center.

We continue planning also to improve the quantity and quality of residence halls. Living in residence at Brown, with its diverse student body and wide range of life experiences, perspectives, and aspirations, is a unique educational experience. Our formal and informal programs, conversations, friendships, and interactions, all among individuals and groups from around the world in the close quarters of residence halls, be they first-year units, sororities, program houses, or upper-class apartments, complement and further the educational mission of the University as carried out in the classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and other campus facilities. Students spend each day negotiating the tensions, conflicts, and benefits of shared living and learning space in a diverse community, and they can take advantage of common space to socialize, study, and sponsor programs with faculty and other guests.

Residential living, properly provided and staffed, has tremendous educational value. Brown administrators believe strongly that the university should promote and foster the educational benefits of residential living to all of its students. Over the next four years Brown plans to spend $24 million renovating existing residence halls. The Corporation recently approved a goal of increasing the percentage of undergraduate students living on campus from roughly 80% to 90% as soon as financing allows; accordingly, we will continue to explore the potential for new undergraduate residence halls.

Besides making improvements to athletics and physical education facilities, Brown successfully achieved NCAA Division-I recertification in 2006, affirming Brown's goal of having an excellent athletics program that provides a superior experience for students and is integrated fully into the academic mission of the University. We have also implemented in Athletics a number of programmatic and staffing improvements including addressing compensation among staff, especially assistant coaches, and adoption of a plan to increase diversity in the coaching and administrative staff. This resulted in the coaching staff’s no longer being deemed an area of underutilization by the University’s EEO/AA office. After wide consultation, the director of athletics developed a vision of, and gained consensus for, ensuring that athletics and physical education are an integral part of Brown’s educational mission; that the safety and well-being of students are paramount in decision-making; that Brown’s athletic program reflects the University’s commitment to being a competitive member of the Ivy League; and that athletic and recreational facilities fully reflect the University’s excellence.

After review by faculty, students and staff, the undergraduate orientation program underwent comprehensive change. The review highlighted concerns by faculty and students that the Orientation program was not sufficiently preparing students to engage in the academic choice and self-direction required to maximize their Brown experience. Specifically, the Committee recommended more involvement of faculty, a better introduction to the academic program, more effective class meetings on campus policies and principles, and a shorter timeframe. The revamped Orientation, implemented in the fall of 2007, is designed to more effectively welcome and introduce new students to the
Brown experience, including orientation to the policies and procedures governing expectations of student conduct and behavior on-campus. The Principles of the Brown University Community, the Academic Code, the Standards of Student Conduct and the Non-Academic Disciplinary Procedures are communicated clearly to all students and are available to the community and the public on-line. Overall, the new orientation schedule and program have gone smoothly and have brought new students into the community effectively. When surveyed, over 88% of new students felt Brown had done a good job of welcoming them to campus during Orientation; more than three-quarters agreed that Orientation provided them with opportunities to explore what and how they wanted to learn at Brown (76%), to learn about Brown’s resources (77%), and to get to know other students (80%). A slightly modified schedule for the fall of 2008 improved the flow of academic advising and addressed students’ requests for additional smaller events, at which they can more easily develop acquaintances.

Efforts are under way to define more clearly and deliberately what we mean by a shared sense of community, including with regard to diversity and internationalization, and to develop strategies and plans for achieving our objectives. In 2007-2008, the Committee on the Residential Experience (CRE) – comprised of students, faculty and staff and complementing the Task Force on Undergraduate Education – engaged in clarifying our aims for learning through residential education, campus programming, and non-academic centers that support activity outside the classroom. (Report of the Committee on the Residential Experience). The committee’s recommendations for enhancing student services include creating more informal community spaces across campus, where faculty, students, and staff can gather for casual interaction such as an advising session or research discussion over coffee, or group study; and creating or recapturing community space in residence halls, given that student living spaces are insufficient for social and gathering purposes. Some residential lounge space was recovered in spring 2008 by reverting a number of temporary student residence rooms to lounges. Although we adopted measures to minimize the need to convert lounges to student residence rooms, over-enrollment in the fall 2008 semester impeded our progress. We will continue to work toward the goal of ensuring adequate community space in all residence halls.

Despite increased funding and concerted recruiting efforts, our residential staff positions in both first-year and upper-class areas remain filled mostly by sophomores. We hear frequently from residential staff that it is difficult for them to address inappropriate behaviors by other students, and see the impact of those behaviors on the living environment, especially in some first-year units. For the 2008-2009 academic year, we increased the number of residential peer leaders in sophomore residence halls, as recommended by the Committee on Residential Experience, and we linked the existing Faculty Fellows program with the Faculty Advising Fellows and increased the number of participants in that program, as recommended by the Task Force on Undergraduate Education. Focus is now on significantly increasing the capacity of the Office of Residential Life’s professional staff to support these programs and student-faculty engagement.
Projection

Although national demographic projections indicate that the population of college-age individuals will begin to decrease, the level of interest in Brown shows no sign of declining. This large applicant pool, one of our greatest assets, must be managed effectively, to maintain Brown’s excellent selectivity and graduation rates. Monitoring and evaluation of staffing levels in admissions and financial aid will continue, along with adequate and informative feedback regarding admitted students. One method of feedback is provided by having an Admissions Office staff member sit on the Committee for Academic Standing in order to follow students with academic difficulties. Brown needs to establish a more rigorous process for evaluation and feedback. The Dean of Admissions and the Dean of the College are conferring on this matter, and expect to make recommendations to the Provost at the end of the 2008-2009 academic year.

Competing for the best and most diverse of students will continue to challenge both our admissions and financial aid staffs. Initiatives such as Talent Quest - a program designed to assist students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds in the college application process, and outreach nationally and internationally, including visits to reservations, urban high schools, underrepresented geographic locales, and international arenas such as Eastern Europe and Africa have contributed positively to the increased diversity of the undergraduate population. We nevertheless believe that we can do even more. The Dean of Admission will work with the Inman Page Alumni Group towards implementing new recruitment strategies during the spring of 2009.

Predicting the future of financial aid is particularly challenging. We expect intensified pressure to make a Brown education more accessible. Balancing increased accessibility with our other budgetary needs will remain a challenge. With our focus on internationalization, we project a need to increase our investments in financial aid for international students. Balancing the need for financial support for international students with that for domestic students will also be challenging. The Office of Financial Aid makes increasingly effective use of technology to improve service to students and families, and must continue this effort. Financial Aid officers have begun targeted work with students and their families on financial skills, which has improved the loan default rate and shown other demonstrated benefits. The need for focused financial training will increase as the student population continues to diversify socio-economically, and will require continued enhancement of these financial education services. The increase in student diversity warrants the hiring and retention of highly qualified Admissions and Financial Aid staff who reflect that diversity. Membership on the Advisory Council on Admission must likewise reflect that diversity. The Director of Financial Aid will work with the Associate Provost/Director of Institutional Diversity and the Director of Equal Employment Opportunity during the 2008-2009 academic year to revise a strategic plan that addresses these concerns.

Apart from the work of the Committee on the Residential Experience, there are a number of areas for improvement within the broad arena of campus life student services. As discussed earlier, the quality and quantity of residence halls is high among those
priorities. As $24 million in renovation projects in existing residence halls proceeds, Residential Life and Facilities Management must identify the next round of priorities and advocate for funding. Campus Life and Student Services, Residential Life, and Facilities Management will continue to plan new residence hall construction, so that we can increase the percentage of undergraduate students living on campus as soon as financing allows.

The initiatives described above, resulting from the reports of the Committee on the Residential Experience and the Task Force on Undergraduate Education, have begun, representing a collaborative effort of Campus Life, Residential Life, and the Dean of the College. The faculty, staff and students who are involved are enthusiastic about the potential of these projects for improving student advising and the residential experience overall. Monitoring and assessing the impact of these initiatives, identifying future initiatives and improvements, and securing resources to enable their successful implementation are critical. These efforts will be largely the responsibility of the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services and the Dean of the College.

The vision established for the Department of Athletics and Physical Education by the Director of Athletics has received widespread support. The need for programmatic and facility investments in this area was endorsed by the Plan for Academic Enrichment Phase II, approved by the Corporation this year. A funding plan, relying largely on annual and endowment fundraising, is being developed. Responsibility for implementation will lie with the Vice President for Campus Life and the Athletic Director.

The Plan for Academic Enrichment goals for developing community focus largely on the quantity and quality of facilities and infrastructure; while extremely important, facilities are merely the means for promoting and building community. We must also continually assess and define what takes place within those spaces – what we mean by and hope to achieve through a shared sense of community. Realizing our aspirations in this area requires a shared vision, goals and priorities as well as program, staffing, time and other resources, to enable students, faculty and staff to realize a shared sense of community.

Defining clearly and deliberately what we mean by a shared sense of community, including the roles of diversity and internationalization, and developing strategies and plans for achieving this objective, is important and necessary work in the coming years. The Committee on the Residential Experience began this work by examining and clarifying our aims for learning through residential education, campus programming, and non-academic centers to support activity outside the classroom. Replicating that level of review and analysis in other arenas of campus life, to the extent there is value in doing so, will be the responsibility of the Vice President for Campus Life.
Institutional Effectiveness

Bringing the various areas of campus life under one rubric has greatly improved our ability to coordinate and manage student services. Having the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services as a member of the President’s senior administration ensures that the general support of students has a central place in the decision making process. Recent moves to bring greater coordination between the Office of Campus Life and Office of the Dean of the College help to better bridge the divide between the residential experiences of students and academic life. Evidence of this improvement is seen in the recent changes made to the Faculty Advising Fellows Program, which emerged from two reviews undertaken simultaneously: the Task Force on Undergraduate Education and the Committee on the Residential Experience. Other significant program and organizational evaluations include reviews of undergraduate student Orientation, student events and policies, alcohol and other drug policies, the non-academic disciplinary process, and numerous functional departments. The staffs of the offices of the Dean of the College and of the division of Campus Life and Student Services meet regularly to review institutional data, to discuss success and identify areas for improvement. Under the aegis of the Brown University Corporation, the division of Campus Life has recently developed strategic indicators for students’ residential and co-curricular experience to institute ongoing review of aggregate evidence of institutional effectiveness.
Standard Seven: Library and Other Information Resources

Overview

Brown University’s library and computing resources are the primary responsibilities of two departments. The Brown University Library is led by the Joukowsky Family University Librarian. Computing and Information Services (CIS) is led by the Vice President and Chief Information Officer for Computing and Information Services. Both administrators report directly to the Provost. The VP and CIO for CIS also reports to the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration. While their respective roles and missions are distinct, the Library and CIS collaborate on a regular basis to provide users with access to a wide array of information resources and services and to support the educational, instructional, research, and administrative activities of the University.

In recent years both the Library and CIS have undergone significant changes, reflecting foremost the expanded capacity and novel applications of information technology in teaching, learning, and research. Since the 1998 self-study, both departments have undertaken major strategic planning initiatives, reorganized their operational structures, and reallocated and reassigned staff accordingly.

As integral partners in Brown’s academic environment, the Library and CIS have capitalized on digital technologies and collaborative/networked approaches to respond to new capabilities and demands. Each has developed specialized resources, services, and spaces relevant to the emerging needs of Brown’s faculty and students. New academic programs, increased user expectations, rapidly advancing technologies, limited financial resources, and a highly volatile publishing environment have placed added pressures on libraries and IT organizations large and small, nationwide. Some of these challenges are being addressed at Brown through the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) and the IT Strategic Plan. Others require longer-term planning and more substantial financial commitments.

Description

Brown University Library

The mission of the Brown University Library, in support of the University's educational and research mission, is to serve as the local repository for and the principal gateway to current information and the scholarly record. As such, the Library is simultaneously collection, connection, and classroom for the current and future students and faculty of the University, while also serving others in the University community and our regional, national, and global communities of learning and scholarship.
The Brown University Library system includes the John D. Rockefeller Jr. Library, the Sciences Library, the Virginia M. Orwig Music Library, the John Hay Library, the Art Slide Library, the Annmary Brown Memorial, and the Library Collections Annex. The library also has administrative responsibility for Media Services which provides technology/equipment support for classrooms and events. The Rockefeller Library serves as the teaching and research library for the humanities and social sciences; it also houses the Library’s administrative offices, the Center for Digital Initiatives, and the centralized technical services operations. The Sciences Library provides an integrated collection for the physical, biological, and medical sciences and features the newly created Susan P. and Richard A. Friedman Study Center. The Virginia M. Orwig Music Library consolidates all of Brown's music materials. The John Hay Library is the location for most of the University’s rare books, manuscripts, special collections, and archives. A description of the Library’s facilities, services, and organizational structure is available on the web. In addition to the University Library facilities, the John Carter Brown Library, an independent research institution specializing in the field of early Americana, is also located on the Brown campus.

As the University’s primary provider of educational and scholarly resources, the Library is deeply engaged in developing and stewarding collections in all formats that support teaching, learning, and research. Librarians in the Scholarly Resources Department are charged to collaborate with faculty to acquire materials that meet the campus’s needs and to integrate Library services and collections into the University’s teaching and learning environment.

The Library web site is the principal gateway to the collections and services available for library users at Brown. Josiah, the Brown University Library online catalog, provides bibliographic information for the Library’s holdings, including information on locations and call numbers, circulation and on-order status, periodical receipt status, self initiated renewal, and course reserve lists. Users can discover records for the Library’s growing collection of electronic resources (e.g., databases, full-text electronic journals, e-books, digital collections, etc.) by searching Josiah or consulting a variety of subject and alphabetical lists on the Library website.

The Brown University Library offers a variety of options for obtaining materials from other libraries. The Library has agreements that enable Brown users to search the collections and directly borrow from other libraries in Rhode Island, New England, and other Ivies.

The Library provides a variety of support services to enhance students’ learning and assist faculty in teaching their courses. Librarian subject specialists regularly assist faculty with content for course web pages, make classroom presentations about finding and using library resources, and provide research consultations for students to assist with research papers. Brown faculty and instructors are able to place electronic materials (text, audio, video, and still images) on reserve for their courses using the Library’s OCRA (Online Course Reserve Access) system, as well as reserves for printed materials.
The Library’s Integrated Technology Services Department (ITS) is responsible for the core information systems and digital technology that enable the Library to serve Brown faculty, students, and staff, and researchers worldwide. A cornerstone of the department is the Center for Digital Initiatives (CDI) which focuses its efforts on producing digital materials for use in scholarship and teaching at Brown; digitizing the "signature collections" from the Library’s world renowned special collections and building specialized tools around the digitized content; developing databases, programs, and applications to enhance access and use of these materials; and providing consulting services for library and academic units undertaking digital projects. In addition, ITS is responsible for maintaining the Library’s website and supporting staff equipment and computing needs.

Media Services provides curricular and event support for faculty, staff, and students, including technology and training for over 150 classrooms and lecture halls on campus. Members of the Brown community can reserve equipment online and the department also offers a variety of loaner equipment for recording video and audio in digital and analog formats.

The Brown University Library is a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) as well as a number of statewide and regional consortia (Boston Library Consortium, Consortium of Rhode Island Academic and Research Libraries, Higher Education Library and Information Network, etc.). Another important affiliated group is the Friends of the Library (FOL) which brings together over 1,000 book lovers, collectors, Brown alumni, faculty, and students dedicated to the support and development of the Brown University Library. FOL serves as a major catalyst for cultivating the Library’s relationship with members of the larger University community through publications, lectures, exhibits, and other events.

**Computing and Information Services (CIS)**

CIS is the central information technology support and service provider on campus. Its mission is to provide the technological and information infrastructure and services that are necessary to support the University in both its day-to-day operations and in its plans for the future.

Information Technology (IT) support is also provided by decentralized IT staff, referred to as Departmental Computing Coordinators (DCCs), who report to various academic and administrative departments. In many instances, this is a single individual with other responsibilities. In other cases, it is an IT group providing systems support, help desk support and training. Some academic departments have servers providing high performance computing, student computing, storage, database, print, and web services to their users.
As the central IT organization, CIS provides infrastructure (networks, data center, storage, systems, and computer facilities), instructional technology, networks, security policy, enterprise applications, and support services to academic and administrative departments on campus. CIS also has a small unit which handles the financial, administrative and human resource matters of the department. The CIS website offers entry to the wide variety of services provided centrally.

Another group outside of CIS, providing IT support to the research community, is the Center for Computation and Visualization (CCV). CCV provides resources integral to the Brown research program with a focus on Linux cluster systems, high-performance storage and virtual reality display technology. The CCV technical staff offers research system management services for departmental research computing, and maintains a one-petabyte Tivoli TSM backup/archive server for campus research data.

Brown University owns and operates an extensive heterogeneous network of computers, including a mainframe computer, rack computers, clustered computers, workstations, laptops and hand-held computers. These systems are made available to the University community through a state-of-the art fiber optic backbone and wireless local area network supporting nearly 18,000 users (faculty, staff, students, and affiliates) with connectivity to more than 160 buildings, and nearly 40,000 active network ports. Redundant paths provide high availability to the commodity Internet and other research networks. The University network is secured through authentication, firewall, intrusion detection, and encryption systems and services. The network and computing infrastructure is complemented by a set of enterprise systems and services including email and calendaring services, file and print services, collaborative and publishing tools such as blogs and wikis, web publishing services with data collection capabilities, a course management system and administrative information systems. CIS utilizes technology that provides for high system availability for centrally managed applications such as email, directory, web, and authentication/authorization. Brown uses a variety of security technologies to protect local and remote access to data.

Individual academic departments have established local computing facilities to meet research and teaching needs. Some departments have servers providing high performance computing, student computing, storage, database, print, and web services to their users. CIS also supports administrative departments. Training and support are available on a variety of software packages. CIS also collaborates with the Library and the Writing Center to offer a program called Professional and Academic Skills for Students (PASS) to both graduate students and undergraduates.

CIS assures access to information by providing the campus network through which digital resources are acquired and a system to proxy access for off campus students and faculty. We also provide a means of provisioning the appropriate level of access through our directory, authentication and authorization systems. In addition to our infrastructure systems which provide access to resources, we maintain information systems which contain robust and diverse content. These systems include our course management system, video streaming server and our wiki system. CIS maintains and operates systems.
for video and teleconferencing geared towards general meetings, presentations, interviews and project work sessions.

The **CIS Help Desk** staff provides the Brown community centralized assistance with information technology via phone, email and field service. Faculty members receive support for the pedagogical use of technology through the CIS Academic Technology Services unit comprised of the Instructional Technology Group (ITG), the Student Technology Assistant Program (STA) and Multimedia Labs (MML). ITG works closely with the Language Resource Center (LRC) to actively support and promote language, literature and culture instruction at all levels at Brown University.

Brown faculty members also receive support for their research and scholarly work in the digital medium. Brown humanities faculty, departments, libraries, and research centers receive advanced technology consulting from the CIS Scholarly Technology Group (STG). The group explores the critical new technologies that are transforming scholarly work and helping to maintain its longevity: data and metadata standards. The **Faculty Grants Program**, which supports a new set of projects each year, allows faculty to work closely with consultants to create experimental research tools or to publish their research digitally in innovative ways. STG works closely with the Library’s **Center for Digital Initiatives** and other digital research centers on campus to develop methods of reformatting, describing, and archiving digital research and materials and addressing the challenges of supporting Brown's investment in digital research.

CIS is responsible for providing central telecommunications services – wireless phones, conference calling, voice mail, local and long distance calling. It does so through a telecommunications network which is in the process of being upgraded.

Brown University has a broad set of information technology needs relative to the administration of a complex array of services and programs. These needs are satisfied by a robust network infrastructure, a common set of office automation and work group technologies, and a diverse portfolio of central, distributed/departmental, and outsourced application systems. A 7,250 SF raised floor data center hosts an IBM mainframe and more than 750 servers and enterprise printers. The administrative technology portfolio consists of over 70 central applications and data warehouses which support a range of business functions and reside on a diverse set of platforms. The University has recently completed a Banner student information system and is in the process of assessing the current and future capacity of the existing data center and evaluating the replacement of the human resource systems.

In recent years the University has established an **IT Project Review Committee** to evaluate all significant IT projects for approval, funding and staffing. Additionally CIS maintains a project portfolio of all IT projects. Internal Audit is often involved in review of medium to large projects that support business areas. Especially large projects, such as the Banner project, have the additional oversight of an outside Quality Assurance review at key milestones.
Additional governance is provided by two advisory boards, the external IT Advisory Council (ITAC) and an internal governance body, the Computing Advisory Board (CAB). ITAC consists of alumni and is appointed by the President, who also designates a chairperson for the council. Its role is to consider long-term policy and planning issues, strategic directions, and efficacy of information technology and its relationship to the overall educational mission of the University. The CAB, with representation from the faculty, staff and students, advises the Vice President for Computing and Information Services, and other senior officers as appropriate, on resources and priorities concerning computing and information technology. The CAB reviews and makes recommendations concerning the University’s plans for current and proposed computing and information technologies. It also reviews and makes recommendations on policies consistent with the goals and objectives of the University for the proper use of computing resources by faculty, staff, and students; and the enhancement of the faculty and student academic environment through the effective use of computing and communication technology, including appropriate computing support for teaching and research. Finally, the CAB is also a source of input and feedback regarding matters of administrative computing needs and requirements.

CIS and the Library actively collaborate to create and maintain physical and electronic spaces conducive to study. A variety of electronically equipped, wired and wirelessly enabled spaces for collaborative work, social learning and quiet investigation exist on campus. New spaces are regularly being deployed which foster the learning environments that students value in their academic investigations. In addition to the many electronically equipped physical spaces, CIS maintains electronic meeting spaces and learning mechanisms in its instructional technology suite of tools. Several computing clusters are available around campus, many of which are open twenty-four hours a day. There are also six Internet kiosks in convenient locations on campus so students can quickly check e-mail or access the Internet. Students and faculty use personal or departmental computers, or one of the free and public computing lab facilities which are part of our learning environment and Library system. CIS provides access to over one hundred software titles in the computing clusters. In addition to providing access to many of the same programs that are available on the Brown web, the computing clusters provide a number of course-specific applications as well as general computer access to the University network.

Campus buildings, including all residence halls, are connected to a private campus network and to the Internet. Wireless networking is available at various locations across campus, including a number of academic buildings and all of the residence halls. Graduate students living off campus can purchase discounted high-speed Internet access through Cox Cable from the Brown Computer Store. Brown television (IPTV) allows students to watch educational and entertainment TV with a computer connected to the Brown network in the residence halls.

Printing capability is available in the CIT and Library computing clusters. All students can send documents from their residence hall rooms or from a wireless connection using the Virtual Private Network (VPN) client to the PAW (People against Waste) print queue.
and release them for printing in the clusters. When students arrive on campus in the fall, they are allocated $30 worth of printing at no charge which can be used for black and white or color printing. Once the value is used on the PAW Prints card, students can use the vending stripe on their Brown IDs to pay for printing.

Electronic data and information is an important University resource. To ensure that all members of the campus community have the tools to manage their electronic assets, CIS, in partnership with departments, offers secure, centralized file sharing and storage. Students can backup or access files easily with the 256 MB of central storage space.

Brown University has a well-established body of policies and procedures related to information technology. Brown also has a schedule to ensure that each policy is reviewed in a timely manner, utilizing teams of subject matter experts to perform the reviews, modify them as needed, and ensure they are reasonable for the environment and level of risk they are designed to address.

Appraisal

Brown University Library

The Library has invested heavily in resources and services that connect people with knowledge and the re-use of that knowledge. Brown’s on-site holdings of 3.65 million volumes include several world-renowned special collections. The Library complements its local collection by providing Brown users with access to over 70 million additional volumes via direct borrowing agreements with consortial partners (a supplement to traditional interlibrary loan services). A growing portion of the Library’s resources today are digital, providing users with more immediately accessible information in a format that suits their research preferences. In FY 2007, 45% of the Library’s acquisitions expenditures went toward electronic resources in support of our collection of 243,000 electronic books, 52,000 electronic journals, and over 300 electronic reference databases. By comparison, in FY 2000 less than 10% of the Library’s acquisitions expenditures were for electronic resources (including 2,100 e-journals and essentially no e-books). The move to acquire more electronic resources, like other decisions concerning the collections, was made in the context of feedback from and in consultation with Brown faculty, students, administrators, and advisory bodies. The Library also strives to maximize purchasing power whenever feasible through consortial and other package deals for e-content.

While the Brown University Library has many outstanding collections of extraordinary depth, it is difficult to keep pace with the new hires and new academic directions resulting from the Plan for Academic Enrichment, especially in interdisciplinary fields and new areas of teaching and research. As mentioned above, the Library has been aggressive in leveraging cooperative borrowing arrangements to maximize the breadth and scope of materials available to Brown users; however, this does not alleviate the need for expanding core collections to support Brown’s distinctive programs.
The Library’s acquisitions budget over the past four years has been able to keep pace with inflation by applying a price indexing approach to determine annual funding from University administration. This has allowed the Library to maintain its standing commitments for journal and online database subscriptions despite rising costs. By contrast, funds have not been available to purchase new serials or new electronic products, or make substantial progress in building collections for new areas of study. To help address this situation, the Library undertook a systematic review of all serial titles, with the aim of reducing little-used titles and investing the savings in new titles requested by faculty and students. The outcome of the two-year review process was notable: approximately $275,000 was saved by reformatting (i.e., relying exclusively on electronic copies) or cancelling several little-used journal subscriptions, thus freeing up funds for 54 new journals, three significant backfile collections, and three major new databases. Adding to these results, the University has allocated an additional $200,000 new acquisitions funds to the Library’s base budget, effective FY 2009. An important next step will be to examine the allocation of all collection funds to determine if selected internal reallocations might result in a closer alignment with academic priorities and the Plan for Academic Enrichment. In addition, it would be helpful to have all new faculty -- especially faculty in areas of emphasis that are new to Brown -- awarded library start-up funds to assist in developing and enhancing the collections to support their research and teaching interests.

One of the most important developments in the past ten years has been establishing (2001) the Center for Digital Initiatives (CDI). CDI has created new opportunities for Library staff to work directly with faculty and students to discover and enhance Brown’s distinctive materials and signature collections, and has secured grant funding for special projects that have led to improved access to collections. Many digital collections have been integrated into course work and research projects at Brown as well as made available to researchers around the globe. For example, CDI collaborated with the CIS Scholarly Technology Group and the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice to create a digital archive of documents and records used by the Committee in their examination of the University’s historical entanglement with slavery and the slave trade. Overall, CDI has created more than 65,000 digital objects and electronic tools to search and access these items; a complete catalog of digital collections is available on the web.

The Library’s web page, recently redesigned after an extensive usability study, serves as a virtual starting point for research at Brown. The web site offers an array of search tools and links to provide members of the Brown community with twenty-four hour global access to all of Brown’s licensed databases and web-based services. New services (launched in the last five years) include desktop article delivery services, paging services for physical books, online course reserves for all media (text, image, audio, video, etc.), online chat reference and text messaging services, and a custom-built search engine called easyBorrow that works behind the scenes to query different online catalogs and automatically place the user’s request with the most appropriate service. To facilitate access to the Library’s extensive online content, librarians at Brown have created nearly
100 resource guides -- web pages that direct users to selected Library resources that pertain to a particular topic of interest.

Efforts to expand the scope of materials available to Brown users and make them more easily accessible are showing signs of success. From FY 2002 to FY 2007, the number of total circulations (items checked out from the Library) increased from 31 per user to 38 (even with a net increase in the population of faculty and students served). This number is nearly twice the industry median. In addition, Brown users are downloading well over one million articles a year from electronic journals. Brown faculty have expressed increased levels of satisfaction (comparing the 2005 and 2008 LibQUAL+ survey results) for items relating to print and electronic collections.

In this era of the virtual library, the needs for bricks-and-mortar library spaces and “high touch” services have changed, but not declined. Undergraduate students, in particular, consider the Library’s physical environment to be a high priority. The University has spent over $16 million since FY 2006 to upgrade infrastructure needs in various library buildings (e.g., wireless access, lights, HVAC, elevators, roof replacement, window films, etc.) and also improve user spaces in the Rockefeller, Sciences, and John Hay libraries. Most notable was the creation of the Susan P. ‘77 and Richard A. ‘79 Friedman Study Center in the Sciences Library, a modern, comfortable, and technologically equipped 24-hour study environment in the heart of campus. Users clearly appreciate these enhancements -- during the first year of the Friedman Center (January-December 2007), approximately 550,000 users visited the Sciences Library, a 94% increase compared to the traffic during the previous year. In addition, user survey responses that showed the most dramatic improvements (comparing the 2005 and 2008 LibQUAL+ results) were in the “library as place” category. Other efforts underway to improve and enhance the Library’s physical environment include targeted renovations to create and upgrade study spaces in the Rockefeller Library and a new high-tech seminar room in the John Hay Library. Future renovation projects (e.g., renovation of the John Hay Library reading room and the Rockefeller first floor) are dependent upon fundraising campaigns and must accommodate the associated costs of the University’s new fire code plan.

The 2005 creation of a high-density storage facility, the Library Collections Annex was a significant step in resolving the space concerns noted by the 1998 NEASC evaluation team. Not only has the Annex provided much-needed relief for over-crowded Library shelving, it also has enabled the Library to repurpose on-campus space for user needs (e.g., the Friedman Study Center mentioned above). As of June 2008 the Annex houses 762,000 volumes, which constitute 52% of its 1.5 million volume capacity. The rate at which the Annex is filled and the ultimate need for additional storage will be influenced by the timing and scope of future renovation/repurposing projects at on-campus libraries; a most modest projection for filling the Annex is approximately five years. The campus will need to give serious consideration to building a new Annex module before that time.

At present, at least two studies are underway to address aspects of space planning within the libraries. One study group is working to develop a plan for on- and off-site storage of library materials. Recommendations from this group will assist the Library in planning
for potential renovation projects and better position us to take advantage of donor opportunities. A second study is exploring how portions of the Sciences Library might be repurposed to accommodate new learning spaces and improve work areas for staff and users. These and other space planning efforts are informed by extensive feedback from students and others through surveys, focus groups, and other opportunities for input and are grounded by both the University’s overall campus plan and the key principles developed in the 2002 Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott Study of Brown’s library space and storage.

In addition to improving spaces within the Library’s buildings, the University also has invested in classroom technology to enhance the use of multimedia in teaching and learning (see Standard Eight for details on classroom technology improvements). A staff position was added to the Library’s Media Services department to support classroom equipment and new services (e.g., videotaping of classroom presentations).

As use and demand for classroom technology grow, ongoing installations and upgrades to equipment will continue to put pressures on University resources. Moreover, as the parallel demand for training (especially for faculty) becomes more pronounced, the Library and CIS will need to identify associated services and appropriate staff to fully facilitate the utilization of technology in support of the institution’s instructional mission. In doing so, the Library and CIS will need to work closely together to try to alleviate any confusion on the part of faculty and students as to where to go for support with technology-related issues. The ultimate goal of the complementary services offered by different units (ITG, STG, CDI, CIS Help Desk, Library Reference Desk, etc.) is to provide seamless assistance to Brown users to meet their information technology needs.

Computing and Information Technology

Over the past seven years, Computing and Information Services (CIS) has made tremendous strides in improving the information technology environment at Brown. Some of the notable achievements include: upgrading the network throughout the campus including extensive wireless coverage; inaugurating residence hall IPTV service; implementing MyCourses (WebCT) course management system; staffing the Help Desk with experienced and highly-trained professionals; standardizing the campus on Microsoft Exchange and Outlook providing a feature-rich email client and campus-wide calendaring; standardizing the campus on Apple and Dell computers, for which we have secured attractive pricing; implementing the COEUS system for cradle to grave support of research administration activities; and launching the Banner student information system, the most ambitious information technology project this campus has ever undertaken.

Quantitative measures of use and performance show that the IT systems and services available to faculty, staff and students are heavily used and reliable. A 2006 survey of the faculty about their use and satisfaction with IT services concluded that the more familiar faculty are with services, the higher their satisfaction. More specifically, faculty rated computing support for their research activities at 3.55 out of a possible 5 points.
suggesting the environment is adequate with significant room for improvement. Support for teaching rated 3.52 on the same scale. Overall, IT services were individually rated from 1.54 (wireless, web publishing, and VPN) to 2.35 (instructional technology, EZ-proxy, email, wired network), using a 0 to 3 scale.

CIS surveyed incoming students and seniors regarding their use of technology in 2004, 2005 and 2006. In response to feedback, CIS expanded the availability of wireless services and computing kiosks on campus. Data from these surveys provided CIS senior management and the Computing Advisory Board with information about student computing habits and device ownership. In the 2005 and 2006 surveys we also asked students to prioritize service and support options. This information has been used to guide decisions regarding student computing services and was used in the development of the IT Strategic Plan. For future years, we are considering participating in Educause’s annual survey of Students and IT.

In 2005, the IT Advisory Council met with student focus groups to hear student ideas on how to improve the delivery and support of IT services to undergraduates. Information gathered from these sessions was incorporated in the annual ITAC report to the President. As part of the 2008 strategic planning process, focus groups were held with undergraduate and graduate students. From these meetings, we learned that many graduate students arrive at Brown expecting a higher level of integration between the Student Information System and Course Management System. Students have also been disappointed in the physical classrooms at Brown, which are often not conducive to working with a laptop. Several students also cited problems with their instructors’ attempts to use projection in the classrooms. Many of these issues were addressed by the work of the Classroom Task Force convened in 2007. Other issues identified by students as problematic were the lack of ubiquitous wireless coverage on campus and the small size of the email quota. CIS has approved projects in process which look at both of these issues. Students arrive on campus with expectations of open, collaborative web-based environments and ubiquitous wireless coverage. Brown’s IT Strategic Plan identifies the need to make more collaborative tools available to students but it is likely that students will continue to depend heavily on external sources for these types of communication for the next several years.

The University allocated more than $25 million in capital funds and additional operating monies to upgrade the data network, install a central Microsoft Exchange email and calendaring system, acquire a course management system, implement a research grant management system, and implement a new student information system. Other investments yielded a new University web site design, expanded support for instructional technology, and upgraded digital facilities in classrooms. More recently, the University re-examined information technology through a strategic planning process derived from the overarching PAE. The 2008 IT Strategic Plan drew on the direct work of nearly 100 IT professionals on campus who received input from over 70 faculty, nearly 400 undergraduate and graduate students, and 50 staff and administrators. Using this extensive data gathered from interviews, focus groups, and surveys, seven working groups prepared a plan that provides both an evaluation of the current services and
capabilities, a vision for information technology at Brown over the next five years, and a set of guiding principles to assist in making technology decisions aligned with University priorities.

Priorities driving technology decisions fall into four broad areas:

**Teaching and Learning.** There are several capable departments at the University which individually and collectively provide a high level of instructional technology support to the campus. These include [CIS Academic Technical Services](#), the [Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning](#), the [Language Resource Center](#), and the [Library](#). Such services, however, are viewed as too fragmented and present a confusing picture to faculty looking for assistance. They also may not take full advantage of opportunities to integrate appropriate content and pedagogical strategies with training on instructional technology tools for both beginning and intermediate users.

**Research.** During the last 5-10 years, innovative use of computers in research activities has greatly expanded across the wide range of research areas present at Brown including the physical, natural, and life sciences, social and economic sciences, the humanities, and the arts. Implicit in the nature of research is the fact that individual programs frequently require unique and specialized computing services and support. The current environment at Brown has developed based on localized solutions in departments and research groups numbering in the range of 15-20 such facilities. Attempts to provide more centralized support have not been hugely successful but a set of centralized, cost effective core services such as Unix support, data storage and backup are viewed as essential.

**Distributed IT Support.** A wealth of IT knowledge and experience exists at Brown, both inside and outside CIS, but the current environment does not adequately support the sharing of problems and the development of common solutions. This can result in duplication of effort and expense or cascading problems stemming from inadequate support.

**Enterprise Business Applications.** The University operates a number of systems that would be considered “enterprise” in support of business and administrative functions. One challenge facing this aspect of IT is the aging of core enterprise systems. In addition, there is growing awareness that the University needs a more robust business continuity and disaster recovery plan including steps that would address deficiencies and limitation of the current data center facility.

**Projection**

**Brown University Library**

The continued expansion of systems to support library and other information resources requires a long-term plan for infrastructure and storage. Two major joint projects shared by the Library and CIS will be (1) the creation of a comprehensive digital repository
service at Brown that will support a range of academic, administrative, and digital library needs and (2) the development of a records management program that will address the selective retention and preservation of both print and electronic records across campus. Plans are well underway for the digital repository, and the initial phase (i.e., a repository of digital scholarly projects) is already in place, with a goal of having functionality for the faculty collection drop-box ready by the end of the Spring 2009 semester. A Records Management Committee has recently been appointed and will be co-chaired by the University Librarian and the VP for CIS.

In recognition of the age, depth, and richness of Brown's special collections, the coming decade will see sustained and innovative methodologies employed to make these collections available both to the Brown community and to the scholarly community at large. Digital projects, the creation of additional EAD finding aids, collections databases, search tools, and customized web sites will provide new directions for complementing traditional modes of access. These efforts recently have been assisted with grants from both the Institute for Museums and Library Services (IMLS) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The former will make the archive of the Gorham Silver Company accessible via the web; and the latter, designated an NEH "We the People" project, will establish a state-wide effort to create EAD finding aids for historical collections throughout Rhode Island.

Changes in technology and the academy have and will continue to affect the very nature of scholarly communication. Like other librarians throughout the country, librarians at Brown University have taken a lead in engaging faculty on campus to discuss their current and future needs in seeking and sharing research results. These conversations touch on far-reaching issues, including "open access" and forms of scholarly communication, data curation, and the life-cycle of scholarly information. The Library has worked closely with the Office of the Vice President for Research to identify areas needing immediate attention and to ascertain the role for the Library and others in addressing these matters. As policies and practices develop, the Library will need to consider the long-term implications for peer review, sustainable journal price models, and other impacts on the overall scholarly communication network. The Library’s newly-hired Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Resources will take a lead in helping the Library and campus work through these issues.

At present, the Library lacks a coordinated internal assessment process to identify needed skills and training programs to assure that the Library’s staff develop and maintain the skills necessary to handle the technological, cultural, and organizational challenges academic libraries face. Recognizing this gap, the Library has filled a newly created position: Head of Library Human Resources and Professional Development. This position will provide leadership in the planning, development, and implementation of human resources programs, systems, and services, including performance development and planning, learning and professional development, and organizational development to ensure effective support for the Library.
The resources available to the university to support the library and information needs of Brown faculty and students will, to one degree or another, be influenced by the larger economic climate. For example, should the university no longer be able to fund the Library's acquisitions budget at the indexed level (i.e., adjusting for the high inflation rates for serials and databases), then even a "flat" allocation would result effectively in a cut of approximately $425,000. Internally, the Library will continue to closely monitor and wisely manage its resources, looking for areas where efficiencies can be gained and more effective services can be implemented.

*Computing and Information Technology*

Projections for CIS have campus-wide impact. Beyond the joint initiatives mentioned above, the 2008 IT Strategic Plan will define the goals and priorities for information technology infrastructure and support for the next five years. The Vice President for Computing and Information Services will ensure that the University’s IT infrastructure does not deteriorate, that staff are supporting systems the community prefers, and that technology selection decisions consider a broad set of criteria including interoperability, modularity, sustainability and open standards. CIS will also be responsible for upgrading systems, cataloguing the services it offers, integrating those services with other programs, and assessing the success of these initiatives. CIS will strive to ensure that Brown takes advantage of advancements in technology appropriate to Brown’s needs. More specifically, over the next decade CIS will improve support for collaboration, expand the portfolio of research technology support services, implement a more coherent and collaborative academic technology support approach, and complete a refresh of the key enterprise business systems.

In addition to these focus areas for change in IT support and services, the University has adopted a set of guiding principles for IT to establish a context to help guide the many operational decisions in IT areas across the campus. They will further help to translate criteria and provide explanations in language all employees can understand.

*Institutional Effectiveness*

*Brown University Library*

The Library’s effectiveness in meeting the information needs of Brown University faculty and students is guided and assessed in a variety of ways. At the strategic level, the Library (like other departments on campus) is driven by the goals and priorities of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. In addition, the Library’s 1999 internal strategic plan reaffirmed the Library's traditional mission while proposing changes in how that mission can best be achieved. A key outcome of that process was a major restructuring to reorient the Library's organization and staffing around the core activities of Library users, moving toward laterally integrated and more flexible work units and away from an overly-restrictive format- and function-based organizational model. Staff reassignments resulted
in the creation of new positions within the Library to support digital technology initiatives and increased staff availability to users. More recently, the 2005 appointment of the new University Librarian has further energized and focused the Library’s strategic directions. Additional new appointments (e.g., Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Resources, Head of Library Human Resources and Professional Development) and recruitments (e.g., Associate University Librarian for Access Services, External Relations and Stewardship Officer) will help strengthen the organizational structure of the Library, establish ongoing assessment programs, and enhance the Library’s visibility and outreach services.

At the operational level, planning and assessment activities draw heavily from feedback solicited from faculty and students across campus through a variety of channels. For example, the space planning studies currently underway take into account the expressed needs and desires of students and faculty gathered in surveys, focus groups, advisory group discussions, and other activities.

The Brown University Library has two formal advising bodies. The Library Advisory Board serves to advise the University Librarian and other senior officers as appropriate on resources and priorities with regard to the University Library system. Recognized and approved by the Brown faculty, the Board is comprised of representatives from the faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and University administration. The Library Advisory Council, in consultation with the University Librarian, advises the President and the Corporation on long-term policy and planning issues, strategic directions, and efficacy of implementation concerning the University Library and its relationship to the overall educational mission of the University. Members are appointed by the President. In addition to these formal advisory bodies, the Library also hosts two informal student advisory groups: the new Friedman Study Center has an advisory board that provides regular feedback and suggestions for how to keep the center responsive to students’ needs; and another student advisory board provides feedback about the Rockefeller Library.

All of these efforts are supplemented by a steady stream of survey input from users (e.g., LibQUAL+ in 2002, 2005, 2008; Senior survey in 2002, 2004, 2006; Graduate student survey in 2004; Enrolled student survey in 2007; First Year Seminar survey in 2008; CIS/Library incoming freshman survey in 2006). The overall goals of these and other assessment efforts is for the Library to stay responsive to the changing needs of the academy and to position the Library in the best possible setting to support Brown’s teaching, learning, and research needs.

**Computing and Information Technology**

In 2008, CIS re-structured and re-allocated staff to meet the changing technology and service needs of the University; these changes affected 10% of the CIS workforce. As part of its re-structuring, a Deputy CIO position was created which provides additional executive level oversight and guidance to department planning and activities. CIS
continues to be pro-active with workforce planning and aligning IT resources to be as effective as possible in meeting the University’s strategic goals as outlined in the PAE. The recent introduction of a formal project management methodology and project portfolio review process results from an objective to more successfully measure the amount of committed and available human resources, as well as provide additional metrics on department performance.

CIS and the Library have over 60 managers jointly participating in Brown’s “Everyday Leadership” program to develop exceptional managers and to enhance their leadership skills. The ultimate goal of this initiative is to create a culture in which exceptional leadership is the “everyday” norm.

Ongoing assessment and direction for information technology resources and services at the University is formally charged to two governance committees: the external IT Advisory Council (ITAC) and an internal governance body, the Computing Advisory Board (CAB). More specific direction and a sustained and open dialogue with its customers is critical to CIS success. Specific direction and recommendations on tactical allocation of resources is managed by a series of steering committees aligned along functional application areas (e.g., human resources, financial, student). Additional feedback is routinely gathered via faculty and student surveys, as well as more interactive methods such as regular monthly gatherings and focused discussions with the many departmental based IT support staff. Wikis and listservs are used regularly to communicate on current services.
Standard Eight: Physical and Technological Resources

Overview

Since launching the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) in 2002, Brown has spent $350 million on facilities renewal, expansion and acquisition. We have made significant improvements to academic and research facilities, student activities space and infrastructure, and spent significantly on code compliance.

Over the next four years, we plan to invest another $500 million to expand our facilities pursuant to the PAE goals. We plan to improve the student experience by renovating Faunce House to create the Stephen Robert ’62 Campus Center, improving our athletic facilities to provide a new swimming pool and to meet the demand for fitness facilities, renovating a number of residence halls, and upgrading our classrooms and installing new technology. We will also continue to enhance and expand our academic facilities. Among these projects are the renovation of Rhode Island Hall for use by the Joukowsky Institute for Archaeology and the Ancient World, a new Creative Arts Center, new facilities for the Mind Brain Behavior program that will allow us to combine the departments of Psychology and Cognitive and Linguistic Studies, and a new Medical Education Building. When all of these projects are completed, Brown will have invested more than $900 million in our physical facilities since 2002.

Description

Brown’s campus has 233 buildings containing 6.5 million gross square feet (gsf) of space and occupies 48 acres of land on the East Side of Providence. The University also has 373 acres at the Haffenreffer estate in Bristol, Rhode Island. Brown recently acquired an additional 600,000 gsf of space in Providence’s Jewelry District and at 121 South Main Street, 77,000 gsf of which it occupies and 175,000 gsf which contain parking structures.

Brown’s campus buildings and improvements are valued at more than $2.4 billion. Of the 6.5 million gsf of space, 50 percent is over 50 years old, 35 percent is 25 to 50 years old, 10 percent 10 to 25 years old, and only 5 percent is less than 10 years old. The average building is 97 years old.

Brown University has 191 classrooms, totaling 159,851 square feet of space. The Registrar schedules classes in 116 of these classrooms, and the academic departments manage the use of the other 75.
The Department of Facilities Management, which reports to the Executive Vice President of Finance and Administration, is responsible for the planning and management of Brown’s facilities. Approximately 60 percent of the Department’s annual operating budget of $53 million is earmarked for wages, benefits, supplies, contracts, and equipment, and 40 percent is allocated to utility costs.

The Department of Facilities Management uses a combination of University staff and contracted specialists to provide daily services, project-related work, and preventive maintenance tasks. The Department’s service divisions include 273 positions related to carpentry, plumbing, electrical, custodial, grounds, painting, heat plant engineering, environmental control, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC). A staff of 106 professional and support personnel manages the Department. Their duties cover operations, service response, business and financial services, human resources, project planning, project management, engineering, energy management, real estate, information systems, and event support.

Between 2002 and 2011, Brown expects to have spent approximately $400 million on facility renewal and modernization, for an average annual expenditure of $44 million. Based on industry standards, Brown should annually spend at least 2 percent of the replacement value of its plant on renewal and modernization, which would be approximately $48 million per year. At this level of expenditure, all facilities would be completely renewed every 50 years. We estimate that the current condition of Brown’s plant is 86 percent “as good as new”, which compares favorably to the range of 80 percent to 90 percent reported by our peers.

**Appraisal**

*The Planning Process*

Since the PAE was adopted, Brown has taken a multi-layered approach to planning. Each level builds on the work done in the previous layer but looks at a specific aspect in more detail. This layering ensures that Brown can move forward with the assurance that its plans have a firm foundation and that it can address changes at the level at which they occur without the need to revisit underlying planning levels. This strategy allows the University to react quickly to changes in priorities, funding, and community relations.

The base layer is the University’s strategic plan, the *Plan for Academic Enrichment.*

The second layer is the *Strategic Framework for Physical Planning* created by RM Kliment & Halsband, which established a framework for the University to follow in making its most lasting investments. The framework focuses on the inevitable growth the campus will experience in the coming decades and on how that growth will enhance the character of the campus and the surrounding neighborhood.
The third layer is a series of Area Master Plans, each of which focuses on a particular aspect of campus-wide planning. These plans are more frequently updated and supplemented as conditions change and plans are completed. Area Plans completed in the past six years include the Campus Heritage Plan, the Utilities Master Plan, the Academic Facilities Plan, the Master Plan for The Walk, the Campus Life Plan, the Undergraduate Housing Plan, the Graduate Student Housing Plan, the Transportation Plan, the Materials Handling Plan, the Multi-year Facilities Renewal Plan, the Plan for the Houses, the Accessibility Plan and the Classroom Task Force Plan.

The fourth layer is project-specific planning. At the outset of each project planning process, the University identifies the amount of oversight needed for the project, classifying the project as Category 1, 2, 3, or 4, with Category 1 projects, which have a significant impact or are a major investment, requiring the most extensive oversight including approvals from senior administration and Corporation committees and Category 4 projects, which have the least campus impact, requiring the least oversight. This approach allows the University to set clear expectations at the outset about schedule, budget, campus impact and process.

To monitor this multi-layer process, Facilities Management staff work closely with the Provost’s Office, meeting weekly with the Associate Provost and monthly with the Provost’s Space Committee. These meetings ensure that evolving facilities plans remain aligned closely with the University’s capital plan and with its academic priorities.

Classrooms

In the summer of 2007, the Provost convened a task force on classrooms that included the Dean of the College, the University Librarian, the Registrar, the Vice President for Computing and Information Systems, and representatives from the departments of Facilities Management and Media Services. The task force’s charge was to evaluate (1) the need for additional classrooms, (2) the current state of our classroom environment, and (3) the need for basic and enhanced technology. The task force reported that, although the number of academic classes offered increased by 15 percent since 2001, the number of classrooms had not increased significantly. The report also highlighted the need for small seminar-style classrooms because Brown was offering more classes with enrollments limited to 20 students. The task force report recommended adding three large lecture halls of 150 seats or greater and 20 new classroom/seminar rooms that would each seat 20 to 30 students. With the renovation of J. Walter Wilson Hall completed in the summer of 2008, Brown added 11 new seminar rooms to its classroom inventory. Two planned academic buildings will also help us to meet our classroom needs: a new 225-seat auditorium and a small classroom in the Creative Arts Center and a new 120-seat lecture hall, four seminar rooms and a computer classroom in the Mind Brain Behavior building.

The task force surveyed faculty and students about the strengths and weakness in the classroom environment and with classroom technology. Overall, both faculty and
students expressed more satisfaction than dissatisfaction with classrooms on campus, but technology was found lacking in many classrooms. In the spring of 2008, the University approved a $4.3 million project to upgrade classroom technology, aesthetics, and comfort. By the start of the fall semester in 2009, Brown expects to have installed basic equipment in every classroom, upgraded furniture in about 50 classrooms, and outfitted about 20 additional classrooms with enhanced technology such as intelligent whiteboards, lecture capture capability, and video conferencing.

Utility Infrastructure

In 2002, Brown began developing a master plan for upgrading our utility infrastructure. Our goals included ensuring that Brown has the infrastructure to support new buildings, increasing reliability, increasing energy efficiency, and eliminating the need for costly and disruptive emergency repairs. The planning process included an assessment of our current high temperature hot water (HTHW) distribution system and of our Central Heating Plant (CHP), which heats over 4,100,000 gsf of campus space. The process also included an analysis of our existing electrical infrastructure and grid, which distributes power to over 4,795,000 gsf of campus space.

In June of 2005, Brown began work on a $71.4-million infrastructure renewal project to replace our existing HTHW system, to upgrade the CHP’s boilers and control systems, to upgrade the major and critical components of our electrical infrastructure, and to install regional chiller plants, which will provide chilled water to our buildings in the most economical and reliable manner. These projects are scheduled to be completed by 2010.

We are currently in the process of planning for additional infrastructure renewal. This phase will include the continued replacement of the HTHW system piping and other necessary upgrades to the electrical infrastructure system and the Central Heating Plant. We are also identifying the work that would be involved in expanding the CHP’s cogeneration capabilities to provide year-round cogeneration for the campus.

Structural Assessment

In the fall of 2006, we discovered major weaknesses in the distinctive wooden roof structure over the Smith Swim Center, Brown’s only pool, which was used by our swimming, diving, and water polo programs and for faculty, student, and staff recreation. After a comprehensive study by several experts, it was concluded that the building was unsafe and that corrective action would not be cost effective. The University closed and then later demolished the pool. Brown installed a temporary pool, which opened in the January 2008, and began planning for a new campus aquatics center.

After the structural issues in the Smith Swim Center were discovered, the Department of Facilities Management hired a structural engineering firm to perform a structural review and investigation of all residence halls, all long-span structures, and unique structures such as the Brown Stadium and the Carrie Clock Tower. While its report, completed in
the fall of 2007, identified no major problems, it did recommend a number of follow-up reviews and noted specific situations requiring corrective action. The Department of Facilities Management has begun incorporating these recommendations in Brown’s maintenance and renewal plans.

Environmental Health & Safety / Compliance

To ensure that Brown is complying with all applicable regulatory provisions, the Department of Facilities Management works closely with Brown’s Department of Environmental Health & Safety and with state and local agencies, including the Providence Department of Inspections and Standards and the Providence Fire Marshall’s Office, the Department of Environmental Management and the Narragansett Bay Commission.

In July of 2005, Rhode Island’s new fire code laws took effect. Since then, all of Brown’s residence halls have been in compliance with the new code requirements for sprinklers and fire alarm systems. Brown also completed sprinkler and fire alarm upgrades to the Brown Faculty Club; the Fox Point Day Care Center; the Meehan Auditorium; and to its largest dining facility, the Sharpe Refectory. We have begun a multi-year project to upgrade the Sciences Library. Fire code compliance is an ongoing consideration in building construction and renovation plans. As buildings undergo major renovations, we thoroughly assess compliance with the fire code and ensure that any needed work is planned and executed as an integral part of construction.

In 2005, the United States Office of Civil Rights reviewed Brown’s undergraduate housing for accessibility compliance. Its report identified various issues in specific residence halls and program halls. As of September, 2007, Brown has corrected all issues, at a cost of $4.5 million.

In 2005, the Narragansett Bay Commission (NBC) reviewed Brown’s facilities to assess its compliance with 26 wastewater pretreatment permits, including those at the Ice Rink, various laundries, food-service areas, darkrooms and X-ray units, a graphics services area and a neutralization system in the chemistry building. The Commission afterwards issued a letter stating that it found no deficiencies.

The Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management’s (RIDEM) Office of Compliance and Inspection reviewed Brown’s compliance with hazardous waste regulations in 2005 and included the majority of research buildings, the art building and waste storage areas in its review. The inspectors also reviewed emergency contingency plans, inspection records, training records and hazardous waste manifests generated over the previous three years. The University received a Letter of Compliance from RIDEM in August of 2005.

In 2007, the Environmental Protection Agency reviewed Brown’s compliance with Clean Air Act regulations and with the University's air operating permit. The permit covers 50
boilers, 19 emergency generators, a sterilizer, a pathological incinerator and other equipment on campus. The inspection included a review of operations at the Facilities Management building, the Central Heating Plant, the Biological and Medical Center, the Sidney Frank Hall for Life Sciences, and several other buildings that have boilers and generators. The inspector reviewed all records, which we must maintain under our permit, and found no issues of noncompliance.

In 2007, the Rhode Island Department of Health’s Radiation Control Agency reviewed Brown’s compliance with its broad scope radioactive materials license and with new NRC requirements for increased controls over certain radioactive materials. The inspection included both an onsite evaluation of those operations that use radioactive materials at various research facilities and a review of the records that Brown is required to maintain. The Agency found no issues of noncompliance.

Energy and Environmental Initiatives

In fiscal year 2007, Brown spent approximately $17 million on utilities for heating, electricity, water, and sewer. Its greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) during this period, including both direct and indirect emissions, amounted to 73,000 metric tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (MTCDE). As expressed in absolute terms, Brown has the lowest emissions level among its peer universities, who also report emissions in terms of normalization to the student population.

Brown completed a campus-wide energy and GHG assessment in 2006 to evaluate energy efficiency and renewable energy options and to determine how to best reduce Brown's GHG footprint. In the fall of 2006, it formed an Energy and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC) to review the assessment results and make recommendations to the University. The Brown University Corporation has approved the following recommendations:

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 42 percent below 2007 levels, equivalent to 15 percent below 1990 levels, for existing buildings over the next ten years. Interim goals will be set as soon as possible and monitored annually.
- Reduce energy consumption for all newly constructed facilities to between 25 and 50 percent below the standard required by state code. New construction must, at a minimum, meet a silver standard in Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), furthering sustainability goals.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions for all newly acquired facilities by 15 to 30 percent.

Brown’s energy management policy sets expectations for temperature levels and for staff responsibilities to conserve energy. Brown has also tracked carbon emissions annually since 1991. From 1992 through 2005, the Department of Facilities Management made energy-efficiency modifications to existing buildings and incorporated energy-efficient
features in new construction that reduced or avoided over $5 million in energy costs. The work included retrofitting of lighting fixtures, motors and mechanical systems.

In the last two years, Brown completed $2 million of lighting efficiency improvements and is in the process of undertaking another $5 million in similar projects. An additional $15+ million of planned energy-efficiency measures will reduce Brown's total GHG emissions by an additional 20 percent.

Also, since 1991, Brown has incorporated energy-efficient and high-performance design standards in new construction and in major renovation projects. As a result, Brown has one of the lowest energy densities and carbon footprints among its peer institutions. The projects have typically reduced energy consumption to 30 percent below code requirements by using energy modeling in the design and installation of high-efficiency equipment. Several building projects, currently in design or under construction, are following LEED certification standards. Brown’s design standards and project-delivery process require all future buildings to meet aggressive energy standards and incorporate high-performance design principles to improve indoor environmental quality, minimize water use and use recycled-content materials. Brown also has a comprehensive climate action plan that targets emissions reductions in new and existing buildings.

Brown’s Transportation Office promotes convenient, safe, and environmentally friendly ways to move around the campus, travel to and from Brown, and reduce traffic congestion on College Hill. Brown offers incentives to carpoolers and fully subsidized fares for R. I bus riders. The SafeRide program provides shuttle service to campus locations and rides from campus to off-campus residences. A “Bike to Brown” support group was established to encourage cycling to work. Brown’s vehicle-purchasing policy specifies fuel economy ratings and restricts the purchase of sport utility vehicles. Several departments use hybrid, natural gas or bio-diesel fueled vehicles. In addition, ZipCars are available on campus.

The Department of Facilities Management oversees Brown’s solid waste management program, originally established in the 1970s, which diverts on average 35 percent of materials to recycling. Recyclable materials are collected in four primary streams: cans and bottles, office paper, mixed paper, and corrugated cardboard. Collection containers are distributed extensively around the campus. Brown also recycles batteries, yard waste, food waste, computers, lamps, and ballasts.

President Ruth Simmons and the Sidney E. Frank Foundation have committed $350,000 to CCURB – Community Carbon Use Reduction at Brown – to support student-led projects and some staff- and faculty-led projects to reduce carbon emissions in the greater Providence area. The projects are intended to complement the work that Facilities Management is doing on campus to reduce Brown’s own carbon footprint. To ensure that this program is successful and that it can be used as a model for other programs, CCURB is working on clear goals and measures, specific project requirements and ways to coordinate with the community groups potentially affected by the project.
Brown’s Dining Department strives to purchase locally grown and fairly-traded foods. In 2002, the University established the Community Harvest program to increase the University’s support of food producers in the Rhode Island region.

Projection

Projecting beyond the current capital plan, we estimate that Brown will need to invest a minimum of $600-$700 million in facilities during the five years between 2011 and 2016. Although we cannot predict exactly how our facilities needs will develop, we expect to focus on enhancing the undergraduate experience, continuing our facility renewal and modernization programs, and improving and expanding our academic and research facilities.

We estimate that $200 to 300 million for undergraduate initiatives would allow us to focus on new and renovated residence halls, and on targeted upgrades in undergraduate facilities such as the Sharpe Refectory, the University Health Services facility, various library spaces, and athletic and fitness facilities.

Our goals for new undergraduate housing facilities include:
- Brown should house 90 percent of undergraduates on campus. The goal is to house all first-years, sophomores and juniors on campus, and to increase the number of seniors housed on campus.
- New undergraduate housing should promote community-building and the educational benefits of residential community. Housing should create innovative links between students’ residential and educational lives.
- Brown should build housing that appeals to juniors and seniors, including opportunities for independent living—apartments, suites, and single rooms.

The goals and priorities for residence hall renewal include:
- Health and Safety—Above all other considerations, residence halls must provide a healthy and safe learning and living environment.
- Systems—Residence halls should be comfortable environments in which to live and learn with adequate and reliable building and computer networking systems.
- Living and Learning Environment—The residence halls should be equipped to play an integral role in students’ academic lives, by facilitating and promoting a sense of community.

We anticipate that $325 million will be targeted for renewal and modernization, which would ensure that our overall renewal backlog does not grow. We project that the replacement value of Brown’s plant will grow to about $3.5 billion in ten years. With an annual investment of about $65 million, Brown would approach the objective of spending 2 percent of replacement value annually on facility renewal. At that level, the condition of our plant would remain at roughly 86 percent as good as new.
To help Brown plan for future renewal needs and space constraints, we are assessing our space utilization in light of our projected needs. This process will help to optimize the use of our renewal funds and to identify the funds needed for a sustainable facility renewal program. This study will establish a new baseline for eliminating the deferred maintenance backlog and, more importantly, identify facilities that simply do not meet our needs, due to inadequate quantity and/or quality of space. Although the University carefully tracks space allocation and uses the data in project planning, it has not performed a comprehensive analysis. When our assessment is complete, the data will enable the University to create a multi-year plan for projects that address academic needs as well as renewable energy needs.

Currently, Brown relies almost exclusively on periodic bond issues to provide the funding for our facility renewal projects. One of our challenges will be to establish a sustainable budget for facility renewal.

In addition to the investments in undergraduate facilities and facility renewal, we expect to invest approximately $200 million in other areas. This amount could fund renovations to existing research and teaching spaces and the construction of new research space on Brown’s recently acquired land in the Jewelry District.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

Brown regularly reviews its institutional effectiveness in several ways. The Provost’s Space Committee meets regularly to review ongoing academic space needs and approve the scope and funding of projects. Internally, Facilities Management Department meets regularly to access, prioritize, and plan facility renewal projects. The Corporation Committee for Facilities and Design meets regularly to select architects and provide design oversight for major capital projects. The Corporation Committee on Budget & Finance meets regularly to review and approve the capital budget, which includes major capital projects and projects involving renewal and the infrastructure.
Standard Nine: Financial Resources

Overview

Brown’s financial assets and revenue streams are intended to support its teaching and research programs. Brown relies heavily on income from its assets, built over the past 240 years, and on annual revenues, to advance the cause of education and scholarship. Brown’s dependence on tuition revenues exceeds that of its peers, and although the mix of revenues varies widely across the group, Brown’s revenue sources are less diversified than are those of most of our peers.

Throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, the University’s operating budget was conservatively structured, and Brown built a strong financial base: The market value of the endowment grew from $448 million on June 30, 1991 to $1.455 billion ten years later; endowment per student over the same period grew from $59,000 to $196,000; unrestricted reserve balances went from $2 million to $40 million. This solid financial foundation warranted the development of a more aggressive financial plan, to support the Plan for Academic Enrichment.

Since 2001, our goals have been to use our assets and revenues to support the Plan for Academic Enrichment and to diversify our revenues to maintain financial stability going forward and to support PAE initiatives over the long term. In particular, we sought to decrease dependence on student tuition and other fees and increase contributions from the endowment, annual fundraising, sponsored research, and revenues from continuing education and other non-traditional sources. We have also sought to expand our fundraising effort and to fund capital projects through the strategic use of debt.

Description

Operating Budget

The University’s consolidated operating budget totals $753 million for FY09. Since 2003, Brown’s operating budget has grown by more than $192 million.

This increase has supported several key initiatives: We have added 80 new faculty positions and increased our annual start-up budget from less than $1 million per year to $8.2 million. The undergraduate financial aid budget has doubled to $70 million to support need-blind admission, the elimination of student loans for many students, and the elimination of parental contributions for most students from families with incomes below $60,000. Graduate student support has increased by 75 percent and student stipends have grown by about 60 percent. We have added $30 million to our operating budget for debt service to undertake facilities renovations and new construction and for their operations and maintenance costs.
Brown’s current financial strategy, which was approved by the Corporation in FY04, is designed to enable us to both make immediate investments in the PAE’s highest-priority projects and to continue those investments in the future: The University would support initial investments through annual fundraising, endowment payout, and the use of reserves and unspent endowment payout. Concurrently, the University would embark on a significant fundraising campaign to provide permanent funding for these initiatives. As part of the annual budget process, the Corporation Committee on Budget and Finance would review the University’s progress toward our revenue goals, the use of and overall level of reserves, the latest information about the external economy, and expenditure pressures, making adjustments, if necessary, in the expense budget to match the anticipated growth in resources.

Fundraising

In October 2005, the University publicly launched “Boldly Brown,” its Campaign for Academic Enrichment, through which we plan to raise at least $1.4 billion by December 2010. Brown raised $575 million during the campaign’s silent phase, moving Brown 41 percent of the way to its goal. The specific goals are to raise $660 million of new endowment, $200 million for major capital projects, $215 million for annual fundraising programs (Brown Annual Fund, Sports Programs, and Financial Aid), and $325 million in current support for departments, centers, and programs. The campaign priorities are aligned with the Plan for Academic Enrichment and include expanding the faculty, enhancing financial support for both undergraduate and graduate students, advancing opportunities for research, shaping an ideal environment for student living and learning, and building the strength of the programs in medicine and public health.

Brown developed a Table of Needs, incorporating input from faculty, senior administrators, students and staff that serves as the Campaign’s menu of options, to guide donors in supporting the priorities established in the Plan for Academic Enrichment. We review the Table of Needs regularly to review our progress and adjust it as necessary, reflecting the dynamic nature of the Plan for Academic Enrichment.

As of June 2008, the University had received $1.2 billion in gifts and pledges in support of campaign objectives, equaling 85 percent of the campaign goal.

Because the University will receive this cash over the next seven to ten years, the administration has used conservative estimates of the timing of receipts from the campaign in making its budget projections.

The Advancement and Finance staff developed Brown’s policies on soliciting and accepting gifts. The Brown University Corporation must approve all gifts exceeding $1 million.
Endowment

The primary purpose of the endowment is to support Brown’s academic mission in perpetuity, providing future generations of students with at least the same level of inflation-adjusted support as the current generation. The payout on the endowment provides more than 20 percent of non-medical operating budget revenue. Every dollar of endowment payout in the budget helps finance vital activities, including undergraduate student scholarships, professorships, graduate student fellowships, library acquisitions, every varsity sport, and building maintenance.

As of June 30, 2008, Brown’s endowment had a market value of $2.78 billion, well above its market value at June 30, 1998 of $1.1 billion. This growth resulted from strong investment performance, the generosity of donors, and a prudent approach to endowment utilization.

Each February, the Brown University Corporation establishes the endowment payout rate for the upcoming fiscal year. Current Corporation policy limits the payout, ordinarily, to between 4.5 percent and 5.5 percent of a lagged 12-quarter average market value, using the twelve quarters of the preceding three calendar years. In February 2008, because of the dramatic increase in market value over the last several years—Brown had an average annual return of 14.6 percent for the prior three years—the Corporation authorized a significant increase in the endowment payout for FY09 to support additional investments in faculty, undergraduate financial aid and graduate students. The approved payout, 5.89 percent of the 12-quarter average, exceeded the policy parameters, the first time Brown has done so since instituting the current payout policy in 1986.

Although it is not a factor in our payout policy, Brown also tracks the “spot rate”: our payout as a percentage of market value at the start of each fiscal year. During periods of rapid growth in the endowment, Brown’s spot rate will be lower than the rate applied to the twelve-quarter average. The opposite is true during financial market declines. Over the last ten years, our spot rate has averaged 4.4 percent.

The members of the Corporation Committee on Investments and the professional staff of the University’s Investment Office jointly manage the endowment. The Committee on Investments is responsible for setting high-level investment policy and strategy, while the Investment Office staff recommends specific policies and strategies to the Committee and hires and evaluates external investment managers. Every three to five years, the Committee and the Investment Office jointly review and revise Brown’s long-term investment policy. The University’s investment policy has evolved considerably over the last ten years, with the most recent policy ratified in 2007.

Brown has four main objectives for the endowment:
- Achieve a 5.5 percent return after inflation;
- Provide a stable spending stream to the University budget;
• Preserve purchasing power over the long-term; and
• Maintain or improve Brown’s position relative to our peers.

Over the long-term, Brown’s investment policies have satisfactorily accomplished the first three objectives. The endowment’s ten-year return of 10.8 percent compares favorably to the spending benchmark of 9.5 percent (inflation represented by the higher education price index plus 5.5 percent). Endowment payout has increased 12.6 percent per year on average for the last ten years.

Meeting the fourth objective—our competitive position—has been a challenge for Brown. The University has done extremely well compared to the broad-based NACUBO data (approximately 700 colleges and universities), with our one, three, five and ten-year returns outperforming the survey medians. Internally, however, our comparison group is much smaller: the top 50 endowments and often times, the top 25. Our endowment has performed consistently close to the 50-school peer group median, but has often lagged the schools with significantly larger endowments for a number of reasons: Brown’s asset allocation had traditionally been designed to outperform our peers in down markets and would, therefore, under perform in strong up markets. We were one of the last of our peers to establish a formal Investment Office. Our portfolio has had less exposure to private equity and real estate, and many of our peers have longer-established relationships with private equity managers, giving them greater allocations to those funds. Brown’s private portfolio is relatively immature, hindering current returns.

In 2007, Brown adopted a more aggressive investment policy in pursuit of enhanced returns while still seeking to control risk and volatility. The most notable policy changes include:

• Reduced exposure to domestic equity and fixed income,
• Increased exposure to developed and emerging international markets,
• Increased exposure to private equity and real assets, and
• Modest use of leverage

With leverage, 100 percent of the endowment may be invested in equities, and an additional 10 percent may be invested in fixed income. The impact of the increased exposure to private equity and real assets will be realized over the next several years, as capital is deployed and investments mature.

Brown has increased overall portfolio risk modestly but adhering to our investment policy should produce higher investment returns over the long term and maintain sufficient downside protection to weather turbulent markets. Brown expects this shift in strategy to help us maintain or enhance our competitive position relative to our peers.

**Budget Process**

The annual budget process begins in the fall with the University Resources Committee (URC). The committee reviews and analyzes Brown’s finances and presents the
president with a recommendation on parameters for the upcoming year’s operating budget. The Plan for Academic Enrichment provides the framework within which the URC conducts its annual review and makes its recommendations. The URC also provides advice on all longer-term financial plans, proposals, and priorities. Chaired by the Provost and composed of six faculty members, five administrators serving as ex-officio members, five students (two from the College, two from the Graduate School, and one from the Medical School) and two staff members, the URC members provide a range of academic and administrative perspectives on the University’s resource allocations.

The URC reviews all major components of the consolidated operating budget, including the Education and General Budget, the Division of Biology and Medicine Budget, and the Auxiliaries Budget. The committee also reviews the University’s capital plans and capital budget, with a particular emphasis on the operating budget implications—both short-term and long-term—of current and proposed capital projects. The URC meets with senior officers, holds open forums for community members to share their perspectives on budget priorities, and reviews Brown’s overall financial condition. All committee meetings are held in closed session to allow for frank discussions among committee members and the senior officers who come before the URC.

By the end of the fall semester, the URC provides a preliminary set of recommendations on tuition and fee levels, endowment payout, fundraising expectations, salary pools, operating budget increases, new initiatives and budget recommendations, to the president. The president reviews the URC’s recommendations and returns them with comments. In late January, the URC meets again to consider the president’s comments and arrive at a consensus on the final recommendations it will make for the upcoming fiscal year. In early February the URC sends its final report and recommendations to the President.

In February, after reviewing the URC report, the president forwards the report, her comments, and her recommendations to the Budget and Finance Committee of the Corporation. After considering the URC report and the president’s recommendations, the Budget and Finance Committee submits its specific recommendations for tuition and fees, endowment payout, and the overall University budget, to the full Corporation for approval.

After the budget is approved, each senior officer receives a budget target from which he/she produces a detailed operating budget for their units. Senior officers receive monthly reports comparing budgeted to actual expenditures for each of their units. Twice a year, the senior officers complete a detailed financial review and projection for the current year. After the close of the fiscal year, KPMG, Brown’s independent auditors, review the University’s operations and financial statements. The auditors also meet with senior officials and the Corporation Audit Committee to discuss any issues or concerns they may have.

Capital Planning and Budgeting
To carry out its mission, Brown University must maintain and upgrade its existing buildings, equipment and general infrastructure, and invest in new facilities.

The University’s current capital plan includes approximately $550 million of projects we expect to complete from FY09 to FY13, provided we can meet the fundraising goals and support the on-going costs in the operating budget. The capital plan includes new buildings for Creative Arts, Mind Brain and Behavior, and a Medical Education Building, renewal and reuse of current facilities, utilities infrastructure upgrades, and technology infrastructure upgrades. (See Standard 8 for details on the capital projects and plans and Standard 7 for information technology projects.)

The University relies on an array of funding sources for its capital budget, including external debt, gifts, and internal allocations. Funding sources for the current capital plan include $209 million of external debt, $55 million of internal loans, $55 million of reserves and “naming” gifts, and $234 million of project-specific fund raising, of which $145 million has already been raised.

We have developed a written debt strategy document to provide a framework to assure that debt is managed and used strategically to advance the University’s mission. As Brown’s financial management has become more sophisticated, we have added additional strategies for debt management, including the use of derivative products. The University has engaged Prager, Sealy & Co as financial advisors on debt and financial management.

The University enjoys an AA+/Aa1 long-term bond rating. Brown’s use of debt has expanded from about $110 million in 2001 to $496 million as of June 30, 2008. The University budgets for both principal and interest costs of its external debt. For bullet maturities, which Brown has issued since 2005, its debt guidelines call for renewal funds to be set aside and invested in the endowment to provide future resources to maintain our physical plant. The current weighted cost of long-term debt is approximately 4.2 percent.

**Appraisal**

Brown has diversified its revenue streams, reallocated substantial amounts, and attained new heights in fundraising. We have taken on more risk and managed that risk.

Since 1998, and increasingly since the start of the Plan for Academic Enrichment, the University has significantly changed its revenue profile. The table below shows the composition of our operating budget revenue (excluding the medical school and auxiliary operations)
The proportion of the budget from tuition and fees has dropped to 50 percent from almost 60 percent in FY97, while philanthropic support, through endowment payout and annual fundraising, has grown significantly to almost 28% of total revenue. During FY08, we raised almost $35 million in the Brown Annual Fund from 33,000 donors. Since President Simmons’s arrival in the summer of 2001, the Brown Annual Fund has more than doubled, and the number of donors has increased by almost 75 percent. Since the start of Boldly Brown, we have received gifts and pledges of $1.27 billion, including two $100 million gifts. From FY04 to FY08, Brown raised, on average, $237 million per year in new gifts and pledges; in the prior three years, Brown raised, on average, $83 million per year.

As shown above, the percentage contribution to total revenue from sponsored funding has dropped. It is the result, however, of the discontinuation of one large research project in the Education Alliance (a largely autonomous consulting organization located at Brown), which accounted for about 10 percent of Brown’s funding.

The growth in other revenue sources is attributable to three changes. First, Brown’s auxiliary service units now contribute a significant share of their combined annual surplus to the University’s operating budget, with the remainder retained by the unit to cover equipment purchases and other capital needs. This was made possible by the expansion of our summer programs and graphic service operations. Second, all salary savings from vacant staff positions are now recaptured from departments and redirected toward PAE’s priorities. Third, the University has improved its management of its working capital to generate additional investment income. About $150 million of working capital is now invested in the long-term pool.

In each of the fiscal years since the financial plan was put in place, Brown’s budgetary performance has been better than plan. Brown’s revenue and asset growth, particularly in annual giving and the endowment, has been unprecedented, enabling the University to add to its reserves even as it budgeted to spend from them. Reserves and unspent payout totaled $380 million as of June 30, 2008, up from $286 million on June 30, 2004. Brown now has $63 million of unrestricted funds, $25 million of unexpended endowment payout, and $292 million of quasi endowment. Brown has added $40 million to the value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY01</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Payout</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fundraising</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Funding</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Reserves</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Revenue Profile
of its current funds by investing them in the long-term pool, providing additional reserves.

The salaries of senior faculty members are more competitive. Brown’s undergraduate admission process is now need-blind, and the percentage of entering students who are on scholarship is 43 percent, a figure placing us in the middle of our peer group. We have increased the base graduate student stipend by 60 percent, so that we are now within our cohort.

Despite this progress, competitive pressures continue to confront us: higher faculty compensation, more generous financial aid packages, better teaching and research facilities and expanded student support services. Public and political criticism on the overall level of and annual increases to college tuition and fees, including ours, present an ongoing challenge.

Most of our peers have significantly larger endowments, and more importantly, a higher level of endowment per student, providing them with more funding and flexibility. Brown’s investment performance has been at about the median for the 50 largest endowments. When we compare ourselves to a more select group of schools – those with whom we compete for students and faculty – it is apparent that Brown is not keeping pace. Brown’s market value per student is $336,000, up from $107,000 a decade ago, and now exceeds that of Cornell, Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania. Although we have maintained our position relative to Dartmouth, we have lost substantial ground to Duke as well as to Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Stanford and MIT.

The change in our endowment asset allocation policy should make our investment performance more competitive, but to continue closing the gap we must continue to increase the overall level of our fundraising.

Our payout from endowment, which has been in the upper half of our payout policy range since FY03, has been quite low as a percentage of beginning market value through FY08. Given our opportunities and challenges, including the concern in Congress that wealthy institutions are hoarding their endowments, we decided that it was an opportune time to increase our payout in FY09 beyond the policy range and to reassess our payout policy to ensure that it is appropriate to the current economic and competitive landscape and that it promotes Brown’s long-term fiscal health.

External support for sponsored research still accounts for a smaller fraction of our budget than we find in many of our peers among private research universities. In the E&G budget, sponsored research accounts for less than 20 percent of our total revenues, whereas for many of our peers this figure is 25 percent or more. Besides providing direct support to faculty and students for research projects, sponsored research support also reimburses the overhead associated with research activities. Increasing our support of sponsored research and reimbursement of its indirect costs must be part of our financial strategy. We must also provide suitable encouragement and incentives to our faculty to seek such support.
We will continue to work on integrating financial and capital planning and management, so that all University resources are directed toward support of the PAE’s long-term goals.

Projection

The current economic volatility, from the financial markets to the mortgage crisis to inflation and recession fears, is a reminder that we need to have financial plans and policies that are robust enough to weather challenging periods for a variety of revenue and expenditure line items, including endowment payout, fundraising, sponsored funding, financial aid expenses and capital projects. The changing undergraduate financial aid landscape, pressures from policy makers with respect to tuition rates and endowment spending, and, most importantly, Brown’s commitment to the Plan for Academic Enrichment mean we must remain focused on our goals and objectives. The details of how Brown implements the objectives in the Plan for Academic Enrichment, at what pace we are able to move forward, and what tradeoffs have to be considered will be determined over time in consultation with the relevant campus constituencies.

To balance the challenges of competition and fiscal strength, the senior administration has been working with the Corporation Committee on Budget and Finance to identify guardrails within which Brown should operate. These guardrails are envisioned as a set of critical parameters, both financial and programmatic, each with a range of permissible values that nevertheless keeps us competitive. These parameters might include the purchasing power of the endowment, our bond rating, total student charges, faculty salaries, the average undergraduate scholarship, the number of students on aid, and the condition of our physical plant.

In any year, Brown could face a short-term financial challenge. Given the likelihood and relative impact—$1 to $10 million in a given fiscal year—we believe such challenges are manageable, given our significant reserves and the flexibility we have in any year’s budget to delay or modify some activities.

We must also be prepared for financial challenges that could affect our financial structure over a long period of time; for example, an extended market slowdown, less successful fundraising or sustained pressure to minimize tuition and fee increases. These risks would require more significant responses, and therefore our financial planning should include mitigating options such as changing the number of students, slowing our faculty hiring, or adjusting the scope or timing of capital projects.

Over the two years, the senior administration has committed to undertake the following:

- Advancement staff and campaign volunteers will complete the Boldly Brown fundraising campaign by December 2010, raising at least $1.4 billion for the agreed-upon priorities.
• The Campaign leadership and the administration will examine Brown’s capacity to raise additional funds for the priorities identified in the review of the Plan for Academic Enrichment.

• The Corporation Committee on Budget and Finance will review the University’s endowment payout policy and make recommendations to the full Corporation.

• The Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration and her staff will develop a long-term plan for facility renewal and incorporate that plan into the University’s multi-year financial projections.

Institutional Effectiveness
The priority placed on planning in our current approach to managing the University’s finances has served to guide our decision making during these turbulent times. The process is withstanding the test, thus providing clear evidence for the institutional effectiveness of the approach.
Standard Ten: Public Disclosure

Overview

Brown produces communications about its mission, programs, and accomplishments in both print and electronic formats. In the time since our last self-study, much of the information that was formerly distributed in print form is now published and distributed on the Brown Web site. In 2005-2006, we reorganized the Office of Public Affairs and University Relations (PAUR) to add a dedicated Web team. This staff designs and maintains Brown’s primary Web pages and helps departments and offices to upgrade and maintain theirs. This centralization of Web services in PAUR has helped Brown improve access to and presentation of the information on its Web site.

Given the changing nature of communication and the somewhat decentralized structure at Brown, with many departments having their own chief communicators, coordinating the flow of news about Brown to the media and the external public remains a challenge. Offices other than PAUR, such as undergraduate admissions, athletics, and the graduate and medical schools create and distribute content and publicity through both print and Web media. A survey of many of these materials suggests that the University could better meet its strategic communication goals through central coordination of Web and print content and messaging. To optimize its competitive position, Brown should seek to convey a consistent message about characteristics that distinguish it among elite educational institutions.

Description

Publications

Print publications are part of the University’s communications strategy. Important print pieces include:

- Annual Report: This document provides an overall view of the University’s past year, highlighting academic excellence of faculty and students. It includes excerpts from the most recent audited financial statements, as well as audited statistical data.
- Admissions: This collateral set is distributed to prospective students. It includes view-books and other pieces directed at prospective applicants to the undergraduate college, graduate school and medical school.
- Fund-raising campaign literature: These include case statements and specific information about various goals in the ongoing Boldly Brown campaign.
• Course bulletin: These booklets, produced annually, were for many years the primary source of information about courses and registration. They have been supplemented with an online system called Banner.
• University catalog/bulletin: Brown updates this complete list of faculty, administration, trustees, courses and degree requirements every three years. The Bulletin makes no statements or promises regarding excellence, postgraduate placement success or alumni and faculty achievements. (This type of information is available in Brown’s news releases, all posted on the Media Relations Web page, with a searchable archive of news items issued over the past 20 years; in the Brown Alumni Magazine; in the Office of Media Relations’ periodic e-mail of recent news items that mention Brown; and on the Office of Institutional Research’s Web site, which provides graduation rate and postgraduate placement statistics.)
• Athletics media guides and recruiting brochures: These materials, produced by the sports information office, describe not only Brown’s varsity sports and athletes, but also provide background information on Brown itself. Most of the information in these publications is also available on the athletics office’s dedicated Web site.
• Guide for New Students and Families: Brown sends this guide to all matriculating students. It includes detailed information on orientation, course selection, AP test scores, residence hall life, activities, rules and regulations regarding student conduct, and community resources. This information is increasingly being published on Brown’s Web site and streamlined in the print version.
• Brown Alumni Magazine: The BAM publishes six issues a year both online and in print, and is distributed free of charge to more than 90,000 alumni, parents, faculty, and staff. Alumni may also subscribe to a monthly e-mail newsletter, Brown Insider, which contains news, features, calendar items, and alumni notes. Over one-third of Brown’s 90,000 alumni subscribe to this newsletter.
• Brown Medicine is published three times a year, both online and in print, and is mailed to alumni of the Medical School.

All of the information in these documents, except for the financial statements included in the annual report, is accessible on Brown’s Web site.

The Web

Brown’s home page, www.brown.edu, is its primary means of announcing and sharing information. It is often the first site visited by those prospective students and their families, who are considering Brown. Key procedural documents, such as applications for admission to all parts of the University, are posted online.

From Brown’s home page, users have one-click access to extensive information about the University’s academic opportunities, research and outreach. The site includes 10 distinct windows, updated weekly, and links to a comprehensive A to Z index. The home page also posts announcements of all major releases of information; for example, the Economic and Cultural Impact Report, the Diversity Action Plan, and regular status reports on the Plan for Academic Enrichment.
All major academic units of the University – the undergraduate College, the Graduate School, and the Medical School – present their programs, faculties, and admission information on the Web. Brown’s athletics program maintains a separate, comprehensive web site. The site is hosted externally and maintained by the University’s sports information staff. Team records, photographs, and schedules for the current and past years are available to prospective and current students and to alumni, all of whom may be greatly interested in Brown’s athletic activities.

The Office of the Vice President for Research maintains a richly detailed web page with current information on all faculty scholarship and news of major outside funding awards. The Office of Media Relations, part of PAUR, produces hundreds of press releases and advisories annually that are available (searchable and archived) on the Web site, while “Brown in the News” is a bi-weekly electronic and print digest of media clips and current higher-education issues of interest to the Brown community, whose members can receive it as an e-mail attachment or view it on the Web. The Office of Institutional Research’s Web site contains rich data about many aspects of the University’s academic life (http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Institutional_Research/). Brown also participates in the University and College Accountability Project (UCAN) by maintaining a webpage displaying various data facts about student learning at Brown (http://members.ucan-network.org/brown).

The Web team continues to redesign and construct Web sites for Brown departments, programs, and centers. It updates the major news and programmatic pages of www.brown.edu daily. Those inside and outside the University can obtain current, accurate information about Brown and its history with an efficiency and ease not available through print media.

Other Electronic Media

The University’s television studio works directly with Live Studio, which is a Boston Bureau Productions Company, for uplink to satellite as well as fiber-optic distribution. The broadcast interview studio is set up to respond quickly and easily to any media request anywhere in the world. The Office of Media Relations, with its access to more than 600 faculty members across nearly 100 academic departments, institutes, centers and research groups, can arrange expert interviews on almost any issue, including medical/health sciences, physical and geological sciences, NASA missions and planetary geology, politics and elections, arts and culture, war and peace, the global economy, international political history, and international environmental issues as well as issues in higher education. The University also maintains an ISDN line for radio interviews.

Several offices at Brown produce e-mail newsletters to keep constituencies up to date. Among those that are distributed widely are the Brown Insider, a compendium of campus and alumni news sent to Brown alumni each month; a newsletter for the local community produced by PAUR’s government and community relations staff; and two weekly
mailings, Featured Events and Brown in the News, both produced and distributed by PAUR’s media relations staff.

The University communicates regularly with elected and appointed government officials at the federal, state and local levels. This process is coordinated by the office of government and community relations and includes sharing information and updates through meetings, correspondence, publications and campus visits.

Appraisal

Publications

Brown’s official print publications continue to play a key role in communicating the essentials about Brown to a variety of audiences, including those without electronic access. They remain an important part of the University’s overall communication strategy.

The absence of a centralized publications office or University policy about communications does pose problems with some of the print materials produced at Brown. In addition to Brown’s official publications, numerous pamphlets and booklets are produced by individual offices, to augment the information that Brown publishes on the Web and in official printed documents. It is not always apparent to the audience, be it students, alumni, families or prospective donors, which among these various materials provides the most authoritative and up-to-date information. Often this augmenting information is presented from the internal office’s perspective rather than from that of its audience.

Although our Web–based content is less prone to diffuse communication, it is not immune to it. The University must persist in the coherent gathering and organizing of both textual and visual content. Brown’s progress over the past two years in establishing its Web presence will help it to continue addressing some of these persistent challenges.

The Web

Ten years ago, Brown’s Web environment provided basic information and news, but its home page and linked sites lacked oversight and regular updating of content. The home page was redesigned in 2006 to improve access to the main site. The new Web staff in PAUR’s office redesigned nearly 200 departmental sites, including all major web pages that are used by external constituencies, to make them easier to use and more consistent in presentation. Designated staff in all of these departments now update their own Web content regularly and are supported by PAUR staff.

The home page includes a feedback link to report site errors or omissions, and to provide an alternative route for inquiries. All feedback is answered immediately or forwarded to
individual departments for immediate response. The home page’s information categories are self-explanatory and contain links to more specific sources for each category. The A-Z link on the home page ensures that users can get to the page they need.

A newer page within the Brown Web environment, Today at Brown, was launched in May 2008 to replace the print periodicals formerly used for internal communication at Brown. Updated continually by PAUR staff members, the site contains news stories and profiles of Brown students, faculty and staff; the daily events calendar; daily announcements; and featured events and exhibitions. While the site is designed for the internal Brown community, it is accessible to local residents, alumni, prospective students and the news media. Much of the content on Brown’s home page now links to its articles.

Brown must continue to specialize and streamline access to the information that each of its constituencies wants, eliminating navigation through more than two links. Until it can develop a centralized communications model, it must deploy a system for fact-checking and quality control of its Web sites and publications. In addition, it is currently difficult to obtain a single document or Web page that provides an overview of all areas of the University, although the University’s Web offerings, taken as a whole, accomplish this.

Relative to its peers, Brown devotes fewer centralized resources to photography, videography (for the Web), and Web communications. Its communications rely increasingly on electronic media, primarily the online environment, whose nature requires a regular supply of visually rich content. Augmenting this area would help the University to use the Web to promote its academic priorities, enhance its visibility, and keep its constituents informed of the advancements in knowledge and scholarship occurring on campus.

**Projection**

Because the Web has transformed the way in which key information is made available to Brown’s audiences, the University has reorganized and invested in staff to manage the content and appearance of its Web resources. Continuing attention to this area will be necessary to keep pace with technological advances and the demand for information. Brown’s continued academic success depends on robust, expert support for its Web-based design, content, and visuals.

Through its public communications, Brown makes clear its goals, progress and challenges. Its continued progress as an institution depends upon ongoing efforts to refine, organize, and present information in a coordinated and technologically sophisticated manner.

The Vice President for Public Affairs and University Relations will convene a group of key University communicators in AY 2008-2009 to identify opportunities to coordinate better external and internal communications efforts, including editorial, design, Web, and
media areas. The goals of the undertaking will include optimizing resources and facilitating clearer and more effective communication. The group will also explore the idea of developing policies to guide decisions that determine appropriate distribution methods (print, Web, or both) for University communications.

Institutional Effectiveness

The University’s communication strategies are reviewed regularly by the Vice President for Public Affairs and University Relations and the directors and staff within the department of Public Affairs and University Relations. In addition to weekly meetings, the PAUR staff has an annual planning retreat to review communications goals and objectives for the year. The Advancement Committee of the Corporation provides strategic oversight for the University’s communications efforts, and general communications planning and implementation is informed by interaction with the President and the President’s Cabinet. The Media Relations Advisory Council, an advisory group composed of approximately 20 alumni who are leaders in the fields of media and communications, meets twice per year to review challenges and opportunities in the area of communications. The Council provides guidance to the President and Vice President for Public Affairs and University Relations aimed at strengthening overall outreach and efforts to advance the University’s visibility nationally and internationally. The Council recently formed subcommittees to focus specifically on media outreach, the Web and general strategic communications. The web is reviewed in a joint meeting held weekly between the Office of Web Communications in Public Affairs and University Relations and the Web Services Group of Computing and Information Services. Both groups also collaborate to update the look, hosting, architecture, content management and other components of the Brown web space. Joint work on the web is based on analytical website traffic data, and information on larger trends and innovations, collected from users, as well as the University Web Roundtable, which is an Ivy plus group of 12 universities, and other peer organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Web Addresses</th>
<th>Print Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Requirements, procedures and policies re: transfer credit</td>
<td><img src="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Registrar/guidelines/acad_regs/transfer.html" alt="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Registrar/guidelines/acad_regs/transfer.html" /></td>
<td>Guide to Brown for Entering Students and Their Families 2006 &amp; 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Rules and regulations</td>
<td><img src="http://brown.edu/Administration/" alt="http://brown.edu/Administration/" /></td>
<td>Academic Code and Non-Academic Disciplinary System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Web Addresses</td>
<td>Print Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for student conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of the College/curriculum/documents/principles.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Other information re: attending or withdrawing from the institution</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/academic_standing/leaves_of_absence.php">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/academic_standing/leaves_of_absence.php</a></td>
<td>Summer @ Brown view book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Your Sophomore Year 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://gradschool.brown.edu/">http://gradschool.brown.edu/</a></td>
<td>Brown Course Listing - Spring 2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bms.brown.edu/">http://bms.brown.edu/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Courses currently offered</td>
<td><a href="https://selfservice.brown.edu/ss/bwckschd.p_disp_dyn_sched">https://selfservice.brown.edu/ss/bwckschd.p_disp_dyn_sched</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Other available educational opportunities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/research/">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/research/</a></td>
<td>Summer @ Brown view book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/OIP/">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/OIP/</a></td>
<td>Planning Your Sophomore Year: 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://careerdevelopment.brown.edu/undergrads/index.php">http://careerdevelopment.brown.edu/undergrads/index.php</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Other academic policies and procedures</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/academic_standing/">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/academic_standing/</a></td>
<td>Academic Code &amp; Non-Academic Disciplinary System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Requirements for degrees and other forms of academic recognition</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/degree/degree_reqs.php">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/degree/degree_reqs.php</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://gradschool.brown.edu/go/academics">http://gradschool.brown.edu/go/academics</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://med.brown.edu/education/">http://med.brown.edu/education/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>List of current faculty, indicating department or program affiliation, distinguishing between full- and part-time, showing degrees held and institutions granting them</td>
<td><a href="http://research.brown.edu/research/search.php">http://research.brown.edu/research/search.php</a></td>
<td>Bulletin of Brown University for the years 2007-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Names and positions of administrative officers</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/President/org_charts/tree.php?id=1">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/President/org_charts/tree.php?id=1</a></td>
<td>Bulletin of Brown University for the years 2007-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Names and principal affiliations of members of the governing board</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/News_Bureau/Info/Corporation.html">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/News_Bureau/Info/Corporation.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Locations and programs available at branch campuses, other instructional locations, and overseas operations at which students can enroll for a degree,</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/OIP/">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/OIP/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/courses/taking_elsewhere.php">http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/courses/taking_elsewhere.php</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Web Addresses</td>
<td>Print Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.9      | Size and characteristics of the student body                               | http://www.brown.edu/web/about/facts/enrollment/  
| 10.9      | Description of the campus setting                                          | http://www.brown.edu/web/about/why  
| 10.9      | Availability of academic and other support services                        | http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/ac_support/                                                                                                                                              | Planning Your Liberal Education: A Guide for New Students, Summer 2008  
Planning Your Sophomore Year 2008-2009  
| 10.9      | Range of co-curricular and non-academic opportunities available to students | http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Campus_Life/  
http://brownbears.cstv.com/  
| 10.9      | Institutional learning and physical resources from which a student can reasonably be expected to benefit | http://dl.lib.brown.edu/libweb/index.php  
http://www.brown.edu/cis/index.php  
Brown University: Building a Life (general view book) |
| 10.10     | Institutional goals for students' education                                | http://www.brown.edu/web/page/  
http://www.brown.edu/web/about/facts/                                                                                                                                                                          | The Plan for Academic Enrichment (detailed book), February 2004  
The Plan for Academic Enrichment (glossy summary book) May 2004 |
| 10.11     | Success of students in achieving institutional goals including rates of retention and graduation and other measure of student success appropriate to institutional mission. Passage rates for licensure exams, as appropriate | http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Institutional_Research/  
| 10.11     | Total cost of education, including availability of financial aid and typical length of study | https://financialaid.brown.edu/Cmx_Content.aspx?cpld=60  
http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Admission/applyingtobrown/financialaid.html  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Web Addresses</th>
<th>Print Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
<td><a href="http://med.brown.edu/admissions/facts.html">http://med.brown.edu/admissions/facts.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Expected amount of student debt upon graduation</td>
<td><a href="https://financialaid.brown.edu/cm_x_content.aspx?cpld=80">https://financialaid.brown.edu/cm_x_content.aspx?cpld=80</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard Eleven: Integrity

Overview

Brown University subscribes to high ethical standards in the management of its academic mission through its policies and practices which apply to faculty, students and staff, its governing board and its dealings with local and federal governmental agencies and with external organizations. The University, through its officers and appropriate departments, provides openness and honesty in its dealings with the community at large. Over time, the policies and practices and the rules and regulations, both internal to the institution and externally mandated have changed. In the face of change, Brown strives to maintain academic freedom; open and broad discussion across the educational experience; fiscal responsibility; fair treatment of faculty, students and staff; and diversity and non-discrimination in its policies for admissions and employment practices. We recognize that transparency is the watchword of the times.

Brown posts its major policies and procedures on its web site, ensuring ready access by faculty, staff and students. External parties can view content bearing on the University’s commitment to fair and equitable practices. Our primary focus has been on codes of conduct for students, staff and faculty, an enhanced program identifying and managing conflicts of interest, and oversight and management of enterprise risk.

This section describes Brown’s institution-wide programs and policies, applicable across the University’s three major constituencies, students, faculty and staff; those programs and policies specific to individual groups; and ways in which they enable us to maintain a free, open and honest exchange of information and knowledge in the marketplace of ideas.

Description

Institution-Wide Commitments

Fiscal Responsibility

The Audit Committee, a long-standing committee of the University Corporation, is staffed by the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration. The Committee is charged with responsibility for monitoring the integrity of the financial statements of Brown University and its subsidiaries, affiliates, and departments; the University’s compliance with the Corporation’s legal and regulatory requirements and policies; the adequacy of the University’s internal control and risk management systems and practices; and the independence and performance of the University’s internal and external auditors.
Each year the Committee engages a firm of certified public accountants to examine the accounts of the University and to consult with the Committee to ensure that members understand the firm’s audited financial reports. The Committee is responsible for understanding the internal controls that are in place for University operations and systems, for making plans for their review and improvement, and for monitoring compliance with University rules and standards of University operations and systems as they relate to the exercise of financial responsibility. The Committee may also initiate internal investigations related to compliance with these internal controls. The Committee’s annual report to the Corporation includes the results of the independent auditor's examination of the University's financial statements.

**Conflict of Interest and Commitment**

All faculty, staff and trustees are subject to the University’s Conflict of Interest and Commitment (COI) Policy, which was modified and approved by the Corporation in 2004. The guiding principle for the University’s management of conflicts of interest is that all decisions and actions taken by employees and other members of the Brown community acting on behalf of Brown in the conduct of business must be made in such a way that promotes the best interests of Brown University. Because different segments of Brown’s population may be faced with different types of potential conflicts, each population is subject to specific guidelines, reporting requirements and reporting forms. The Provost or his designee is responsible for the administration of conflict policies for faculty and the development of appropriate management plans. The Human Resources Department is responsible for resolving staff conflicts, in consultation with department heads. The Secretary of the Corporation administers the conflict of interest policy as it applies to members of the Corporation and its standing committees. ([Faculty](#) and [Staff](#) COI Policies.)

The Research Compliance Network (RCN) is a collaboration of Brown University staff who are attentive to potential issues of compliance with federal, state, and sponsor regulations on the conduct of research. The RCN plays an important role in assessing compliance, providing outreach and training to faculty, students, and staff engaged in research and research administration, and acting as a resource for information on and assistance with research compliance. The RCN maintains policies on research involving human subjects, animal care, scientific misconduct, environmental health and intellectual property rights.

**Policies Related to Non-Discrimination**

Brown has several policies on non-discrimination. The [Corporation Statement on Nondiscrimination](#) applies to all members of the University and to all of its activities. Brown also abides by an [equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policy](#)
has established a clear policy and set of procedures regarding sexual harassment. Brown recently adopted a separate policy and set of procedures regarding discrimination and harassment generally.

Brown’s policies governing non-discrimination are monitored by the Director of Institutional Diversity, the Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, the Office of Campus Life and Student Services, representatives from the Admissions Office and the Faculty Committee on Equity and Diversity. The policies are reviewed annually and revised as needed.

**Information Technology**

In the time since our last accreditation process, the world of computing and information technology has changed dramatically. Beginning in 2002, the Computing and Information Services department began developing and issuing policies on computing issues, including acceptable use, copyright infringement (RIAA Anti-Piracy Enforcement Efforts), and copyright and fair use resources. Several of the current policies were developed or revised in the past two years.

**Political Activities Guidelines**

The University has long had guidelines governing participation in political processes and political activities which occur on campus. These policies were revised in 2008 to address current issues relating to political activity, access to facilities, and use of campus resources. The revisions retained significant opportunities for recognized campus groups and individuals to exercise free expression regarding issues and candidates. The University believes that its policy ensures a robust exchange and diverse exposure to issues for the Brown community, and more clearly defines the permissible uses of campus resources in supporting political activities, without risk to the University’s 501(c)(3) status.

**Students**

The academic conduct and general behavior expected of students is set forth in the Academic Code, and the Student Rights and Responsibility Handbook, issued by the Office of Campus Life and Student Services. Three separate versions of the academic and non-academic codes, for undergraduate students, graduate students and medical students are in the process of being prepared by a joint committee. All are available online and are presented to each incoming student prior to arrival. Graduate students receive printed copies at Orientation where they are discussed in detail. New undergraduate students are required to complete an online Orientation tutorial prior to their campus arrival. This
tutorial includes information on the academic code and standards of student conduct as well as health and safety resources.

The academic code sets the expectations for student conduct around their academic work. Students are to submit their own work, which must clearly represent the facts and properly document references and sources. The procedures for addressing infractions of the academic code are also clearly stated in the policy.

Student life at Brown is guided by tenets of community behavior that reflect respect for Brown’s educational mission. Among the tenets are respect for the integrity of the academic process, individual integrity, respect for the freedoms and privileges of others, and respect for resources. The tenets are outlined in the Student Rights and Responsibility handbook. The handbook also contains policies and procedures governing specific areas of student life and outlines non-academic disciplinary procedures.

In addition to written policies, expectations and codes, the Offices of the Dean of the College, the Graduate School and the Dean of Student Life have primary responsibility for setting and enforcing standards of integrity and honesty among students. A discussion of integrity, and its importance in an academic community, begins during undergraduate and graduate Orientation. The Graduate School hosts a dinner and seminar series entitled “The Academy in Context” designed to address ethics across the curriculum. The Graduate School won a grant to support training in ethics and responsible conduct in research.

Faculty are encouraged to speak about the academic code, honesty and integrity in their classrooms and laboratories. All members of the community are expected to report suspected academic dishonesty to the Dean of the College, Graduate School or Medical School, as relevant. Discussion of issues of citizenship, respect, and non-discrimination occur regularly in the residence halls, led by the counseling programs, including the Community Directors. The University’s public service programs and athletic program also work to educate the community on integrity issues.

The federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) provides students specific legal protections regarding the release of their educational records. This Act is discussed in the Student Handbook. Among other protections, FERPA gives students the right to access their educational records kept by the school; the right to have their educational records be disclosed only with their consent; the right to amend the content of their educational records; and the right to file complaints against the school for disclosing the content of their educational records in violation of FERPA.

The University has responded to recent national concerns about conflicts of interest in internal and external financial relationships, including those relating to programs for study abroad. In 2008, the University conducted a thorough internal investigation and identified no conflict of interest issues; it also found that Brown is a leader in offering its students a vast variety of external opportunities for study abroad.
The Public Safety Oversight Committee (PSOC) was established in 2005 to advise the Chief of Police on the practices, policies and procedures of the Department of Public Safety and to make policy recommendations where appropriate. Brown’s Department of Public Safety also issues a brochure “Your Basic Rights and Responsibilities When Interacting with Law Enforcement.” In 2005, the University also established the Officer Conduct Review Board (OCRB) which meets when necessary to investigate specific complaints or incidents of police misconduct by Brown’s Public Safety Department. No complaints or incidents have been brought before the OCRB to date.

The federal Jeanne Clery Act requires the University to collect statistical data on its campus crime and campus security policies and to annually prepare, publish, and distribute a security report through publications or mailings to all current students and employees. The report must also be furnished on request to any applicant for enrollment or employment.

The NCAA requires every participating institution to complete a self-study for recertification of its athletics program every ten years. The last self-study at Brown was completed during the 2005-2006 academic year with Brown receiving its recertification in 2006. The Department of Athletics issues a policies and procedures manual which includes not only the relevant requirements for NCAA, Ivy League and ECAC compliance, but also information on the fair treatment of Brown’s student-athletes and department employees. The manual, last updated in July, 2007, includes a dispute resolution procedure for use when a student-athlete has a dispute with his coach or others in the department. Student athletes retain access to all other avenues of grievance/dispute resolution within the University.

Brown annually complies with the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, which requires reporting on participant numbers, coaches and revenues and expenses of men’s and women’s teams. The report is published each October through the U.S Department of Education, and is posted on Brown’s Athletic Department web page.

**Faculty**

Policies and procedures relating to the faculty are designed to ensure an environment where the free exchange of ideas can flourish. The primary articulation of this objective is in the University’s Statement on Academic Freedom. It states that the pursuit of scholarship is essential to the academic enterprise, and affirms that faculty members and students shall enjoy full freedom in their teaching, learning and research. This philosophy is reinforced by policies included in the Faculty Rules and the Student Handbook.

The Committee on Grievance, a standing committee of the Faculty, is charged with the review of petitions which allege a violation of the academic freedom of faculty. The Faculty Executive Committee acts as a conduit between the Faculty and the Administration, Corporation and students in discussions on faculty issues. It also
provides a review of policies on academic freedom and recommends revisions to policies and procedures as necessary. The faculty grievance procedure also covers allegations that: (1) the University has failed to follow prescribed procedures in reappointment or promotion; (2) an individual grievant has been the subject of discrimination; and (3) the rights of a member of the community have been abridged. Appeal and review mechanisms are in place as a check and balance against unfair administration of these policies.

In May, 2005, the Corporation approved and adopted the Brown University Patent and Invention Policy and Copyright Policy. The policy is intended to further the “missions of education and the production, preservation and dissemination of knowledge.” The policy articulates the royalty rights of the inventor, the University, and the academic department in the licensing of any patent or invention, and in the registration of faculty copyrights in scholarly works. The Research Advisory Board for the Office of the Vice President for Research is charged with periodically reviewing and updating the policy. Disputes are heard by a Standing Appeals Committee, in consultation with the Office of Brown Technology Partnerships and the Office of the General Counsel, who together make recommendations to the Vice President for Research, the Provost and the President.

In 2005 the University created the position of faculty Ombudsperson. This person provides an impartial, confidential and informal venue for faculty members to discuss problems and receive guidance and support in the pursuit of voluntary resolution, and is available to assist in mediation and dispute resolution. The Ombudsperson has no authority to receive formal complaints, make administrative decisions, or adjudicate disagreements, but is available to listen, offer feedback, identify issues and options, clarify and make suggestions about procedures and policies, and refer faculty to appropriate resources and offices. The ombudsperson also advocates for fairness and justice, including recommending policy or systemic changes. 

**Staff**

The University has issued a comprehensive policy document entitled Human Resources Policies and Practices Manual. This manual, in combination with You & Brown: Human Resources Staff Information Guide, reissued in late 2007, and Employee Responsibilities and Rights, a broad compendium of resource referrals for the day-to-day responsibilities of staff employees, issued in 2005 define the rights and responsibilities of Brown employees. All of these documents are accessible to all employees from Brown’s Human Resources web page. Staff members who do not have regular access to computing may receive written copies of the documents at their place of work. New staff members are required to attend an orientation session at the beginning of their employment where they receive a copy of You & Brown and Employee Responsibilities and Rights. All documents are reviewed regularly and modified as necessary. Staff members are informed of relevant changes through either Morning Mail, a daily e-communication of University-related activities, or through other electronic or written communications.
The Human Resources Department, as well as the Division of Biology and Medicine Human Resources Department, is responsible for all employment policy matters relating to staff. The University administration is charged with ensuring compliance and with addressing violations when they occur. The annual performance appraisal and salary increase process, as well as a number of grievance procedures, present opportunities for these issues to be discussed. Internal and external audits and other control mechanisms of the University are in place to review staff conduct. A Problem Resolution Process, for addressing and resolving grievances and conflicts within the staff, has been established and is described in the Human Resources Policies and Practices Manual. Union employees are represented by their representatives and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract between members and the University. The Director of Labor Relations, a member of the Human Resources Department, is responsible for proper administration of the union contract on behalf of the University.

The University recently launched an electronic employment site, where any person at any location can view all available staff positions at the University and submit applications online. This has yielded a substantial increase in the number and range of potential employees, decreasing Brown’s need for reliance on outreach efforts and print advertising.

The University is committed to providing a safe and secure environment for its students, employees and financial resources. In 2006 the University implemented Reference and Employee Screening Policy (Human Resources Policies and Practices Manual 20.014.) This policy specifies that applicants for certain positions may be subject to screening checks in addition to standard reference checking, after Brown makes its conditional offer of employment but before the applicant is permitted to start work. These may include a criminal history check at the local, state, federal or international level; motor vehicle records check; and verification of educational and license credentials. In rare situations, drug screening may also be involved. The Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), as amended in 2001, regulates the use of information obtained through these checks, and the requirements for notifying the prospective employee. The University has entered into an agreement with an external firm to conduct such checks as the University determines are necessary in each case. As a part of the agreement, the Human Resources Department has certified that the University will comply with all terms and conditions of the Act.

While the University has long had a process by which employees could address their workplace concerns, the Problem Resolution Process has been updated since the 1998 self-study to clarify what employees are covered under the policy and the types of workplace actions subject to the policy. The policy exists to provide a formal means for employees to resolve work-related concerns. This process is limited to actions by employees who have experienced an adverse employment decision in the form of a discharge or suspension, or have otherwise been disciplined in a manner which they believe to be inconsistent with the terms and conditions of their employment or other University policies. It does not provide a forum for review of management style or professional assessments about grade classifications and judgments of supervisors.
including day-to-day management of work assignments, performance evaluations, salary and staffing or organization of a department, or complaints against a non-supervisory coworker or other employee.

**Appraisal**

Since its last reaccreditation, the University has extensively reviewed and revised many of its policies and procedures, and has initiated several new mechanisms for ongoing oversight and review. These changes have been made both to practices, policies and structures that are applicable University-wide and to those applicable to specific constituencies.

The University has developed new structures to support Brown’s ongoing commitment to transparency in its operations and to facilitate the identification of and response to potential risks. The Risk Management Committee (RMC) was established in 2005 and charged with identifying, assessing, reducing, monitoring, and reporting key risks that might impair the achievement of Brown’s strategic goals and objectives. The Committee consists of University administrators with key risk management responsibilities.

Since the last accreditation process, Brown has also created the position of Associate Vice President for Research Administration. This position ensures that the research infrastructure is robust and responsive to the needs of Brown University investigators and their research partners. The Associate Vice President oversees all aspects of research administration and compliance at the University, serving as the advocate for faculty throughout the grant-seeking and oversight process, and also assists the Vice President for Research and the University in developing, implementing, and monitoring the effectiveness of Brown’s research policies and procedures. Under the direction of this office and of the Office of the Vice President for Research, specifically the RCN mentioned earlier, the University has greatly revised its policies and procedures on conflict of interest, use of human subjects, animal care, scientific misconduct, environmental health and intellectual property rights.

Also since the reaccreditation process of 1998, Brown’s Purchasing Department has established procurement standards in business ethics, statutory compliance, use of minority- and women-owned businesses, environmental issues and a vendor code of conduct for Brown University licensees. The code of conduct states that compliance with the code by the vendor or its contractors is “a condition of being permitted to produce and/or sell licensed products bearing the name, trademarks and/or images of Brown University.” This information is available on Brown’s Purchasing Department web page.

In 2005, the University issued its Discrimination and Harassment Policy and Grievance Procedures, complementing Brown’s well-established Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures. It addresses the making, investigating and resolving of allegations of harassment and discrimination based on race, color, sex, age, religion, national/ethnic origin, veteran status, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.
The policy establishes a standard of conduct that is similar throughout the University, but its due process procedures vary, depending on whether the respondent is a faculty, student or staff member.

In 2008 Brown created the position of Senior Vice President for Corporation Affairs and Governance. This position is responsible for leading and coordinating the University’s policies, structures and operations for Corporate affairs, University governance and risk management, to ensure integrated, coherent and effective oversight. Major responsibilities include providing leadership and strategic direction in Corporation affairs and University governance; and overseeing the leadership and effectiveness of Public Safety, Environmental Health and Safety, and other departments. The Senior Vice President works with the Office of General Counsel to address issues of risk avoidance; clarify and integrate the University’s risk management strategy; ensure University compliance with national and international best practices for governance and risk management; and lead Brown’s participation in shaping its national agenda in these increasingly important areas.

**Projection**

During the last ten years, the University has conducted internal comprehensive reviews, or has commissioned external ones, of many of its policies and practices. In response to the findings of these reviews, Brown revised many of its policies and practices to maintain their adaptability to the changing environment in which an institution of higher education operates today. The University acknowledges that change happens rapidly, and that to protect against errors in judgment or breaches of trust, it must remain vigilant. Senior administrators, faculty and staff are well aware of the potential consequences if the University ceases its constant review to ensure that the University remains honest and fair in everything it does for its students, employees and the community at large.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

There are several committees which participate in the review of the institution’s policies and practices to insure the highest levels of institutional integrity, many of which have been discussed in greater detail in the preceding pages. The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) is charged with responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of policies applicable to faculty, recommending changes, and obtaining faculty approval. The Dean of the College, the Provost and the Dean of Students and Campus Life evaluate and assess for students the academic and non-academic policies affecting the education and well-being of students. Since the last accreditation, several other committees which contribute to the evaluation of institutional integrity have been established:

- University Resource Committee (URC)
- Brown University Community Council
Staff Advisory Committee (SAC)
Public Safety Oversight Committee (PSOC) and Officer Conduct Review Board (OCRB)
Risk Management Committee

All of these entities, plus more, use a variety of methods for accumulating and assessing evidence which guides them to improved policies and delivery of services with institutional integrity throughout the University. Membership by the senior officers on the President’s Cabinet and on these major University committees works to assure integrated outcomes applicable University-wide.
Conclusion

The self-study process has greatly contributed to Brown’s continued improvement. The simultaneous reviews of the graduate and undergraduate programs in conjunction with the scrutiny required for the self-study reminded us all that our individual work serves a shared purpose. These processes have affirmed our sense of pride in this great university, invigorated our improvement efforts, and renewed our optimism about the future.

We can glean several key messages from the self-study and other reviews undertaken during the process. For one, the historical strength of Brown’s undergraduate program was reaffirmed. By most every measure, Brown students achieve at the highest level. They successfully compete for some of the most prestigious fellowships and awards and many go on to obtain graduate and professional degrees from the highest quality programs in the world. Brown students attain this success even as they take the lead for designing and executing their own educational careers. With guidance and support from the faculty, Brown students not only sample an amazingly broad array of core courses, but they also take full advantage of the opportunities and options within concentrations to obtain a depth of knowledge in particular subject matter. Brown’s undergraduate program is healthy and delivering the desired outcomes.

Second, Brown’s continued commitment to investing in its educational program was reflected in the area of emphasis prepared for the self-study. The work of the Task Force spoke to the relevance of the open curriculum especially in the context of the contemporary goals of liberal education, but their report still provided insights into how Brown might continue to improve the effectiveness of its unique educational approach. Although several of the recommendations may not be fully realized for a few years, the University has already begun to act on the Task Force’s suggestions. Primarily increased support has been allocated for creating better tools for guiding students through the open curriculum, such as new publications, curricular events and improved faculty advising. Moreover, the University has begun to strengthen science and math teaching. Also important are the plans for better assessing student learning outcomes. Plans are already underway to design and implement new processes for collecting and analyzing data on student learning outcomes in writing and within the concentrations. These efforts will surely continue to increase the academic excellence offered by the Brown Curriculum.

Then too, the self-study shows that recent investments in faculty and academic programs are helping to strengthen Brown’s position among nationally ranked research universities. These investments which include growing the faculty, while increasing salaries and other resources are working to improve Brown’s ability to recruit and retain faculty of the highest quality. Results of these efforts are seen in the number of prestigious awards granted to members of the Brown faculty over the last few years and in the improved ability of the faculty’s to win financial support for their research. Also the expanded
faculty has helped to create new programs and centers focused on new and innovative topics such as Brain Sciences, Environmental Studies, and Nanotechnology. The University will continue to focus on improving its research status by persistent investments in technology, space and infrastructure to support the faculty’s scholarship and teaching.

We also see that investments in faculty and academic programs have strengthened graduate education at Brown. The Graduate School is experiencing record numbers of applications and the competitiveness of its students is increasing. Some of the recent success is also owed to the attention the University has paid to making graduate stipends more competitive and guaranteed. The Working Group on Graduate Education has recommended other improvements to graduate education at Brown. These include further improvement in stipends and growing the graduate school. We expect that the future will show even more increased indicators of success for the Graduate School at Brown.

A final point made clear by the self-study is that the work at Brown has been aided by increasing attention to strategic planning and evaluation. The adoption of the President’s Plan for Academic Enrichment and the appointment of an executive vice president for planning who is charged with stewarding the Plan insures that the University’s priorities are well explicated and that there is coherency between the priorities and the resources to realize those priorities.

The preparation of the self-study provided us with an opportunity to experience a broad survey of Brown’s efforts over the past decade. Our emphasis on enhancing the student experience, expanding and supporting faculty, redesigning and redefining campus infrastructure, and examining and implementing plans for emerging priorities mirror the concerns embedded in the Commission’s Standards. We will continue to assess Brown’s success in the context of this framework, and recommend improvements consistent with these ideals and those established by our mission.
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<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Racial and Ethnic Distribution</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Enrollments in New Graduate Programs</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Peer Comparison of Graduate Stipend</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Faculty Distribution by Ethnicity and Gender</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Regular Faculty Growth</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Student-Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Revenue Profile</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1 Taskforce Recommendations
4.2 Taskforce Plan
LIBERAL EDUCATION

Promote a culture of responsible and integrative learning

1. The Task Force recommends that the College Curriculum Council develop a revised set of principles and goals for liberal learning at Brown. These principles should clarify the meaning of breadth in the context of an open curriculum and acknowledge the critical importance of real-world experience and civic engagement in shaping lives of “usefulness and reputation.” The principles should also articulate the areas of intellectual inquiry—and the modes of thought—that students are expected to engage when developing and building their own core curricula. Such areas include the ability to communicate effectively in more than one language; the capacity to understand histories and differences among cultures; the knowledge of scientific methods together with the quantitative skills necessary to imagine and solve complex problems; and the appreciation of forms of representation in many kinds of expressive media. Profiles of individual students should be provided to suggest the kinds of educational programs undergraduates have designed for themselves. We recommend, moreover, that departments create a number of regular undergraduate offerings that introduce the spirit of their disciplines, thus encouraging students to explore the curriculum in the broadest possible way—not just in the first two years, but during all four years of study.

2. The Task Force calls for a full examination of Brown’s concentration programs to ensure integrity and consistency across the curriculum. To that end, we recommend that each concentration complete a self-study that will offer a clearly stated rationale for the concentration’s required courses and learning outcomes. The statement would explain not only how the program’s required courses fulfill the expectations of a given discipline, but also how they serve to fulfill the broader learning goals of a liberal education. Concentration programs must identify a number of meaningful and connective intellectual experiences (“capstone” experiences) that would be available to all concentrators. Departments are urged, in addition, to develop periodic, systematic plans for assessing students’ success in fulfilling concentration outcomes.

In connection with this general review, the Task Force recommends that the College Curriculum Council take special care to review student enrollments and faculty resources in each concentration. In cases where the CCC sees that a program lacks sufficient interest or resources, it may decide to close down the concentration. In cases where interest is high, but resources are slim, the Dean of the College should work closely with the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty to provide what is necessary to ensure the program’s academic integrity.

3. The Task Force urges the College to work closely with the Office of International Affairs to make Brown a leader in innovative global education. We recommend that the University create new opportunities for in-depth international study connected to the concentrations, including flexible short-term study experiences, new international fellowships, and internships. In conjunction with the overall review of concentrations, departments are encouraged to consider designing an international track within their own concentration programs, with the appropriate language expectation.

4. We propose that the College develop an e-portfolio system to aid both students and faculty advisors in evaluating the shape and direction of a student’s liberal education. Students would be asked to write about their educational goals and development at key points in their Brown careers: before they matriculate, during their first year of study, prior to choosing a concentration, and during their senior year. These self-assessments would demonstrate students’ success in meeting concentration outcomes and Brown’s liberal learning objectives. E-portfolios could also serve as a component of the departmental assessment plans recommended above.

5. The Task Force recommends that Brown’s existing expectation for writing competency be strengthened.
We advise the College to undertake an external review of Brown’s various writing programs and support services with the aim of enhancing opportunities for students to fulfill this expectation. The College should develop a clear statement about writing proficiency along with methods for assessing students’ writing abilities prior to matriculation, during their first two years of study, and upon completion of the concentration. The e-portfolio recommended above would allow students to demonstrate growth in their writing abilities over time and thus could enable the College to provide direct evidence that students have met the writing requirement.

**ADVISING**

**Improve advising and mentoring beyond the classroom and across the years**

6. The Task Force recommends that the College work with the Office of Student Life to create an enhanced Faculty Advising Fellows Program that would provide more intensive and broader advising support than can be expected from Brown’s regular contingent of academic advisors. Faculty Advising Fellows would work in teams with existing Fellows in Residence to help students connect their academic experiences to their lives outside the classroom. The Advising Fellows would organize and attend events at Fellow houses, provide enhanced advising for sophomores, reach out to students in academic difficulty, and offer training and support for other advisors. Additional resources are needed for staff who would work with Fellows and students to help plan events and facilitate communication.

7. The Task Force endorses the recommendation of the Undergraduate Science Education Committee that the University establish a resource center on campus to enhance the advising and mentoring of students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines. Ideally, this center would bring together, under one roof, Brown’s many departmentally based peer-advising and tutoring networks in math and science, while also enhancing opportunities for students to work with faculty on research projects and community outreach activities.

8. The Task Force urges the Dean of the College Office to develop more nuanced measures to track student progress and to assure student success in Brown’s open academic environment. In keeping with Brown’s mission of diversity, we especially encourage the College to implement new advising strategies responsive to evolving student demographics. Careful attention should be paid to the needs of students from historically underrepresented minority groups, students from under-resourced or under-performing secondary schools, students with high financial need, first-generation students, and international students. We encourage new programs that would initiate the advising dialogue before students arrive on campus and strengthen advising support throughout the academic year.

9. The Dean of the College Office should develop additional measures to enhance the continuity of the advising experience over a student’s four years. We recommend developing a more reliable means for retaining pre-concentration advisors for two-year intervals, and also recognizing them for their work. We suggest piloting the use of Personal Identification Numbers (PINs) for sophomore registration to ensure timely conversations between students and their advisors. And we recommend that the Dean of the College develop a simple online mechanism for advisors and advisees to communicate with each other about how the partnership is working.

We believe the student e-portfolio mentioned above should help facilitate conversation between sophomore advisors and concentration advisors, as students complete the concentration declaration. But we feel strongly that advising norms for concentrations must be clarified across the curriculum. In that spirit, the Task Force recommends that every concentration be required to foster an active Departmental Undergraduate Group (DUG). Concentration advisors and DUG leaders should work together to ensure continuity from year to year, and to sponsor a reasonable number of events per semester, one of which should be a spring meeting involving new concentrators.
10. From a broader perspective, the Task Force urges the College to assess the full range of student advising needs, especially toward the end of students’ time at Brown. To prepare for life after college, all undergraduates should be advised about meaningful work experiences in the course of their undergraduate programs. We encourage the College to develop more internships and placement opportunities for students seeking employment in both the private and the public sector, along with strengthened advising programs to help students plan for post-baccalaureate fellowships and professional degrees.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

Support curricular development, independent and peer-directed learning, and effective teaching

11. To encourage the continued growth of the open curriculum, the Task Force recommends that the College increase annual funding for new and innovative courses. We especially support the Undergraduate Science Committee’s proposal that a pool of resources be created to support curricular innovation in the sciences. We also recommend that opportunities for team-teaching be expanded. By fostering conversations across departments, team-teaching can promote a greater sense of community among faculty while also developing a student’s awareness of the pluralism and even dissonance of knowledge production.

12. The Task Force recommends that the College increase funding for independent learning experiences, including undergraduate research opportunities and internships. Special efforts should be made to support more international Undergraduate Teaching and Research Awards (UTRAs) and internships. The Task Force also encourages the College to assess its peer-directed learning programs (e.g., the Meiklejohn Peer Advising program, undergraduate teaching assistant programs, and peer tutoring programs in the sciences) with the double aim of expanding the programs where appropriate and ensuring that all undergraduate teaching assistants and tutors receive the support and training they need.

13. In order to assess teaching and learning more effectively, the University is encouraged to develop a flexible, online course evaluation tool that would be made available to all departments. The online instrument could be modified by departments and would encourage students to provide more extensive feedback on their learning experiences. The Task Force also encourages faculty to solicit some form of midterm feedback from students in their courses. Such feedback allows faculty to assess their initial effectiveness in working toward course goals and to modify their approach if necessary.

14. To help graduate student teaching assistants acclimate to Brown, the Task Force recommends that they be provided with opportunities to learn about Brown’s educational philosophy before entering the classroom. The Graduate School should continue monitoring the state of graduate teacher-training in individual departments, identifying best practices and helping departments implement appropriate methods for preparing students to become effective teachers.

15. New and junior faculty should also be provided with structured opportunities to learn about Brown’s educational philosophy and distinctive student culture. We recommend that new faculty members work with departmental mentors of their own choosing who can help them learn more about Brown and about teaching in the discipline.

Finally, in keeping with Brown’s longstanding commitment to excellence in teaching, academic departments should develop clear plans to support, assess, and improve the teaching of all faculty. The development of improved course evaluation tools described above should be an integral part of such plans. But departments should also explore other forms of peer evaluation to improve departmental dialogues about teaching and ensure that faculty have what they need to achieve excellence.
Plan of Action

The following pages list the concrete actions necessary to implement recommendations made by the Task Force on Undergraduate Education. The table identifies progress already made and a timetable for completing the steps. Recommendations in the table are abbreviated. For the complete text of each recommendation, see pp. 24–26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Related Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Date Completed Actual</th>
<th>Date Completed Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work with CCC to develop principles of liberal learning at Brown, and develop other means to expand and integrate learning experiences beyond the classroom</td>
<td>Meet with CCC to work on principles. Publish and distribute.</td>
<td>Send “Liberal Learning at Brown” to class of 2012, to advisors, and sophomores</td>
<td>April-August 2008</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect student and faculty narratives to supplement document</td>
<td>Solicit student profiles and publish in matriculation materials sent to incoming students</td>
<td>May-June 2008</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new courses that include community service</td>
<td>Swearer Center announces call</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage departments to create undergraduate offerings in their field to promote exploration of the curriculum.</td>
<td>Expand First-Year Seminar Program through curricular development grants</td>
<td>Number of FYS increases from 56 in 2007-08 to 76 in 2008-2009</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop plan to offer more seminars for sophomores, juniors, and seniors</td>
<td>Cogut Humanities Center announces new junior/senior seminars taught by visiting faculty, postdocs, and fellows</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Call for development of new sophomore/junior seminars</td>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct comprehensive review of Brown’s concentrations</td>
<td>Notify departments that will be reviewed in 2008-2009</td>
<td>Contact Africana Studies, Cognitive Neuroscience, Comparative Lit, Education, Hispanic Studies, History, International Relations, Psychology, and Theater, Speech, and Dance</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with CCC to create calendar for review of all concentrations by 2011</td>
<td>Discuss plan with CCC</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage faculty in question of measuring student learning in all concentrations</td>
<td>Draft general plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop methods to encourage and track senior capstone experiences</td>
<td>Organize Wayland Collegium workshops to expand conversation with faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2007 and Spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send letters to juniors and seniors; hold junior class reception</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design and create Portfolio environment (see #4 below)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Related Action</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Date Completed Actual</td>
<td>Date Completed Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase opportunities for international study through both short-term and long-term programs</td>
<td>Work with Office of International Affairs to develop scholarships for international study</td>
<td>Announce Brown International Scholars Program</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Office of International Programs, Summer and Continuing Studies, and Curricular Resource Center to reconceptualize existing international opportunities. Expand capacity and support for short-term international programs, internships, and non-credit options</td>
<td>Conduct initial planning meetings with OIP and SCS</td>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create initiatives for developing international curriculum</td>
<td>Announce new programs</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with faculty groups to outline the components of a flexible international track in the concentrations</td>
<td>Meet with select departments</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with CCC and Graduate School to explore advanced degree programs centered on international experience</td>
<td>Develop Wayland Collegium workshops to expand conversation with faculty (see #2 above)</td>
<td>Fall 2008-Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce Brown International Scholars Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop e-portfolio system to aid in the evaluation of student progress</td>
<td>Research software</td>
<td>Select software</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet with Computing and Information Services, Library, IT Project Review Committee, and student focus groups to discuss options and resources</td>
<td>Form committee to implement system</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make portfolio environment available to incoming class</td>
<td>Complete testing</td>
<td>Summer 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launch portfolio</td>
<td>Launch portfolio</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Related Action</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Date Completed Actual</td>
<td>Date Completed Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strengthen Brown’s expectation for student proficiency in writing and conduct review of Brown’s existing writing programs</td>
<td>Establish faculty-student board</td>
<td>Convene Writing Advisory Board</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage outside reviewers</td>
<td>Conduct outside review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect information about writing-based courses across the curriculum and establish new course designation (W)</td>
<td>Send preliminary survey to departments</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send follow-up survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Create enhanced program of Faculty Advising Fellows to increase opportunities for students and faculty to interact informally</td>
<td>Develop program with current Faculty Fellows and Committee on Residential Experience</td>
<td>Meet with Faculty Fellows and CRE</td>
<td>March–April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce program and recruit new fellows; pair new FAFs with houses; meet with new fellows to plan fall activities; design websites for the five houses</td>
<td>Announce program to faculty</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit 10 new Fellows; schedule summer meetings</td>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design house websites</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit 5 additional Fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td>March–May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertise and fill position</td>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete staff reorganization in ResLife</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Establish a new resource center to coordinate and expand advising and mentoring of students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics</td>
<td>Create Science Advisory Board</td>
<td>Hold Board meetings</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop web presence for center</td>
<td>Launch provisional website</td>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create new staff positions for Center</td>
<td>Update website</td>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate academic support services with Curricular Resource Center</td>
<td>Advertise and fill Coordinator position</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design space in Sci Li and raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold grand opening</td>
<td>Create new fundraising materials and engage donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Related Action</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Date Completed Actual</td>
<td>Date Completed Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Develop more nuanced measures to track student progress during the semester</td>
<td>Partner with Institutional Research to gather data on student populations</td>
<td>Create report template</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Director of Co-Curricular Advising to identify and support students in academic difficulty</td>
<td>Devise tracking method</td>
<td>Fall 2008 and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Banner midterm grade reports</td>
<td>Announce midterm grade option to faculty</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and reach out to students whose course enrollment jeopardizes academic standing</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement new advising strategies that are responsive to evolving student demographics</td>
<td>Identify and address unmet student advising needs</td>
<td>Survey minority students</td>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with International Mentor Program to improve advising for international students</td>
<td>Work with International Mentor Program to improve advising for international students</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase academic deans’ outreach to students</td>
<td>Hold dean’s open hours in TWC</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve mentoring for students</td>
<td>Conduct meetings with Faculty Fellows</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop summer bridge program</td>
<td>Pilot “Excellence at Brown” initiative</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enhance the continuity of the advising experience through small measures and larger ones</td>
<td>Improve advising for transfer students</td>
<td>Publish new “Transfer Guide to Brown”</td>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot PINs for sophomores</td>
<td>Write to faculty and sophomores about pilot</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide research stipends to faculty who advise student cohorts for two years</td>
<td>Present advising resources needs to URC</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve concentration advising</td>
<td>Announce plan to faculty</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create online advisor/advisee feedback report</td>
<td>Develop concentration advising guidelines</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute guidelines to departments</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Related Action</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Date Completed Actual</td>
<td>Date Completed Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. cont’d</td>
<td>Create active undergraduate groups in every department to increase faculty-student interactions and sense of community among concentrators</td>
<td>Work with UCS to collect information on DUG student leaders and activities</td>
<td>Send survey and collect data</td>
<td>November 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create guidelines for DUG activities and send to departments and concentration advisors</td>
<td>Send letter to concentration advisors</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with PAUR to create “dugspaces” on all departmental home pages to advertise activities</td>
<td>Resend letter</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Wayland Collegium Board and Director to develop new teaching opportunities and discussion groups</td>
<td>Create template</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with Brown’s ADVANCE grant to create new teaching support programs for women faculty in the sciences</td>
<td>Communicate with departments about template</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Wayland Collegium, Cogut Center, and Watson Institute to develop new team-teaching initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10. Improve advising for lifelong learning and preparation for life after college | Improve advising about socially responsible careers | Launch “Engaged Life Partnership” in Swearer Center | January 2009 |
|                                                                                   | Increase use of alumni to educate students about concentrations and careers | Launch “Brown Degree Days” | March–April 2009 |

<p>| 11. Increase annual funding for the development of new courses | Create annual funding initiatives to seed the curriculum with new courses in new areas | First-year seminar initiative funds 20 new seminars for 2008–2009 | October 2007 |
| Create pool of resources for curricular innovation in the sciences | Work with Wayland Collegium Board and Director to develop new teaching opportunities and discussion groups | Announce 2008–09 “Year of the International Curriculum” (see #3 above) | September 2008 |
| Expand opportunities for team-teaching | Partner with Brown’s ADVANCE grant to create new teaching support programs for women faculty in the sciences | | Fall 2008 |
|                                                                                   | Work with Wayland Collegium, Cogut Center, and Watson Institute to develop new team-teaching initiatives | | Fall 2008 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Related Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Date Completed Actual</th>
<th>Date Completed Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Increase funding for independent learning experiences, including UTRAs and internships</td>
<td>Increase UTRA awards by 20% a year for the next 4 years</td>
<td>20% increase in 2007–08</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>450 UTRAs by 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect data on campus internships and create plan for increasing internships in public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve consistency and quality of undergraduate TA programs</td>
<td>Survey departments on undergraduate TA employment and “best practices”</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess peer-directed learning programs in order to expand and improve training for students</td>
<td>Create TA “best practices” document and distribute to departments</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Sheridan Center to develop TA/Tutoring training</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement TA/Tutoring training requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand training for Meiklejohn Peer Advising Program</td>
<td>Develop training modules on curriculum</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan and implement faculty-student led trainings</td>
<td>April and August 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study feasibility of leadership development course for Meiklejohns</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Develop flexible online course evaluation tool</td>
<td>Create online course evaluation form</td>
<td>Collect forms from departments and draft new form</td>
<td>December 2006–April 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design new form with CCC</td>
<td>Design new form with CCC</td>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build and pilot online version in seven courses</td>
<td>Built and pilot online version in seven courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify form to include flexible questions and pilot in 4 departments</td>
<td>Modify form to include flexible questions and pilot in 4 departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage faculty to give and to solicit midterm feedback about their courses</td>
<td>Increase faculty use of midterm feedback processes</td>
<td>Collect sample feedback tools currently in use</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send sample tools to faculty</td>
<td>Send sample tools to faculty</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Related Action</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Date Completed Actual</td>
<td>Date Completed Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Create additional opportunities for graduate TAs to learn about Brown’s culture and to improve their teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Work with Graduate school and Sheridan Center to develop new programs</td>
<td>Implement Early Start program proposed by Graduate School</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Graduate school to develop standards for graduate TA practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Educate new faculty about Brown’s educational philosophy</td>
<td>Revise new faculty orientation to include segment on teaching from Dean of College and Dean of Graduate School</td>
<td>Plan new faculty orientation</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish mentoring system for new faculty</td>
<td>Work with Dean of Faculty and Faculty Affairs Committee to create mentorship program</td>
<td>Hold new orientation sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop plans for improving the quality of instruction in all departments</td>
<td>Create guidelines with CCC Subcommittee on Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>