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1. Corporate name of institution: Brown University

2. Date institution was chartered or authorized: 1764

3. Date institution enrolled first students in degree programs: 1765

4. Date institution awarded first degrees: 1769

5. Type of control:

   Public
   - State
   - City
   - Other

   Private
   - Independent, not-for-profit
   - Religious Group
   - (Name of Church)______________________
   - Proprietary
   - Other: (Specify) ___________________

6. 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 after Data First Form 3.1 in Standard 3.

7. 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
   - [x] Four- or five-year baccalaureate degree granting program
   - [ ] First professional degree
   - [x] 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 doctoral programs __________
   - [ ] Other (Specify)
8. 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 ____________________________

9. The calendar system at the institution is:

☒ Semester  ☐ Quarter  ☐ Trimester  ☐ Other ____________________________

10. What constitutes the credit hour load for a full-time equivalent (FTE) student each semester?

a) Undergraduate  3-5 courses; 4 courses is the norm

b) Graduate  Dependent upon program structure; ranges from 1-4 courses

c) Professional (MD) For years 1 & 2, registration for all required courses. For years 3 & 4, registration in 13-24 weeks of clinical courses

11. Student population:

a) Degree-seeking students (Fall 2017):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time student headcount</td>
<td>6,654</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>9,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time student headcount</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE (FT + ½ PT)</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>9,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

12. List all programs accredited by a nationally recognized, specialized accrediting agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Accredited since</th>
<th>Last Reviewed</th>
<th>Next Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Accreditation Board for Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Liaison Committee on Medical Education</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health*</td>
<td>Council on Education for Public Health</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MPH program was previously accredited
13. **Off-campus Locations.** List all instructional locations other than the main campus. For each site, indicate whether the location offers full-degree programs or 50% or more of one or more degree programs. Record the full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE) for the most recent year. Add more rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. In-state Locations</th>
<th>Full degree</th>
<th>50%-99%</th>
<th>FTE (FT + ½ PT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical School – Providence, RI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Masters – Providence, RI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.5 (all PT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Out-of-state Locations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Pfizer – Groton, CT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (all PT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **International Locations:** For each overseas instructional location, indicate the name of the program, the location, and the headcount of students enrolled for the most recent year. An overseas instructional location is defined as “any overseas location of an institution, other than the main campus, at which the institution matriculates students to whom it offers any portion of a degree program or offers on-site instruction or instructional support for students enrolled in a predominantly or totally on-line program.” **Do not include study abroad locations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of program(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of program</th>
<th>Degree level</th>
<th>% on-line</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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 for a Title IV-eligible degree or certificate, indicate the name of the contractor, the location of instruction, the program name, and degree or certificate, and the number of credits 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 or certificate</th>
<th># of credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE Business School</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>IE Brown Executive MBA</td>
<td>Executive MBA</td>
<td>28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While it can vary slightly from year-to-year, approximately 7 “Brown Course Equivalents” (Brown courses are 4 credit hours) are earned at IE Business School. Approximately 5.5 Brown Course Equivalents (22 credits) are earned at Brown.

17. List by name and title the chief administrative officers of the institution. (Use the table on the following 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, IT, 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.
19. Record briefly the central elements in the history of the institution:

Brown was founded in 1764 — the third college in New England and the seventh in Colonial America. Brown was the first Ivy League school to accept students from all religious affiliations, a testament to the spirit of openness that still typifies Brown today.

Originally located in Warren, Rhode Island, and called the College of Rhode Island, Brown moved to its current spot on College Hill overlooking Providence in 1770 and was renamed in 1804 in recognition of a $5,000 gift from Nicholas Brown, a prominent Providence businessman and alumnus, Class of 1786.

Women were first admitted to Brown in 1891. The Women’s College was later renamed Pembroke College in Brown University before merging with Brown College, the men’s undergraduate school, in 1971. The northern section of campus where the women’s school was situated is known today as the Pembroke Campus. The first master’s degrees were granted in 1888 and the first doctorates in 1889. The first medical degrees of the modern era were presented in 1975 to a graduating class of 58 students. Today, Brown awards approximately 100 M.D. degrees annually from the Warren Alpert Medical School.

Undergraduate education changed dramatically in 1970 with the introduction of what has become known as the Open Curriculum. The idea for this change came from a report written by undergraduates Ira Magaziner, of the undergraduate Class of 1969, and Elliot E. Maxwell, of the undergraduate Class of 1968, as part of a GISP (Group Independent Study Project) that examined education at Brown. The “new curriculum” eliminated core requirements shared by all Brown undergraduates and created specific departmental concentration requirements. This approach has defined the undergraduate academic experience at Brown ever since, demanding that students serve as the architects of their courses of study.

Constant change defines Brown’s past and future, though the University’s culture is rich in tradition. Brown’s first building, for example, the red-bricked University Hall, was built in 1770 and still stands on the College Green. Today, the University consists of nearly 230 buildings on approximately 150 acres, and includes undergraduate and graduate programs, plus the Warren Alpert Medical School, School of Public Health, School of Engineering, IE Brown Executive MBA, and executive masters of healthcare leadership, science and technology leadership, and cybersecurity.

In 2013, President Christina H. Paxson, Brown’s 19th president, charted the course for the University’s future with her strategic plan, Building on Distinction: A New Plan for Brown. The plan was launched in 2014, the 250th anniversary of Brown’s founding. It provides a vision to achieve higher levels of distinction as a university that unites innovative education and outstanding research to benefit the community, the nation and the world. It calls for targeted investments to attract and support the most talented and diverse faculty, students and staff, and to support rigorous inquiry and discovery across the disciplines to address the world’s most complex challenges. The plan highlights the need to keep a Brown education affordable for talented students from all economic backgrounds and to sustain a community with the diversity of thought and experience required for excellence.

The University in Fall 2015 completed an operational plan to translate the aspirational goals set out in Building on Distinction into concrete actions to be taken over the next 10 years. The Operational Plan for Brown's
Excellence outlines targeted actions to position Brown to enhance its role as a leader in higher education and research. The plan also is driving the University's $3-billion BrownTogether comprehensive fundraising campaign, which was launched in October 2015. The campaign holds the promise to boldly transform the future of the University.

### CHIEF INSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function or Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Exact Title</th>
<th>Year of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Samuel M. Mencoff</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Christina Paxson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>Russell Carey</td>
<td>Executive Vice President for Planning and Policy</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Chernow</td>
<td>Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Richard Locke</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans of Schools and Colleges</td>
<td>Andrew G. Campbell</td>
<td>Dean of the Graduate School</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Elias</td>
<td>Senior Vice President for Health Affairs, Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Larson</td>
<td>Dean of Engineering</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maud Mandel</td>
<td>Dean of the College</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bess Marcus</td>
<td>Dean of the School of Public Health</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin McLaughlin</td>
<td>Dean of the Faculty</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Sibley</td>
<td>Vice President for Strategic Initiatives and Dean of the School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>Jay Calhoun</td>
<td>Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student Services Officer</td>
<td>Eric Estes</td>
<td>Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Russell Carey</td>
<td>Executive Vice President for Planning and Policy</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>K. Tracy Barnes</td>
<td>Director of Institutional Research</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Mary Wright</td>
<td>Director of the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Sergio Gonzalez</td>
<td>Senior Vice President for Advancement</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Harriette Hemmasi</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>Ravi Pendse</td>
<td>Vice President for Computing and Information Services and Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>Karen Sibley</td>
<td>Vice President for Strategic Initiatives and Dean of the School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Research</td>
<td>Jill Pipher</td>
<td>Vice President for Research</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Logan Powell</td>
<td>Dean of Admission</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Robert Fitzgerald</td>
<td>University Registrar</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>James Tilton</td>
<td>Dean of Financial Aid</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Cass Cliatt</td>
<td>Vice President for Communications</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Association</td>
<td>Todd Andrews</td>
<td>Vice President for Alumni Relations</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Shontay Delalue</td>
<td>Vice President for Institutional Equity and Diversity</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Dowling</td>
<td>Vice President and Chief Investment Officer</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverly Ledbetter</td>
<td>Vice President and General Counsel</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly Roskiewicz</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table of Contents

Institutional Characteristics Form
Table of CIHE Actions, Items of Special Attention, or Concerns........................................... ii
Abbreviations ......................................................................................................................... iv
Introduction ............................................................................................................................... v
Standard One: Mission and Purpose.......................................................................................... 1
Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation.................................................................................... 4
Standard Three: Organization and Governance ....................................................................... 11
Standard Four: The Academic Program.................................................................................... 19
  A. Assuring Academic Quality ............................................................................................... 19
  B. Undergraduate Degree Programs, Liberal Learning, and the Concentration .................. 21
  C. Graduate Degree Programs .............................................................................................. 29
  D. Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit ................................................................. 37
Standard Five: Students........................................................................................................... 47
  A. Admissions ....................................................................................................................... 47
  B. Student Services and Co-Curricular Experiences ........................................................... 57
Standard Six: Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship ................................................................. 66
  A. Faculty and Academic Staff ............................................................................................. 66
  B. Teaching and Learning ..................................................................................................... 76
Standard Seven: Institutional Resources ................................................................................. 79
  A. Human Resources ........................................................................................................... 79
  B. Financial Resources ........................................................................................................ 81
  C. Information, Physical, and Technological Resources ....................................................... 85
Standard Eight: Educational Effectiveness ............................................................................... 92
  A. Undergraduate Programs ............................................................................................... 92
  B. Graduate Programs ......................................................................................................... 100
Standard Nine: Integrity, Transparency, and Public Disclosure ............................................. 105
  A. Integrity ........................................................................................................................... 105
  B. Transparency and Public Disclosure ............................................................................. 108
Conclusion ............................................................................................................................... 113
Appendices .............................................................................................................................. 114
Table of CIHE Actions, Items of Special Attention, or Concerns
From June 28, 2013 Letter Accepting Brown University’s Fifth-Year Interim Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of Emphasis/ Standards Cited*</th>
<th>Addressed in the Self-Study</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. developing and implementing its strategic plan and integrating its financial, facilities, and fund-raising plans within its strategic plan  
   Standards Cited: 2.3, 9.9 | Introduction: v  
   Standard 2:  4-5  
   Standard 2:  7  
   Standard 7B: 80-84  
   Standard 2:  7-8  
   Standard 7C: 86-88  
   Standard 2:  5  
   Standard 7B: 83 | The strategic plan, *Building on Distinction*, was approved in 2013. It was followed by an *Operational Plan* (2015), which in turn served as the basis for the $3 billion BrownTogether fundraising campaign now underway.  
   Financial Sustainability is a key goal of the strategic plan. Brown’s financial planning is organized around managing resources for realizing near- and longer-term strategic objectives. This includes greater revenue diversification through growth in fundraising (endowment, current-use, and annual giving), sponsored research activity, and industry partnerships, as well as managing the endowment so that it can support a greater share of operating expenditures.  
   Significant capital improvements have taken place in support of key areas of the plan, including the complete renovation and repurposing of a building for the Brown Institute for Environment and Society, a new building for the School of Engineering, new buildings for the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, a new Performing Arts Center, and the move of many administrative offices to free up central campus space for new or expanded academic programs. We are also steadily increasing the budgets for capital renewal and core research facilities.  
   Academic, financial, and fundraising goals under the plan are managed in an integrated way through a Strategic Plan Coordinating Committee consisting of senior officers. |
| 2. continuing to strengthen its graduate programs, with particular attention on the University’s plans to expand its master’s programs  
   Standards Cited: 4.21, 4.29 | Standard 4C: 29-37  
   Standard 8:  99-103 | Brown has significantly expanded the support that PhD students receive directly (stipend growth, sixth-year funding, dental insurance, child care, parental leave, etc.), and through enhanced opportunities to develop their scholarship, teaching experience, and professional credentials. Other investments have focused on graduate students’ campus experience. Graduate School staffing has been expanded and reorganized to better monitor program quality and address student needs. Planned but selective growth in master’s programs is aligned with the University’s strategic plan, and a more robust system of evaluating master’s programs has been put in place. A suite of blended-format Executive Master’s programs have been launched and will be evaluated. |
### 3. continuing to ensure the effectiveness of faculty tenure and promotion processes and enhancing the participation of faculty in governance

**Standards Cited:** 3.12, 5.10

**Standard 6A:** 66

The new processes for faculty tenure and promotion introduced following the last ten-year review has established a more rigorous culture of evaluation and greater clarity of communication to junior faculty about expectations and performance. Brown’s higher standards of evaluation for tenure can be seen, among other things, in the declining percentage of four-year reappointments granted to junior faculty.

**Standard 3:** 13-15

Brown has a robust system of faculty governance, which is a core principle of the University. Elected faculty representatives constitute or are part of committees and advisory bodies for the University’s most significant and critical functions, including tenure and promotion, academic program reviews and approvals, curricular oversight, academic code, budget, corporate responsibility and investment, campus life, student conduct, campus planning, diversity, human resources, information technology, library, and research.

### 4. achieving its goals for faculty diversity

**Standards Cited:** 5.4, 11.5

**Standard 2:** 5

**Standard 6A:** 67-68

In 2016, Brown’s *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* action plan included a goal of doubling the number of faculty from historically underrepresented groups by 2012, an increase of roughly 60 faculty members. Departments were also required to develop their own diversity and inclusion plans and consider strategies for increasing faculty diversity. Over the last two years, hiring of scholars from underrepresented groups has increased markedly. Among US residents for whom race is known, the percentage of newly-hired faculty from historically underrepresented was 31% in 2015-16 and 42% in 2016-17 – more than double the percentages achieved in the prior three years.

### 5. completing its review of academic program and using the results for improvement

**Standards Cited:** 2.6, 4.52

**Standard 4A:** 19-20

**Standard 4B:** 25-26

**Standard 4C:** 30-31

**E-Series Form**

The first review cycle was completed in 2015, and helped to set in motion numerous improvements and, in a number of cases, significant changes. Following an evaluation of the process, the cycle now underway was strengthened in a number of ways, including mid-term check-ins and discussions with departments heading into the review process to identify areas of focus for their self-study. Improved instructions to external review committees are producing more trenchant evaluations, leading to better decision-making. The results of some reviews to date have led the Provost and dean to work with departments on developing strategic plans as a basis for investment. Reviews of undergraduate and graduate curricula that follow the external reviews have also been enhanced.

*References are to Standards in effect in 2013.*
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Academic Priorities Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioMed</td>
<td>Division of Biology and Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>College Curriculum Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFED</td>
<td>Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFHE</td>
<td>Consortium on Financing Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEC</td>
<td>Faculty Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC</td>
<td>Graduate Student Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>Medical Student Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIR</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISD</td>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPAC</td>
<td>Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCS</td>
<td>Undergraduate Council of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URC</td>
<td>University Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Brown University’s mission is to advance society through its distinctive approach to scholarship and education, emphasizing intellectual rigor and interdisciplinary inquiry. Brown’s emphasis on innovative student-centered learning and cross-disciplinary collaborative research has never been more relevant. The University’s unwavering focus on advancing knowledge and understanding to make a positive impact on the world has never been more necessary.

Brown is committed to pursuing its mission at the highest standards of excellence. Our major goals are to:

- Achieve the academic objectives outlined in Brown’s strategic plan, *Building on Distinction*, focusing on targeted investments in area of strength.
- Build a cohesive, open-minded, and engaged community of faculty, students, staff, alumni, and others who understand and appreciate Brown’s aspirations and values.
- Develop the financial resources needed to maintain and build excellence through fundraising, the careful use of existing resources, the adoption of new modes of resource creation, and skilled endowment management.
- Become a model of a well-run university – agile, efficient, and open to progress, driven by a culture of collaboration, innovation, and evaluation.

As this self-study document will describe in detail, much is new at Brown. Even so, these commitments, values, and practices are hardly new to the University. Our strategic plan is titled *Building on Distinction* precisely because the accomplishments of the past allow us to maintain a continuity of institutional goals and pursue them to new levels of achievement.

Since Brown submitted its previous self-study in January 2009, the University’s leadership has undergone a major renewal, including Corporation officers, the President, and nearly all senior officer positions. The University’s system of shared governance ensured stability and continuity while also providing a foundation for continued progress. One strategic plan to significantly advance Brown’s academic excellence concluded, and a new one for the next era was launched. An ambitious new $3 billion fundraising effort is more than halfway complete, already surpassing the $1.61 billion raised in the previous campaign. Our campus-wide plan to advance academic excellence and strengthen our community by becoming more diverse and inclusive has attracted national attention, and Brown’s earlier groundbreaking work to investigate its past connections to the transatlantic slave trade has inspired similar undertakings at other institutions. Even as it celebrated the 250th anniversary of its 1764 founding, and as it prepares to mark the 50th anniversary of its 1969 “New Curriculum” for undergraduates, Brown continues to innovate and look toward the future.

Since the last review, one-third of the faculty is new and more than 23,000 undergraduate, graduate, and medical students have earned Brown degrees. The University established three new schools and built up major interdisciplinary institutes in strategic areas along with key allied
centers and new initiatives. Brown faculty garner recognition and honors for outstanding accomplishments in their fields, recently including a second Nobel Prize. We have launched a dozen new degree programs that have extended our educational impact, including to mid-career professionals participating in our suite of executive master’s programs.

Notwithstanding its growth as an internationally recognized research university, Brown sustains its identity as a “university-college.” There is one unified faculty teaching both undergraduates and graduate students as well as carrying out groundbreaking research. Further, the disciplinary rigor of Brown’s schools, institutes, centers, and programs strengthens and draws strength from the crosscutting intellectual exploration that runs throughout the undergraduate curriculum, and lends distinctive character to graduate and medical training. Educational experimentation has taken many forms, including online courses, active learning, and an intensive Wintersession. At the same time, we have engaged in careful assessment of proposed and existing programs to encourage greater excellence or to reshape our offerings. Brown has also established a host of other learning and leadership opportunities for students at all levels. In these ways and others, Brown is giving greater scope, depth, and interconnection to the ingenuity of faculty and students.

The recent period has also been marked by a strong commitment to strengthening the campus community and student experience – most prominently around diversity and inclusion, Title IX, and first-generation and low-income students, but in many other ways as well. We have augmented undergraduate financial aid and extended support for graduate students. In addition, we have attempted to create robust channels for discussing controversial and contentious issues as a community. Supporting and enabling all this work has been an ongoing commitment to improving and extending Brown’s infrastructure, including financial resources, information technology, research facilities, and the physical plant. Guided by careful, data-driven planning, the University has continued strategic and transformative growth in the adjacent Jewelry District. Brown’s plans for building academic excellence align well with the interests of Providence and the State of Rhode Island, especially in the areas of job creation, innovation, and improved health care in the state. Those plans further expand the University’s role in advancing policy development, education, cultural life, and other areas of critical importance for our surrounding community.

Over the last decade, Brown has worked hard to overcome challenges on many fronts and our resilience as a community – our capacity to be thoughtful and take resolute action – has made us a stronger and better university in the process. As the self-study makes plain, there are many challenges ahead as we press forward toward achieving our goals. Some challenges are internal to Brown, calling upon us to find better and more effective ways to allocate our resources in service of our mission. Other challenges come from outside the University. In 2008, the global financial crisis was highly destabilizing, requiring universities like Brown to review, rethink, and reorganize. Today, the political climate and public discourse are creating an adverse environment for the aims and aspirations of institutions like Brown. In response, we continue to reaffirm our values, maintain our focus on innovation and distinctiveness in both teaching and scholarship, find the ways that we can be one community with equal respect for a wide range of voices and perspectives, and demonstrate on a daily basis how Brown is truly serving the community, the nation, and the world.
Self-Study Process

The self-study process for this accreditation could not have occurred at a better time. Since 2013, the Brown community has undertaken intensive institutional planning involving critical dimensions of mission, resources, and organization. The starting point for this work was Brown’s strategic plan, *Building on Distinction: A New Plan for Brown*, which was approved in fall 2013. Since then, the University has issued a number of key reports and established new plans and processes, including:

- Sexual Assault Task Force Interim and Final Reports (2014, 2015)
- *The Operational Plan for Building on Distinction* (2015)
- The BrownTogether Comprehensive Campaign (public launch 2015)
- Reformed Budget Process and Organization (2015)

These plans involved intensive participation of members of the Brown community (faculty, staff, and students) through committees, consultation with relevant campus advisory groups, and, in a number of cases, opportunities for open comment on draft plans. When the self-study process for accreditation started in 2015, Brown was already deeply engaged in the kind of self-scrutiny that accreditation processes usually prompt.

To prepare for the accreditation, the President charged Provost Richard Locke and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Barbara Chernow with co-chairing a steering committee that included administrative leadership, faculty, students, staff, and representation of the Brown University Corporation. Preparation of the self-study relied primarily on standing University committees that include (in varying combinations) elected faculty, student, and staff representatives. Where these committees’ mandates dovetailed with accreditation standards, they were asked to generate responses to the enumerated criteria under the relevant standard. For other parts of the self-study, offices responsible for a particular area made use of advisory bodies that include faculty, students, and other stakeholders. Finally, special committees were formed where needed. The Office of Institutional Research prepared data and supplied analysis for all aspects of the self-study.

Two ancillary processes also took place in 2015-16. One was a series of conversations with different campus groups to generate broad awareness about the accreditation process, along with other forms of communication including coverage in the *Brown Daily Herald* student newspaper and the creation of a website. The second process sought to educate faculty and provide clarification about credit hour standards while instituting new requirements to include a clear statement of expected time commitment in every course syllabus and to make all syllabi available.
online. Academic departments were instructed to review the work assigned for their classes in relation to credit hour requirements.

In January 2017, reports on individual accreditation standards were compiled into a working self-study draft, which was reviewed by the leadership and/or governance bodies of academic and administrative offices, faculty, students, and staff. In April 2017, a revised draft was opened to the whole campus for comment, a model successfully employed in previous planning efforts at Brown. During the comment period, 728 members of the campus community visited the site, 491 of them clicked through to download the draft, and 20 made comments on the text. The revised draft was reviewed by staff from the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, who provided valuable comments and suggestions that were duly incorporated. In October 2017, this penultimate draft was submitted to the Brown Corporation, and subsequently revised further by the President and Provost in January 2018. Notification of the comprehensive evaluation and invitations for public comment were placed in local and campus media.

Self-Study Organization

Brown’s Accreditation Liaison Officer, Deputy Provost Joseph Meisel, was the lead organizer of the self-study and the larger accreditation process in collaboration with Director of Institutional Research K. Tracy Barnes who oversaw the data collection effort and Senior Associate Secretary of the Corporation Catherine Pincince who staffed the Steering Committee, managed assembly of the Workroom, and supervised visiting team logistics. Other members of the core organizational team consisted of Assistant to the President for Student Affairs and Special Projects Marguerite Joutz, Chief of Staff to the Provost Marisa Quinn, and Executive Assistant to Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer Catarina Santos. Many other staff members throughout Brown’s administration provided crucial assistance and support, with special thanks to Karen Baptist, Associate Director of Institutional Research; Christopher Dennis, Deputy Dean of the College; Shayna Kessel, Associate Dean of the Graduate School for Master's Education; Joel Revill, Associate Dean of the Faculty; Besenia Rodriguez, Senior Associate Dean of the College for Curriculum; and Kimberly Roskiewicz, Assistant to the President.
Standard One: Mission and Purpose

Description

Brown University exists to provide an outstanding education to students at the baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral levels, to advance scholarship, to foster new discoveries, to make meaningful contributions, and to address challenges to benefit society. Since its founding in 1764, Brown has fulfilled its core purpose of instructing students in the vernacular and learned languages and the liberal arts and sciences has remained constant. Academic excellence is our central value. We set high intellectual and scholarly standards so that we can attract outstanding faculty and students who participate in a global society with integrity and responsibility.

Brown’s mission is also reflected in the University’s development over time from a college to the incorporation of graduate programs and the addition of the schools such as the Warren Alpert Medical School, School of Engineering, School of Public Health, and School of Professional Studies. All share and exemplify Brown's commitment to educational excellence, serious scholarship, and usefulness and reputation in the world. Moreover, consistent with our integrative values, the schools are not standalone operations but highly integrated, especially through the education of undergraduates through the open curriculum.

Appraisal

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.

This mission statement is featured on Brown’s website (under Facts About Brown) and included in a wide range of Brown publications, such as the University Bulletin, admission brochures, and Corporation documents. The antiquated but memorable language of “usefulness and reputation” continues to resonate and anchors a common identification with Brown’s mission and purposes among students, faculty, and staff.

The celebration of Brown’s 250th anniversary in 2014 afforded the opportunity to reflect on and reaffirm the University’s core values while also planning for the future. Since its founding, Brown has sought to contribute to the community, nation, and the world through teaching, research, and service at the highest levels. Brown’s mission is fulfilled each day through work both on campus and across the world. Brown’s distinctive approach unites rigorous fundamental inquiry and interdisciplinary problem solving within, not alongside, an avid community of learning.
For years, Brown has encouraged students to take responsibility for framing and pursuing their own educational goals. In 1850, Brown’s fourth president, Francis Wayland, advocated for a model in which “every student might study what he chose, all that he chose, and nothing but what he chose.” Brown’s open curriculum for undergraduates, established in 1968, encourages broad-ranging intellectual exploration in the first two years of study followed by a rigorous focus on a disciplinary or interdisciplinary subject in the second two years. This ethos of student self-direction combined with field-based rigor extends to the advanced degrees awarded in Brown’s graduate and professional programs. To succeed as it does, Brown’s student-centric academic culture demands close faculty involvement and well-designed support structures.

Research and discovery in the service of society are central to Brown’s mission. Brown fosters a vibrant and rigorous intellectual environment that advances knowledge through teaching, research and engagement across the disciplines, both inside and outside of the classroom in order to deepen our understanding of the world and identify solutions to society’s most pressing problems. All faculty at Brown are expected to generate research at the highest standards of excellence. In addition, research and teaching are viewed as complementary activities that are equally 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.

The principles on which a Brown education has been based for many decades underlie the goals set out in the University’s 10-year strategy document, *Building on Distinction: A New Plan for Brown*, launched in 2013. Brown’s primary ambition is to fulfill its mission at ever-higher levels of distinction and to continue raising its stature as a world-class university that unites innovative teaching and outstanding research. To achieve these ends, Brown’s strategy calls for focused investments in integrative scholarship and innovative teaching, combined with enhancements in academic excellence across the community. Success will be manifested through discoveries that advance human well-being and new research that helps us understand the human condition. It will be reflected in greater productivity and visibility of faculty members working at the forefronts of their fields, in the increased stature of graduate and medical programs, and in the continued stream of exceptional and adventurous undergraduates who go on to equally outstanding careers that reflect the high value of a Brown degree.

*Building on Distinction* reaffirms and renews the mission within the present-day context and lays out an ambitious vision for the University’s future. The plan’s goals focus on four major areas: Integrative Scholarship to address some of the world’s great challenges; Educational Leadership to prepare students for the challenges of the 21st century through innovation in educational programming, delivery, and experience; Academic Excellence to provide faculty and students with the resources needed for success as a community of knowledge creators with the diversity and breadth of experience required for excellence; and Campus Development to provide the infrastructure needed to support world-class education, research, and the community that is so central to Brown’s culture. The University’s *Operational Plan for Brown’s Excellence* translates these inspiring strategic goals into concrete actions to be taken over the next 10 years so that Brown can fulfill its mission and consolidate its role as a leader in higher education and research. Complementing and integrating with the strategic and operational plans is *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion: An Action Plan for Brown University*, which articulates an ambitious and clear set of goals to promote greater diversity and inclusion among our students, faculty, and staff so that Brown can advance its aspirations for enhancing academic excellence and strengthening the campus community.
Brown’s core values have guided the University’s responses to the complex issues facing society, including sexual assault and harassment, bigotry and prejudice, questions about freedom of expression and open discourse, and threats to the ability of international students and scholars to study at Brown. Reflecting Brown’s tradition of openness, faculty, staff, and students have been grappling with these issues and developing new policies and practices to address them, such as the policy on Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship and Interpersonal Violence and Stalking, and the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan. With respect to campus culture more generally, the President and Provost’s “Reaffirming University Values: Campus Dialogue and Discourse” project, launched in 2016, provides a platform for discussing controversial issues in a constructive and engaging way as an academic community with shared fundamental beliefs in free inquiry, open debate, and an appreciation of multiple perspectives.

Projections

- Higher education is increasingly embattled. In public discourse, there is growing skepticism toward “elite” liberal education and its financial sustainability, as well as increasingly utilitarian views about the value and role of expert knowledge. As the recent Pew Research Center report on views of national institutions shows, the partisan divide over whether colleges are a positive force in the nation has grown dramatically. Actual or proposed legislative and policy actions are posing substantial direct challenges for Brown’s academic mission and institutional values in areas such as mobility of international students and scholars, protections for non-citizens, funding for research and creative production, tax status of endowments and charitable giving, and rights for women and historically marginalized groups. Brown has renewed its mission and purposes through successful campus-wide planning efforts, but in this climate of adversity the University will be called upon not only to reaffirm and reinforce them, but also to redouble its efforts to demonstrate their essential contribution to the public good.
Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Description

Rigorous, data-driven, systemic planning and evaluation is firmly entrenched in the Brown culture. Initiated with particular strength and institutional leadership under the Plan for Academic Enrichment, Brown’s previous strategic plan, the commitment to long-term thinking and strategic priorities has been continued and enhanced in the era of Building on Distinction. The Operational Plan, the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan, and the ongoing BrownTogether campaign elaborate upon Building on Distinction and are enabling its effective implementation. As a set of organizing principles for defining aspirations, setting priorities, and making decisions, the current strategic plan has given new emphasis and direction to pre-existing planning and evaluation practices at multiple levels, while also giving rise to new efforts to gauge the University’s progress toward its goals.

Appraisal

Brown has a strong record of successfully implementing and evaluating its plans. Between 2001 and 2012, the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) and the accompanying Boldly Brown campaign succeeded in significantly expanding Brown’s capacity as a research university, including a 20 percent growth in faculty, new graduate programs, improved undergraduate financial aid, and major building projects. Similarly, Brown responded to the financial downturn of 2008-09 with a University-wide organizational review and budget reduction exercise that enabled the University to continue advancing its strategic priorities under the PAE. The work to define and support Brown’s current priorities builds upon what is now a robust institutional culture of planning and implementation.

Brown has taken great strides in building a more integrated approach to academic, financial, and capital planning. Our greatest challenge is reconciling our ambitions for broad-based academic excellence with Brown’s small scale of operations and resources relative to aspirational peers. We recognize that it is impossible to build excellence in all areas at once, and we must make hard decisions about the best ways to focus the University’s activities and resources. Careful planning and rigorous evaluation are central to achieving our goals.

Strategic and Operational Planning

Launched in 2013 during the 250th anniversary of Brown’s founding, the strategic plan, Building on Distinction, offers a broad vision and set of goals for fulfilling Brown’s mission of teaching, research, and service at the highest levels over the next decade (see Standard 1). The plan expresses the University’s commitment to build in four areas: Integrative Scholarship, Educational Leadership, Academic Excellence, and Campus Development. The planning effort began in 2012 with the appointment of more than 70 faculty, staff and students to committees on Faculty Recruitment, Career Development and Retention; Financial Aid; Undergraduate Educational Innovation; Doctoral Education; Master’s Education; Online Teaching and Learning; and Reimagining the Brown Campus and Community. In parallel, a Working Group on Signature Academic Initiatives considered responses to the Provost’s call for faculty proposals on areas in which Brown could have a distinctive impact on scholarship.

The planning process ultimately engaged hundreds of students, faculty, and staff who completed a number of surveys and attended forums and meetings that informed the planning
committees. A penultimate draft of *Building on Distinction* was distributed to the Brown community for comment and discussion at the beginning of the 2013-14 academic year, and the Corporation of Brown University unanimously adopted it in October 2013. The plan guides all aspects of Brown’s efforts to fulfill its mission. The strategy is led by the President and Corporation, but is implemented and supported by the Brown community. A factor contributing to *Building on Distinction*’s success is that, from its inception, the planning process was inclusive and iterative, involving intensive broad-based community discussion and deliberation. Subsequent planning processes – varying from departmental to institutional in scale – have embodied the same values, and the community has actively engaged in their development.

Following on *Building on Distinction*, the University developed two detailed plans that specify the steps the University would take to realize the high-level goals of the strategic plan. The first, completed in the fall of 2015, is the *Operational Plan for Brown’s Excellence*. This plan describes the specific resources and actions needed to fulfill each of the goals in the strategic plan. The *Operational Plan* was developed through a highly collaborative process in which the Provost worked with academic leaders to develop goals for faculty hiring, facilities upgrades, and new academic programs within each of the areas covered by *Building on Distinction*.

The second plan, developed in 2015-16, is the *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* action plan. This plan, which is grounded in the idea that diversity and inclusion are cornerstones of academic excellence, lays out actions to diversify Brown’s faculty and student bodies, and create more inclusive learning and working environments. In addition, it establishes governance and assessment processes to ensure that we are achieving these goals. Early successes include the development of diversity and inclusion action plans for each academic and administrative department, a large increase in recruitment of faculty and graduate students from historically underrepresented groups, the establishment of a Native American and Indigenous Studies Initiative, and the creation of a center to support first-generation and low-income students. *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* was developed through a collaborative process that permitted input from the entire University community. Accountability is an important component of the plan. An annual progress report is reviewed by relevant campus committees, presented to the Corporation, and published on the University’s website.

The *Operational Plan* served as the basis for the University’s $3 billion *BrownTogether* comprehensive campaign launched in October 2015. The campaign passed the halfway mark in October 2017, and is generating record levels of financial support for faculty recruitment, academic program development, undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships, diversity and inclusion initiatives, and capital improvements including the construction of a new building for the School of Engineering, an expansion of the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, and a Performing Arts Center. This generous philanthropy is a key indicator of the confidence that alumni and friends of the University have in our strategic priorities and institutional trajectory. Translating the investment goals identified in the *Operational Plan* into the campaign’s Table of Needs involved close cooperation between senior officers representing academic affairs, finance, and advancement. To ensure that academic goals, financial planning, and fundraising activity continue to stay aligned as the campaign moves forward, the Provost was charged with establishing a Strategic Plan Coordinating Committee. This committee monitors campaign progress against *Operational Plan* targets, adjudicates the categorization of gifts in relation to the plan, and adjusts campaign targets to incorporate new priorities and opportunities that emerge.
Academic Planning

Although *Building on Distinction* provides broad direction for academic planning, the Provost, as chief academic officer, has the specific responsibility to lead the planning efforts for all academic programs and activities within the College, the Graduate School, the School of Engineering, the School of Public Health, the Division of Biology and Medicine, and the School of Professional Studies, as well as those located in departments, interdisciplinary programs, academic centers, and institutes. Under the Provost’s leadership, the senior academic officers direct planning and evaluation functions in their areas. An important factor in academic planning at Brown is the degree to which the senior academic officers work together. The Provost and senior academic officers (the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, the Dean of the School of Engineering, the Dean of the School of Public Health, the Dean of the School of Professional Studies, and the Vice President for Research) meet weekly to coordinate priorities, discuss resource implications, and develop plans to strengthen academic excellence. This collaboration prevents schools and units from working in isolation and supports the integration of research and education across the campus.

The Provost also 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 elected faculty members and senior administrators (see Standard 4A). URC members come from the senior administration, faculty, staff, and student bodies (see Standard 7B). The APC provides oversight of academic programs and is responsible for making recommendations to the President concerning the growth and allocation of resources in support of education and research (see Standard 4A). The URC is responsible for recommending the annual operating and capital budget to the President (see Standard 7B). In the case of academic initiatives, consideration by the full faculty is also required. A notable recent development is that the review process for academic departments, centers, and programs overseen by the Provost is leading to units developing their own strategic plans for academic excellence based on the external and internal guidance they receive.

As detailed in Standard 4, 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 joint 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.

Proposals for new academic programs and major changes to existing programs follow a thorough approval process. These proposals are initially considered by the APC and then moved forward to the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). These committees may raise questions or request modifications to a proposal. The faculty votes on the establishment of new academic programs and major modifications to existing ones, and final approval is granted by the Corporation. The Provost, deans, and FEC officers are responsible for ensuring that these processes are coordinated and that all ideas and proposals are moved through the process in a timely and effective manner.
Financial Planning

The ability to realize Brown’s ambitious strategy depends on effective and efficient management of financial resources to sustain and enhance core infrastructure and invest in critical new initiatives. The ongoing challenge we face is to be responsible about how we use our limited resources while at the same time not allowing excess caution to curtail our ambitious plans. As described in more detail in Standard 7B, Brown has recently made significant organizational and procedural improvements to strengthen budget and financial planning. These measures included the creation of a Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer position reporting jointly to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, the reorganization and improved coordination of financial offices under the CFO, a significantly strengthened budget process, enhanced financial forecasting and modeling capability, and improved information systems. These processes support and complement the URC process described above, and over the last three years that process has been revised and augmented. The increasingly effective budget process is ensuring that the initiatives and investments brought to the URC reflect the priorities established in the University’s strategic plan.

Capital Planning

Brown’s picturesque campus is one of the University’s great assets, but Brown must also grapple with the amount and (in places) quality of space that is available for realizing its aspirations. This has called for creative approaches to imagining and re-imagining the possibilities of our physical plant as well as managing the cost of its development and maintenance. Russell Carey, Executive Vice President for Policy and Planning, oversees and coordinates campus planning efforts in close collaboration with the relevant leaders in the Office of the Provost and the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, as well as with state and local government and community leaders.

Significant planning work over the last decade is leading to a reconceptualization of Brown’s campus as it grows beyond its historic home on College Hill. The relocation of sections of Interstate 195 that passed through Providence’s Jewelry District offered possibilities for revitalizing commercial activity in that area as well as several large land parcels less than a mile from the heart of Brown’s campus. As stated in Building on Distinction, the University’s vision for Brown in the Jewelry District is to be a partner in the development of a vibrant ecosystem of academics, commerce, and innovation. Brown has invested more than $200 million in the Jewelry District, including the state-of-the-art Warren Alpert Medical School education building, the School of Professional Studies, the Laboratories for Molecular Medicine, and more.

More recently, Brown became the anchor tenant in South Street Landing, a $220-million redevelopment of an iconic decommissioned power station by the Boston-based firm CV Properties LLC, in partnership with Wexford Science and Technology. Brown has occupied approximately 136,000 square feet that is now home to 11 administrative units. Strategically, the project not only further consolidates Brown’s presence in the Jewelry District and contributes to the transformation of that area, but has also freed significant space on College Hill to accommodate new and expanded programs called for under Building on Distinction, including spaces for academic departments and centers, interdisciplinary collaboration, entrepreneurship, and student activities.

Already, the project is having the intended effect of catalyzing further economic growth. In December 2016, the University signed a letter of intent to lease 50,000 square feet over 15 years for its School of Professional Studies as part of a proposed Innovation Center being
developed by Wexford. The building will also serve as home to the Cambridge Innovation Center, with occupancy targeted for early 2019. Further development is also likely to support expanded research and incubator space for biomedical faculty and students, facilitating Brown’s strategic goals in health sciences and brain science.

On College Hill, a major planning priority is continued improvement of Thayer Street (the primary commercial street that runs through campus) as a vibrant retail and multigenerational residential environment. Heavily used by the University community, Thayer Street constitutes a critical internal north-south corridor and a connective spine to existing University housing districts that anchor each end of the street. In 2013, the City of Providence initiated a planning process for Thayer Street, led by a stakeholder committee including Brown. The committee held two public meetings and commissioned a planning study of the area, funded by Brown University. The Thayer Street Study Plan, released in 2014, guides infrastructure improvements, new zoning regulations and development, enhanced transportation and parking investments, and marketing. Progress is regularly tracked by the stakeholder committee and actively managed by the Thayer Street District Management Association, of which Brown University is an active participant with two board members.

Standard 7C describes work to maintain and improve the campus through renewal and new construction as well as recent improvements to the capital planning and project approval processes. Led by the Provost, capital planning and approval is guided by the priorities set out in Building on Distinction. The process is managed by Facilities Management and includes senior academic officers, financial leadership, and representation from the Division of Advancement in order to ensure effective integration of capital planning with program and resource planning. Under the Providence zoning ordinances, Brown is required to maintain a five-year Institutional Master Plan for new building projects and major renovations. This plan also requires an assessment of the impact of building plans on the community and summary of efforts to mitigate problems created by construction.

Evaluation

Evaluation takes place at multiple levels throughout Brown. As discussed in Standard 1, Brown’s Corporation periodically evaluates its organization and effectiveness. A recent major review of its Corporation and faculty-based committees led to the establishment of a number of advisory and community councils 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. Statutory faculty committees such as the Academic Priorities Committee, the University Resources Committee, the College Curriculum Council, and the Graduate Council 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. The FEC assesses the efficacy, structure, and charges of governance committees, which have evolved over time in response to new needs and priorities and in the interests of efficiency. The Graduate Council is also reviewing its own functions and processes.

When Building on Distinction was approved, the Corporation requested a set of performance metrics to track progress against the plan’s goals and objectives and assess the impact of investments. This report is coordinated by the Provost’s Office and prepared by senior academic officers working with the Office of Institutional Research. The report tracks a wide variety of indicators for undergraduate, graduate, and medical education, faculty excellence,
research, and finances. This information is displayed in dashboards (see Workroom) that are available to senior officers and other campus groups as appropriate. Strategic Plan metrics are also accessible by the Corporation and discussed on a regular cycle in the Corporation Committee on Academic Affairs and in Strategic Sessions (which involve the entire Corporation). Similarly, we have created data dashboards for the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan, and academic excellence in departments. The data are not only helping to monitor progress on the impact of investments in our strategic plan but are also providing the basis for some of the decision-making about program development, policies, and resource allocation described elsewhere in this self-study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dashboard</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building on Distinction</td>
<td>Monitoring how investments are achieving plan goals</td>
<td>Senior officers; Corporation; other campus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion</td>
<td>Monitoring progress, visibility, and accountability</td>
<td>Senior officers; Corporation; Diversity and Inclusion Oversight Board; campus community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>Planning and evaluation for academic excellence</td>
<td>Senior officers; department chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several academic programs have regular accreditation reviews, including ScB concentrations in Engineering through the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology; the School of Public Health’s bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral programs through the Council on Education for Public Health; and the Warren Alpert Medical School through the Liaison Committee on Medical Education of the Association of American Medical Colleges. Brown also conducts external reviews of its academic departments and graduate and undergraduate curricula on a regular cycle (see Standards 4A, B, and C) as well as periodic reviews of major institutes and centers. These occur on the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit/Program</th>
<th>Review Schedule</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>Academic Priorities Committee</td>
<td>Includes mid-course check-ins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Curricula</td>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>College Curriculum Council</td>
<td>Follows dept review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Programs</td>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>Coordinated with dept review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Programs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Programs (initial review)</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>As Appropriate (APC, CCC, GC)</td>
<td>e.g., Executive Master’s programs; Wintersession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes, Centers, Libraries, Museums, etc.</td>
<td>Determined by senior administrator</td>
<td>Academic Priorities Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These processes, which involve collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, have resulted in ongoing improvements and at times significant organizational and program changes (see the E-Series forms).

Planning and evaluation also occur annually through meetings between department chairs and the dean to whom they report to review general departmental activity and each faculty member’s performance (see Standard 6). Similarly, the Dean of the Graduate School meets with department chairs and directors of graduate studies each fall. Increasingly, deans have worked with departments to develop metrics to help inform evaluation of their activities. The Graduate School, in collaboration with the offices of the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost, are in the process of developing regular metrics for PhD programs. The Provost meets individually with deans, department chairs, and center directors to discuss the strategic goals and plans of their unit, as well as collectively on a monthly basis to discuss issues of common concern and share best practices. This includes soliciting feedback on what the administration
is doing well from the perspective of departments and centers, and areas where it could improve its approach. Plans for assessments of academic programs are presented regularly at Cabinet and Executive Committee meetings led by the President. Evaluative practices are layered throughout our activities, such as in course evaluations or requirements related to sponsored research.

Another kind of stocktaking takes place when the President leads a Cabinet retreat at least annually to focus on larger issues and significant challenges or opportunities. The Office of the Provost, the Office of the Dean of the College, the Graduate School, and the Division of Campus Life and Student Services also conduct regular retreats. Where appropriate, retreat discussions are informed by data reports and analysis.

**Projections**

- The President and senior leadership will continue to enlist the efforts of the whole campus to advance the goals in *Building on Distinction and Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion*. These goals will continue to shape priority setting, resource allocation, and organizational change, as reflected in projections under other Standards.

- Although the University has significantly strengthened its mechanisms for assessment and evaluation to inform strategic decision-making and resource allocation, work is ongoing both to develop even better tools and to continue promoting these practices throughout the University. In the coming years, for example, the Office of the Provost, supported by the Office of Institutional Research, will continue to enhance metrics for assessing the impact of investments in our strategic plan; academic deans will continue to hone approaches to measuring the performance of academic departments reporting to them; the academic review process will continue to identify opportunities to strengthen departments and programs, leading to more department/program-level strategic plans for academic excellence; and the University’s financial administration will further refine the long-term financial model and its integration with stronger and more uniform budgeting practices.

- Currently, separate data platforms and information systems make it harder than necessary to conduct evaluations of academic programs. The Office of Computing and Information Services is prioritizing the integration of data, along with creating data governance policies and practices that support evaluation of academic programs while maintaining data security.
Standard Three: Organization and Governance

Description

The Corporation, and thus all of Brown, is governed by a document drafted when Rhode Island was an English colony. Faculty rules and regulations and assorted other policies, committees and practices developed over time have been amended by gradual accretion and, at times, replaced wholesale. Throughout, and particularly during the last decade, a consistent institutional commitment to conduct University business in a manner consistent with our values and principles has prevailed. Since 2012, when President Paxson took office, Brown has carried out comprehensive reviews of its Corporation and faculty governance as well as of its administrative structure. The resulting changes have streamlined operations, improved communications, and strengthened accountability.

Sound governance mechanisms and processes guide daily operations and shape future aspirations for all members of the community, enabling Brown to make important decisions in a manner that endeavors to be transparent, inclusive, and timely. Brown’s organization and governance practices are characterized by a high degree of collaboration among senior leaders, open communication, responsiveness to students, and respect for the faculty’s prerogatives in academic matters. The University engages in continual assessment of organization and governance in order to ensure ongoing improvement and excellence in the methods we use to make decisions and implement policy. Over the last 10 years, Brown has engaged in systematic reviews of governance conducted by both the Corporation and the faculty. Additionally, new or improved governance practices have been introduced in other areas.

Appraisal

Corporation

The Brown University Corporation is composed of a 12-member Board of Fellows, with the President as presiding officer, and a 42-member Board of Trustees, headed by the Chancellor. The Corporation’s powers and duties are set forth in the 1764 Charter granted by the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Although several powers are reserved for the Fellows (for example approving new academic programs and granting degrees), the Trustees and Fellows most often operate as a unified body. The Corporation’s standing committees perform oversight and advisory functions and provide guidance to the Corporation as a whole.

The Corporation has three main committees: Academic Affairs, 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 Governance and Nominating Committee may serve on more than one of these committees. The Corporation’s remaining responsibilities are assigned to a set of other committees: Advisory and Executive; Audit; Communications, Alumni, and External Affairs; Facilities and Campus Planning; Governance and Nominating; Investment; Medical School; Senior Administration; and Trustee Vacancies. The charges of each committee are specified in the Corporation Statutes and publicly available on the Corporation website. Committee chairs and vice chairs are appointed by the Corporation, upon recommendation by the Governance and 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 Statutes...
and in the *Trusteeship* article, “Restructuring for Good Governance.”! The President occasionally establishes *ad hoc* committees to handle special matters. In the last few years, she established an *ad hoc* committee to review progress on the implementation of Brown’s new Title IX policies. A current *ad hoc* committee provides oversight of the implementation of the *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* action plan.

The Corporation meets at least three times each year and is responsible for granting tenure; setting the University’s budget, tuition, and fees; selecting the President; establishing policy and strategic plans; appointing faculty and senior administrative officers; siting buildings; and accepting gifts and approving naming opportunities. It has final authority and responsibility for all policy and strategy. The full Corporation approves all major strategic initiatives, such as *Building on Distinction*, the University budget, and capital projects. The Board of Fellows approves all degrees and academic programs. It meets twice a year with faculty leaders. The Corporation Committee on Campus Life receives updates from the heads of the student government organizations at least once a year, and members interact regularly with undergraduate, graduate, and medical students. A 14-member Advisory and Executive Committee meets telephonically at least four times a year to act on items that require attention between full Corporation meetings.

Each of the Corporation’s standing committees meets at least three times a year and submits an annual report to the full 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 Corporation approval are first submitted to the Corporation Office, which reviews them to ensure that proper process has been followed.

The Corporation appoints its members internally through several processes. Of the 42 Trustees, 13 are elected by alumni pursuant to an agreement between the Corporation and the Alumni Association. These 13 trustees include the current and two past Brown Alumni Association presidents, and 10 others elected to six-year terms. The Committee on Trustee Vacancies makes recommendations when vacancies occur among the remainder of the Trustees, and the Board of Fellows does the same when vacancies occur among the Fellows. Careful selection of Trustees and Fellows ensures that Corporation members have the professional and personal backgrounds needed to meet their fiduciary and oversight responsibilities.

At the end of the 2015-16 academic year, Chancellor Thomas Tisch and Vice Chancellor Jerome Vascellaro concluded their service after nearly a decade leading the Corporation through a period of significant growth for the physical campus and for the stature of the University while grappling with the 2008 financial crisis and other challenges. Anticipating the completion of the terms of Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, members of the Governance and Nominating Committee engaged in a rigorous process to nominate their successors, including consultation with all current and immediate past members of the Corporation. The committee gathered thoughts and opinions about the University’s goals and challenges, and the Corporation’s leadership needs. This inclusive process solicited interest and nominations for the

---

1 *Trusteeship Magazine*, August 1, 2006. In this article, University Chancellor Stephen Robert and Russell C. Carey, then vice president and secretary of the University, describe the restructuring process.
Chancellor and Vice Chancellor positions and included preliminary discussions regarding the anticipated vacancies in the Treasurer and Secretary positions. The Corporation of Brown University elected Samuel M. Mencoff to be the University’s 21st Chancellor, Alison S. Ressler as Vice Chancellor, and Theresia Gouw as Treasurer with terms starting July 1, 2016. Richard Friedman was elected as Secretary, with a term beginning July 1, 2017.

In 2015-16, the Corporation also conducted a self-assessment of its governance practices and procedures, including trustee selection and member engagement. As a result, current and recent members now receive an annual survey to assess Corporation effectiveness, engagement, and satisfaction as well as to determine members’ interests and preferred committee assignments. The results are shared and discussed at the informal meeting of the Corporation in August, and have helped inform committee assignments and ongoing engagement of members with recently expired terms.

In 2016-17, as President Paxson was concluding her first five-year term, the Corporation conducted a thorough assessment of her performance, collecting information from current and previous Corporation members and campus leaders, including the Provost, senior deans, and the leadership of the Faculty Executive Committee. On the basis of this assessment, she was reappointed to a second five-year term starting in July 2017.

The Corporation maintains active engagement with the campus and works on principles of transparency. It is particularly concerned to have input from faculty and students as well as from senior administration. Corporation meeting schedules are structured to include discussions with students on a given topic of concern (see Standard 5) and with faculty leadership. As members of advisory councils and boards for particular units on campus, Corporation members are also directly engaged with academic and student programs.

In 2009, the Corporation established a New Alumni Trustee position to provide a perspective that is more closely grounded in the student experience and to act as an interface with current Brown students. As a result of its recent self-assessment exercise, the Corporation approved significant changes to the method of selecting New Alumni Trustees. Since July 1, 2017, the Corporation has reserved two positions for New Alumni Trustees. Eligible voters – undergraduate, graduate, and medical students in their final year of study and alumni within five years of their graduation date – now select a trustee from a slate of three candidates. New Alumni Trustees are appointed for staggered two-year terms.

Transparency mechanisms are in place at various levels. Corporation members sign a conflict of interest statement placing them under a continuing obligation to disclose any real or potential conflict that exists or may arise. Members of the Investment Committee must make additional disclosures. The new members’ orientation program reviews the organization of the Corporation, its mission, governance reforms, committee functions, and the conflict of interest policy. The President communicates major outcomes of Corporation meetings to the campus.

*Faculty Governance*

At Brown, faculty governance extends not only to the management of matters of direct faculty concern, such as faculty appointments, promotions, tenure, creation and abolition of academic units, evaluation of faculty merit and salaries, and academic budgets, but also includes participation in the process of setting Brown’s academic priorities. Through membership on various advisory boards (e.g., for Campus Life, Computing and Information Services, Human
Resources, and the Library), the faculty also provides input to senior members of the administration responsible for major University functions.

The faculty’s authority and responsibilities are detailed in the Faculty Rules and Regulations (FRR), approved and updated regularly by faculty vote. The faculty meets monthly during the academic year. Its business is supervised by the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), whose principal tasks are to (a) 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 leadership meets monthly with the President and Provost, annually with the Corporation, and as requested with undergraduate, graduate, and medical students.

The faculty maintains the integrity and quality of academic programs through a system of committees with elected membership. The Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC) plays a critical role in ensuring high standards for faculty appointments and promotion. Academic departments initiate recommendations for senior faculty appointments, reviews for the promotion of tenure-track faculty to the ranks of tenured Associate and Full Professor, and for the promotion of Lecturers to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and Distinguished Senior Lecturer. Tenure-track Assistant Professors have a mid-term reappointment review in their fourth year, and lecturer-track faculty are reviewed at regular intervals. TPAC also oversees the reappointment and promotion of research-track faculty and Professors of the Practice.

The committee reviews each dossier and submits its recommendation to the Provost, who in turn forwards his recommendation to the President. Positive recommendations for promotion receive final approval from the Corporation. Decisions to deny promotion or reappointment are reviewed by the Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED) to determine whether procedures and policies were followed and applied equitably. Medical faculty appointments to associate and full professor ranks, which are not tenured, are submitted to the Committee on Medical Faculty Appointments (CMFA), whose members include campus-based medical faculty. A similar process is followed for non-tenure-track appointments in the School of Public Health. Recommendations are reviewed by the Provost and President, and recommendations for promotion, reappointment, and tenure, receive final approval from the Corporation.

The faculty also supervises the integrity of 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 (see Standards 4B and 4C). Medical curriculum matters are addressed by the Biomedical Faculty Council, the Medical Curriculum Committee, and the Biology Curriculum Committee. The faculty advises the administration on faculty compensation, benefits, and leave policies through CFED, which also advises the faculty generally on practices relating to diversity and non-discrimination. Faculty participate in decisions about academic programs through the Academic Priorities Committee (APC), chaired by the Provost. All decisions to adopt new programs or change the status of existing ones must first be approved by the APC, then referred to the FEC and scheduled for action by the full faculty (see Standard 4A). Faculty advise the President on University budget priorities through their membership on the University Resources Committee (URC), which is chaired by the Provost and also includes student and staff representatives (see Standard 7B). The FEC’s charge as articulated in the Faculty Rules includes receiving annual reports from all standing committees of the faculty. FEC meets with committee leadership and then distributes reports for discussion at regular, University-wide faculty meetings.
The Administration appoints chairs of academic departments following intensive consultation with all faculty in the department. 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. Department chairs receive ongoing mentoring and support from their deans, and have opportunities for collective discussion and sharing in regular meetings of chairs organized by major division. In addition, the Provost convenes a monthly meeting of department chairs and major center directors, the topics of which are developed by a faculty agenda committee.

The FEC conducts a general review of governance every 10 years. The process currently underway began in spring 2016 with a survey of all standing committees of the faculty. The FEC reviewed the survey results in conjunction with a set of focus groups in winter and spring 2017. It found that no changes are needed in some areas, while in others there will be recommendations for enhancing effectiveness or clarifying purpose. All changes to standing committees are approved by a vote of the faculty. In February 2017, the University Resources Committee (URC) revised its charge to reflect accurately its current practice and membership. In April 2017, the Standing Committee on the Academic Code (SCAC) amended its charge to increase membership for demographic diversity. In October 2017, the Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED) successfully brought a motion to the faculty to update its charge to align with the University’s recently adopted Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan.

In fall 2017, the new Director of the Title IX Office began working with the FEC to establish a faculty committee that would serve as a standing pool for hearing cases and appeals in which faculty members are responding to alleged violations of the Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship and Interpersonal Violence and Stalking Policy. Members would also hear appeals in which a student is responding to an allegation. This structure will increase the number and diversity of people undertaking this demanding work while also allowing for clearer recognition for their service. The proposal is expected to come before the faculty for a vote in spring 2018.

Administration

Brown’s senior administrative leadership team works together in a highly collaborative fashion to advance the University’s mission and strategic goals. President Paxson is assisted most directly by her senior staff, composed of the Provost, the Executive Vice President for Planning and Policy, the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Senior Vice President for Advancement, the Vice President and General Counsel, the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services, the Vice President for Communications, the Vice President for Institutional Equity and Diversity, and the Assistant to the President. The Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences and (per Ivy League rules) the Director of Athletics have dashed-line reporting to the President. The President’s Cabinet is composed of 21 members of the senior administration. The President also convenes an Executive Committee, which consists of the Cabinet and about 40 additional members of the senior administration. The President meets weekly with the senior staff, every three weeks with Cabinet and monthly with Executive Committee. The Cabinet holds a day-long retreat every August and often in January to discuss long-range strategic planning. From these discussions, the President and Cabinet determine the planning agenda for the coming year. This agenda also serves to guide much of the work of Corporation committees and administrative planning.
The President also meets frequently with members of the Brown community. She chairs monthly faculty meetings during the academic year and meets monthly with FEC officers and officers of the Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS) and Graduate Student Council (GSC). The President meets at least annually with the Staff Advisory Council and, upon request, with the Medical Student Senate, and the Medical Faculty Executive Committee. The President chairs the Brown University Community Council, a broad-based group of faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and a Corporation representative, which meets three times per semester to discuss issues that are of current interest and concern to the community at large. In addition, the President sets aside office hours to meet with students and staff.

Provost Richard Locke is the University’s chief academic officer. His direct reports include the Dean of the Faculty, the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, and the Dean of the School of Public Health. Among them, these senior academic leaders supervise all of Brown’s faculty, academic departments, institutes, and centers. The Dean of the School of Engineering currently reports jointly to the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty. Other deans and officers reporting to the Provost are the deans of the College, the Graduate School, and the School of Professional Studies, the University Librarian, the Vice President for Research, the Vice President for Computing and Information Services, the Dean of Admission, and the Dean of Financial Aid. The Provost meets regularly with academic department chairs, the APC, the URC and all other committees of which he is chair. The Provost is assisted by a senior staff consisting of a Deputy Provost, a Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, an Associate Provost for Space Planning, an Associate Provost for Global Engagement and Strategic Initiatives, and a Chief of Staff.

Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Barbara Chernow oversees the vice presidents for Facilities Management, Finance and CFO (jointly with the Provost), and Human Resources, the Vice President and Chief Investment Officer, as well as the Assistant Vice President for Business and Financial Services, the directors of Dining Services and Environmental Health and Safety, and the Chief University Auditor. She also convenes an administrative leadership group on a monthly basis to discuss topics of interest and to hear presentations from other administrators or faculty.

The President, Provost, and EVP for Finance and Administration have all been active in reviewing administrative organization. Among the offices reporting to the President, reorganizations have taken place in the offices of Advancement, Communications, and Campus Life and Student Services. In the Provost’s area, there have been major structural overhauls in the Graduate School (see Standard 4C) and the Office of Global Engagement. There has also been a highly significant consolidation of financial offices under the purview of the EVP for Finance and Administration (see Standard 7B) as well as a new management structure for Dining Services and the introduction of strategic sourcing in procurement. Since 2013, the Investment Office has also undergone a major reorganization and change in leadership. In addition to these more notable changes, positions and areas of responsibility throughout the administration are regularly realigned as necessary. In 2016-17, to provide coordinated oversight to the management, integrity, accuracy, and distribution of University data, senior leadership established a Data Governance Committee and Data Governance Advisory Group comprised of faculty and senior representatives of academic and administrative units. Guided by Building on Distinction, all senior administrative officers recognize their responsibility to execute successfully against the plan and are in constant conversation about how best to do so.
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. (The GSC includes the School of Public Health, but there is also an internal School of Public Health Graduate Council.) The presidents of these bodies are non-voting members of the Corporation Committee on Campus Life. Student representatives sit on major University governance committees where student interests are involved, including the graduate, undergraduate, and medical curriculum councils and also the URC.

UCS consists of an eight-member elected Executive Board and more than 40 representatives committed to serving Brown’s undergraduate community. Any member of the undergraduate student body who obtains the signatures of 150 members of the undergraduate student body on a Petition of Election shall become an At-Large Member of the UCS, as long as the member maintains a good attendance record. Students serve one-year terms. The UCS has seven subgroups: the Outreach and Advocacy Committee, the Management Board, the Communications Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, the Campus Life Committee, the Student Activities Committee, and the Student Wellness Committee. The UCS meets weekly each semester and interacts regularly with the administration.

GSC serves Brown’s PhD and master’s students. With representatives from each department who elect its officers from the graduate student population, GSC’s goals are to foster a sense of community among graduate students across departments and to offer a voice for Brown’s graduate student population and graduate student groups within the University and the Providence area. The GSC meets monthly and interacts regularly with the Graduate School deans. It also meets regularly with the President and Provost as well as with the officers of the Faculty Executive Committee each semester.

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 MSS committee members. MSS 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.

Students serve on many of the University committees that directly affect them or their interests, including the Campus Planning Advisory Board, the College Curriculum Council, the Diversity and Inclusion Oversight Board, the Title IX Oversight and Advisory Board, the Campus Life Advisory Board, the Mental Health Community Council, the Information Technology 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 Brown University Community Council.

Projections

- Brown’s organization and governance continue to become more complex with the growth of distinct schools within the University and a set of powerful cross-disciplinary Institutes, all promoting greater strength in research and graduate education. At the
same time, undergraduate education remains central to Brown’s identity, values, and reputation. The idea of Brown as a “university-college” is that outstanding liberal education for undergraduates does not simply co-exist with advanced scholarship and research, but that both are parts of an integrated system in which each is enriched by the other. As Brown continues to grow in scale and scope, the University’s organization and governance structures will need to evolve while also seeking to preserve the nimbleness in decision-making and highly consultative culture that have been a source of organizational strength.

- Growing external pressures and constraints in areas such as utilization of the endowment, affordability and access, research funding, international mobility, and other topics of public discussion about higher education will place new demands on Brown’s governance and organization for maintaining the University’s mission and values.
Standard Four: The Academic Program

A. Assuring Academic Quality

Description

At Brown, the task of assuring the quality of academic programs falls to a set of key committees consisting of elected faculty representatives and senior administrators. The Academic Priorities Committee (APC), chaired by the Provost, supervises external reviews of academic units and evaluates proposals for new departments, centers, programs, and institutes. The College Curriculum Council (CCC), chaired by the Dean of the College, oversees the evaluation of undergraduate programs, and the Graduate Council, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School, performs the same function for PhD and master’s programs (including Executive Master’s programs offered through the School of Professional Studies). Both of these committees also include elected student representatives. The APC works in consultation with the CCC and the Graduate Council on proposals to establish new educational programs.

Appraisal

Between 2006-07 and 2014-15, Brown reviewed all of its academic departments plus a number of major centers and programs. Reviews involved a detailed self-study, an internal review by two faculty from related departments, and an external visiting committee. The external reports were shared with departments, which provided written responses. The APC met with each department chair to discuss these materials and issued guidance letters in light of the review findings. In the year following the external review, the CCC and Graduate Council conducted detailed reviews of, respectively, undergraduate concentrations and graduate degree programs (see Standards 4B and 4C). This integrated process of reviews gave focused attention to the quality of Brown’s academic programs and ensured that academic administrators had the necessary information to evaluate their effectiveness and plan for improvements.

With the conclusion of this review cycle, the APC evaluated the efficiency and effectiveness of the process, including feedback solicited from individual department chairs as well as a collective discussion during the Provost’s monthly meeting with department chairs and center directors. The resulting revised guidelines for the conduct of external reviews encourages them to focus their self-study on a few key areas, such as issues that emerged from the previous review, new challenges currently facing the department, and emerging questions that the unit and the administration view as significant for the future. To reduce redundant effort, departments were also given more flexibility to align the timetable for the external and graduate program reviews. These changes should help reduce somewhat the time between reviews to five or six years.

The APC has worked to make the guidance it provides at the conclusion of the review process more explicit about specific actions that should be taken. Several recent reviews concluded with the Provost asking departments to develop a strategic plan for academic excellence using empirical data and benchmarking. Such plans provide the basis for evaluating the extent to which review recommendations can realistically be implemented and, more importantly, whether they are likely to enhance the quality of the department and raise its profile in the discipline. Department heads now also meet with the APC between reviews to discuss progress on goals and to plan for areas of focus in the next assessment. Written guidance from the APC and
discussion with the Provost’s office informs the preparation of the self-study and ensures that there is a shared understanding of priorities for the upcoming external review.

Programs, reviewers, and senior officers receive data packets that facilitate the incorporation of key metrics into the review process and into academic planning more generally. The quality and reliability of this data have also been improved. Collaboration among the Provost’s office, the Dean of the Faculty’s office (which oversees faculty data collection across the University), and the Office of Institutional Research, as well as consultation with departments, has resulted in more consistent data about faculty demographics, teaching and advising, scholarly activity (using the Academic Analytics data service as well as other sources), external funding, use of space, and educational programs (enrollment, satisfaction, etc.).

The review process has led directly to improved departmental and program quality, as summarized in the E-Series forms. Some reviews have been especially consequential, leading, for instance to the restoration of the defunct Language Resource Center following coordinated review of language and literature departments, the integration of the Taubman Center for Public Policy and American Institutions into the Watson Institute for International Affairs (Itself significantly revitalized following a 2010 review) to strengthen both the undergraduate concentration in Public Policy and the Master of Public Affairs program, and new central oversight and financial support for core research facilities following review of the School of Engineering. A set of criteria for reviewing research centers, programs, and institutes developed by the Research Advisory Board in 2012 led the APC to recommend that senior officers be more directly responsible for monitoring each unit’s activities and contributions to Brown’s research mission. Senior officers are also charged with developing metrics by which to evaluate the impact and success of these research centers, programs, and institutes and with determining when a review – internal or external – would be appropriate.

Beyond overseeing reviews, the APC plays an important role in vetting proposed new academic initiatives, programs, and units along with (as appropriate) the CCC, the Graduate Council, and the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). Final approval rests with the full faculty and the Corporation. Recent examples include Naval and Air Force ROTC opportunities (2014-15) following a detailed study and extensive campus debate; a new ScM program in Data Science (2016); criteria for awarding certificates in non-degree programs for post-baccalaureate students and adult professional learners (2015-16); and certificate and ScM programs in Medical Sciences, enabling students to gain additional preparation for medical school or other health professions by completing first-year coursework at the Warren Alpert Medical School (2016–17). APC’s recommendation to establish a new program typically includes a defined set of metrics for success and a plan for review after a specified number of years. For example, as new ventures for Brown, the Executive Master’s programs in the School of Professional Studies and the Wintersession program have been asked to report on progress after three years. New programs in more established areas may be given a somewhat longer period for initial review.

Projections

- The current cycle of department and curricular reviews, expected to finish in 2020-21, along with reviews of centers and other programs, will identify areas of strength and concern that will assist the Provost, deans, chairs, and directors with developing unit-level plans for advancing academic excellence within the broader goals of *Building on Distinction* and *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion.*
• APC will continue to consult with deans as they enhance the means for assessing the quality of academic units using data from internal and external sources as well as metrics identified by the units themselves.

B. Undergraduate Degree Programs, Liberal Learning, and the Concentration

Description

Brown currently enrolls around 6,670 undergraduates, more than 99 percent of whom are full-time. Students engage with a variety of approaches to understanding and navigating the world. An open curriculum enables students to combine wide-ranging exploration and experimentation with focused study in one of about 80 concentrations (Brown’s equivalent of academic majors) leading to baccalaureate degrees and several special degree combinations. A strong advising system of deans, faculty, and peers supports students’ academic pursuits. Tutoring and study help centers in writing and science are available to all students.

Brown undergraduates take advantage of hundreds of research opportunities and internships each year, explore social issues in the classroom and through community engagement, and build the skills, knowledge, and relationships necessary for lives of thoughtful and effective action. Brown students have an enviable record of winning competitive national and international fellowships and demonstrate significant post-college achievement in all areas of intellectual, professional, social, and creative endeavor. This degree of success underscores the impact of Brown’s distinctive approach to undergraduate education. Continuing to enhance and evolve the undergraduate educational experience is a cornerstone of Building on Distinction.

Appraisal

Brown offers two four-year baccalaureate degrees, the Bachelor of Arts (AB) and the Bachelor of Science (ScB), which require students to (1) complete at least 30 four-semester-credit-hour courses, 15 of which must be taken at Brown; (2) complete a concentration; (3) fulfill a two-part writing requirement; (4) fulfill an eight-semester enrollment requirement; and (5) be in residence for at least four fall or spring semesters of full-time study. A small number of students earn a combined AB-ScB over five years, and exceptionally capable students may simultaneously complete both a baccalaureate and a master’s degree. Select groups of first-year students are accepted to the Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME), which includes admission to Brown’s Warren Alpert Medical School, and the five-year dual degree program in which students earn an AB or ScB from Brown and a Bachelor of Fine Arts from the Rhode Island School of Design (RISD). Students enrolled in these programs must meet certain requirements beyond Brown’s standard undergraduate degree requirements.

In a survey of enrolled students, an average of 90 percent expressed satisfaction with the overall quality of class instruction, faculty availability, and opportunities for class discussion. A Brown education is demonstrably applicable to a wide range of careers that students pursue after graduation. Among alumni surveyed 10 years after graduation, 90 percent reported being employed and 94 percent felt that Brown prepared them well for their careers. We do not yet have peer data for comparison, but in previous years Brown’s results have been consistent with those of institutions with more traditional curricula. CareerLAB data show the top five employment sectors for the Class of 2016 (ranked in order) are technology; finance/banking and real estate; education; consulting; and science/research. Brown students also perform extremely well on tests for entry to graduate and professional studies (see Standard 8).
The Open Curriculum and Liberal Learning

Like many institutions dedicated to the liberal arts, Brown encourages its undergraduates to study broadly and deeply, to become self-reflective, and to develop a moral core. The Brown Curriculum, outlined by student and faculty reformers in 1969, empowered students to direct their own educational development. This embrace of independence has defined Brown's place in the landscape of American collegiate education for almost 50 years. According to the 2017 Cooperative Institutional Research Program's survey of entering students, about 90 percent of incoming students saw Brown's open curriculum as a major factor in attracting them to Brown.

In place of general education requirements, Brown challenges students to build their own core curriculum and sample courses from across academic divisions. But the real challenge of Brown's approach is for students to make connections among those courses, using the perspective gained from one discipline as a window into the next. Our philosophy is that student choice, exercised in collaboration with engaged faculty advisors, fosters students’ abilities to think independently, approach questions from multiple vantage points, and practice habits of self-reflection and empathy. The ultimate goal is to create citizens who are at home in a world of multiplicity and change and who have the capacity to make important decisions for themselves with integrity and responsibility.

As detailed on the E-Series forms, Brown's liberal learning goals, developed during a 2008 review of the undergraduate curriculum, guide students' academic choices. Even without distribution requirements, the vast majority of students take courses across academic divisions throughout their time at Brown. The myriad ways that Brown students integrate knowledge across fields on a daily basis is not easily captured. But we can see the extent to which students are actively pursuing integrative learning in network graphs of students' course choices across departments, even while they are pursuing their concentrations (see the 2013 Handbook for Physical Planning). Even Engineering concentrators, who have the greatest number of course requirements, continue to take classes in many other departments. This data led the administration to rethink plans to site a new Engineering building in the Jewelry District, which could have led to the isolation of engineering students and dissuaded other students from taking engineering classes. Instead, the building was erected on College Hill.

The recent introduction of a powerful new online course search and registration tool, Courses@Brown, may also furnish new insights on the ways students approach the task of selecting courses in an open curriculum. The site provides a number of pathways through which students can locate or explore course offerings, based on concentration, schedule, searchable course descriptions, and even a randomized “Have You Considered?” list. We intend to analyze usage data to gain further insights into how students are navigating Brown's open curriculum.

The Brown Learning Collaborative, a new initiative housed within the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning, is focused on enabling Brown students at all levels of ability to strengthen core competencies that are foundational to a liberal arts education: communication (reading, writing, oral communication), analysis (data analysis and problem-solving), and research skills. Research indicates that peer-to-peer instruction can dramatically improve student performance, well-being, and retention. The Learning Collaborative will extend successful peer mentoring models at Brown so that all students, regardless of their initial level of competence, will be able to build essential skills in conjunction with the curriculum. These programs are not remedial. Communities of peer leaders, called Undergraduate Fellows, will
partner with faculty in courses to provide enrolled students with increased opportunities to strengthen their liberal arts competencies. A complementary initiative will develop a Teaching Fellows program to enhance faculty and graduate TA instructional skills in these areas, partner with Undergraduate Fellows, and develop robust connections with academic departments.

The Learning Collaborative is being piloted with a program for undergraduates focused on problem solving, and another for faculty centered on writing in the disciplines in support of our writing requirement. In the next five to 10 years, the Learning Collaborative will expand to facilitate skills in data analysis, research, oral communication, and critical reading. The Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning has filled a new full-time position dedicated to assessment to help faculty with tools to evaluate learning in their own courses, particularly as they adopt more active learning practices.

Advising and Navigating the Open Curriculum

Because of the freedom the curriculum affords, Brown places great emphasis on advising. Before students arrive at Brown, they are assigned to a first-year advisor drawn from the faculty or senior-level staff. First-year advisors generally continue with advisees through the sophomore year. Students declare a concentration at the end of their fourth semester, and a designated faculty member from their chosen field becomes their primary academic advisor for their remaining time at Brown. Peers also play an important role in advising. The Meiklejohn Advising Program pairs trained upperclass students with first-year advisors. Collaboratively, they provide guidance on course selection, study habits, internships, and research opportunities. Meiklejohns are often the primary source of advice and support around social issues, housing, and navigating resources on Brown’s campus and beyond.

Surveys of both first-year students and seniors (see E-Series forms) indicate a fairly high level of satisfaction with advising. First-years expressed even higher satisfaction with their Meiklejohn advisor than with their first-year advisor. Seniors look back to their pre-major advising with somewhat less satisfaction, but are more enthusiastic about their concentration advising. The percentage of first-years expressing satisfaction with advising, which had been at around 80 percent, took a slight dip in 2015 (a year of some campus turmoil), but recovered much of its lost ground the following year. The strength of Brown's advising structure also underlies senior survey results in which 85 percent of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they used the open curriculum to create a challenging course of study. Special advising programs for at-risk students also contribute to Brown’s high graduation rate.

To ensure advising quality, Office of the Dean of the College and the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning distribute fact sheets prepared by the Office of Institutional Research to acquaint new advisors and new faculty with relevant high-level data. The Dean of the College also hosts orientation meetings for advisors at the start of each academic year, and a significant body of resources for advisors is conveniently assembled in online portals. The TEAM (Team Enhanced Advising and Mentoring) program for faculty advisors established in 2009 provides a regular forum for faculty from a range of disciplines who meet regularly to discuss situations they have faced with first-year advisees and the best practices in such scenarios. Around 170 advisors have participated since the program's inception. In collaboration with the Science Center, the TEAM program created general and course-specific resources to help non-STEM first-year and sophomore advisors guide students who may be considering courses in the sciences. TEAM participants report that the program has had a positive effect on their advising.
New students are educated about Brown’s curriculum in several ways. Even before they arrive on campus, students receive the Guide to Brown and Planning Your Liberal Education. In addition, a new online workshop covers such topics as: how to make the most of a liberal arts education in the context of an open curriculum; how to construct an effective advising network; and how to adopt learning strategies for a successful college career; and how to participate in a learning environment committed to fostering the spirit of free inquiry.

Once on campus, an increasing number of students participate in one of several optional pre-orientation programs designed to help them acclimate to the open curriculum. These programs impart knowledge of Brown’s history, traditions, and values; describe the knowledge, skills, networks, and frameworks needed for navigating an open curriculum; and foster a sense that students are part of a community of peers with common interests. Pre-orientation options include “Excellence at Brown,” a writing-intensive program for approximately 125 students; New Scientist-Catalyst and Mosaic +, serving about 30 students with a focus on the physical and computer sciences (discussed further below); and the Third World Transition Program promoting community-building and interracial understanding among its 200 participants. An International Orientation, required for students on a visa, is also open to all incoming first-year and transfer students who self-identify as international, regardless of citizenship or residency.

Following the general orientation, students meet in small groups with their academic advisors and Meiklejohn peer advisors to discuss their interests and plan their initial course of study. At the start of every semester, students have a two-week “shopping period” in which they may sample courses before committing to them. As a result, students are able to identify the courses that are best suited to their academic plans. This process has recently been strengthened by the requirement to post course syllabi online before the start of term.

The Concentration

In their fourth semester, all students must declare a concentration from among the roughly 80 programs that lead to the AB or ScB. Brown does not offer minors. Descriptions of all standard concentrations and approved concentration requirements are published in the University Bulletin. Each concentration’s learning goals are posted on Focal Point, Brown’s concentration resource, which also contains information on alumni outcomes, capstone requirements or options, and contact information for faculty concentration advisors. All concentrations have requirements to ensure that students have learned content that is central to the discipline, but most also provide some flexibility and many offer specialized tracks. Students’ concentration and (if applicable) track appear on their official record. Concentration course credit requirements range from eight to 21 (for engineering programs accredited by ABET, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology). The small number of concentrations requiring eight courses have significant prerequisites, such as language mastery, and often serve as second concentrations. Around 20 percent of graduating students are double concentrators; fewer than five per year complete three concentrations.

Since its last self-study, Brown has seen a steady increase in completion of life science concentrations, and a doubling in the number of physical science concentrations. In 2017, the percentage of graduates earning a degree in the life and physical sciences was roughly equivalent to the percentage earning degrees in the humanities and social sciences.
Nearly a decade ago, Brown’s admission yield was lowest for students interested in the physical and quantitative sciences. The rapid growth of interest in STEM fields reflects both national trends and Brown’s efforts to strengthen its reputation in the sciences. Now we are looking at how to maintain an overall balance of students’ intellectual interests and to build other areas of strength and opportunity. As at colleges and universities across the country, the number of humanities concentrators has declined at Brown (although enrollment in humanities courses remains high). The Office of College Admission has recently been more proactive with students whose interests gravitate toward the humanities. As part of our strategic plan, Brown’s major investments in the arts (including a new Performing Arts Center) are directed in part at better supporting students who are seeking both academic and creative excellence.

Concentrations provide a focused area of study but they are not intellectual silos. Students are encouraged to use knowledge and subject matter acquired in other coursework. Some concentrations even require courses outside their discipline. The Engineering ScB, for example, requires at least four courses in the humanities or social sciences. More than a dozen concentrations are explicitly interdisciplinary (e.g., International Relations). Students whose interests are not adequately addressed by a standing concentration may propose an independent concentration. Independent concentrators (ranging from six to 28 in recent years) must have a faculty advisor and a study plan approved by the CCC, including a capstone project. The Curricular Resource Center for Peer Advising provides guidance on developing proposals and ongoing support.

Students across all concentrations have opportunities to synthesize and demonstrate the knowledge and skills they have gained in their concentration and broader coursework at Brown. More than half of Brown’s undergraduate degree offerings require a capstone experience, although not all require that this work be completed for course credit. Approximately 30 percent of graduating seniors earn honors in any given year. The percentage is often higher in concentrations leading toward the ScB, which require two semesters of research. According to the 2016 senior survey, two-thirds of the graduating class complete an original, culminating project, including theses, creative work, and independent research. Many of these students present their culminating projects in their home departments and at Theories in Action, a multidisciplinary capstone conference begun in 2010. In spring 2018, the CCC will ratify a statement on the impact of capstone experiences and encourage the departments that do not currently require a capstone to do so, ideally for course credit. The CCC will also use the regular review of concentrations to stress the importance of incorporating a thesis or capstone experience as a culminating experience for all graduating seniors.

The 2008 report of the Brown Task Force on Undergraduate Education called for a comprehensive assessment of all concentrations by the CCC. The number of concentrations was reduced from around 100 to roughly 80 today due to lack of student interest, insufficient faculty support, or significant overlap with other programs. The report also launched the systematic review of concentrations by the CCC following external department reviews (see
Standard 4A). The CCC is now into its second round of reviews, and its Guidelines for Chairs in the Review of Concentrations (2013) describes the key areas that all program reviews will address. As summarized in the E-Series forms, CCC reviews have led to numerous improvements to concentrations, including some significant changes. The Department of Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Sciences revised its three concentrations to improve the balance of breadth and depth while also minimizing overlaps and redundancies. American Studies reorganized its curriculum around four broad themes and four intersecting approaches for understanding them. Environmental Studies was completely restructured to provide greater cohesion and connection to faculty research, while also adding a new track on environment and inequality. Philosophy replaced its track model with distribution requirements and areas of specialization, increased course requirements, and strengthened advising.

The current cycle of reviews looks beyond the concentration to a unit’s entire curriculum and gives greater emphasis to how learning goals are reflected in syllabi and the methods used to assess them. The reviews ask the faculty to discuss the specific ways in which their concentration requirements and the broader curriculum address their articulated learning goals as well as how students are demonstrating expected skills and knowledge. Like the previous review cycle, the CCC subcommittee meets with faculty and students in the program before composing a report on the concentration, curriculum, and learning outcomes; advising and mentoring systems; and culminating senior-year experiences. The department provides a response to this report and then meets with the larger CCC to discuss their program’s structure and goals. The CCC produces a summary letter identifying areas of strength and issues requiring attention.

**Competence in Writing**

All students are expected to develop as writers during their time at Brown. The 2008 curriculum review resulted in a stronger and more transparent statement on writing. Among graduating seniors in 2016, 80 percent report that their experience at Brown contributed “quite a bit” or “very much” to their ability to write clearly and effectively (up from 71 percent and 74 percent in the previous two surveys). Our multipronged approach to writing support includes screening students’ applications for writing competency, enabling instructors to flag concerns about students’ writing on course grade sheets (the “writing check”), and requiring students to demonstrate that they have worked on their writing at least twice – once in their first four semesters and a second time in the fifth through seventh semesters. Thus, students who struggle with meeting the requirement can be identified and assisted before their expected completion date.

Unlike institutions with a prescribed “freshman comp”-style writing course, Brown students have opportunities to develop their writing throughout their undergraduate years and across multiple disciplines. In any given semester, students can select from among the nearly 100 courses offered in the departments of English, Literary Arts, or Comparative Literature. They may also choose from among approximately 200 courses in other departments that have been approved by the CCC for the “WRIT” designation. Since implementing the revised writing requirement, there has been a steady increase in the percentage of students completing at least one writing-designated course in their first year – from 58 percent in 2010 to 74 percent (nearly 1,200 students) in 2015. In addition, more than 600 Brown students per year cultivate their writing through the Nonfiction Writing Program, housed within the English department, which offers courses ranging from foundational college-level to advanced writing skills.
With four professional staff and around 35 trained graduate student writing associates from a mix of disciplines, the Writing Center (now part of the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning) provides 3,500 to 4,000 hour-long individual consultations per year with students. The Center also recruits and trains 25 to 50 undergraduate Writing Fellows each year who review and give editorial guidance on drafts of papers produced by their peers for courses across the curriculum. Surveys of Writing Center users strongly indicate students’ positive evaluation of services. The Writing Center also supports English Language Learning (ELL); 30 percent of consultations in 2016-17 were with ELL students (up from 23 percent in 2015-16).

The small number of students (51 in 2016-17) identified through the “writing check” noted above meet with the Associate Director of the Writing Center followed by an average of five meetings with a writing associate to work on current assignments. Students may be identified both mid-semester and at the end of the term, and may not graduate until the check is cleared (although approximately half are first-years). This system has proven effective: 90 percent of students who received a writing check between 2009-10 and 2016-17 did not receive a second.

**Competence in Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning**

Brown’s strengths in scientific and quantitative learning continue to grow. We recently elevated our Engineering and Public Health programs to schools, both of which enroll a large share of undergraduates. The Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME), the Ivy League’s only combined baccalaureate-MD program, allows undergraduates aspiring to medical careers to enjoy the benefits of the open curriculum while also preparing to enter Brown’s Warren Alpert Medical School. Moreover, several of Building on Distinction’s integrative themes are significantly enhancing resources for research, teaching, and advising in STEM fields.

With no distribution requirements, 95 percent of students in the class of 2017 took at least one course in the sciences. The Satisfactory/No Credit (S/NC) grade option helps give all students the confidence to explore science. Growing student interest in STEM has led a number of departments to expand offerings for non-science concentrators. Computer Science has nearly doubled such courses in the last six years and enrollments have soared. At present, one in five undergraduates will have taken a Computer Science course before graduation. Outside the classroom, 55 percent of the Class of 2017 engaged in original research through enrolling in at least one reading and research course. Between 400 and 500 students pursue summer research opportunities each year, especially through the Undergraduate Research and Teaching Awards (UTRA) program that has averaged more than 250 students in the last few years. Although not exclusively for STEM, UTRAs skew toward the sciences.

Despite the fact that the vast majority of Brown students take at least one STEM course, we are concerned that survey data for 2014 seniors show that a somewhat smaller proportion of Brown students report strong learning gains in STEM compared to peers at other colleges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEM Learning Gains from 2014 Senior Survey</th>
<th>Brown</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent to Which College Contributed to Knowledge, Skills, and Personal Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Responding “Quite a Bit” or “Very Much”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the process of science and experimentation</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the role of science and technology in society</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using quantitative reasoning and methods</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described above, the new Brown Learning Collaborative will provide new resources for strengthening all students’ competence and confidence with scientific and quantitative
reasoning skills. Its work will dovetail with that of the Science Center (established in 2010), which supports specialized advising and study groups, science-specific academic and research help, and career mentoring while also assisting faculty with curricular innovation, broader impact activities required by research grants, and research collaborations.

Brown recognizes the need to increase the representation of women and underrepresented racial and ethnic groups in STEM education, particularly in the physical sciences. In 2017, women comprised a majority (64 percent) of the baccalaureate recipients in the life and medical sciences, but only 34 percent degree recipients in the physical sciences. Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) involves more than 700 students and faculty; its activities encourage women to pursue degrees in the STEM fields.

For students from historically underrepresented groups interested in science, we offer a week-long pre-orientation program introducing STEM concentrations and faculty as well as starting community-building activities that continue through the academic year. In 2016, this New Scientist-Catalyst program partnered with Computer Science’s mentoring program, Mosaic+, to identify an additional group of incoming first-years interested in studying computer science. Thirty incoming students now participate in a three-week online summer program preceding their week-long on-campus introduction to Brown’s science departments and campus life. The College plans to evaluate the efficacy of this expanded program in providing a stronger foundation for incoming students in key physical science disciplines and improving retention rates among students from underrepresented backgrounds in particular.

Recently, Brown received two grants for curricular innovation in STEM with the goal of expanding the pool of scientific talent. The Association of American Universities (AAU) is funding a three-year project focused on implementing active learning practices in eight courses for first-year and second-year students in Applied Mathematics, Chemistry, Engineering, and Physics. In fall of 2016, around 10 percent of undergraduates participated in the AAU-funded courses. Student performance data indicate that the more often students participated in active learning exercises during lectures and small-group collaborative learning experiences outside of class, the more their performance improved relative to their pre-course preparation. While students in the AAU-supported courses showed some improvement overall, two historically underrepresented groups have benefitted disproportionately: black or African-American men and Hispanic or Latina women.

A second grant, from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI), focuses on introducing collaborative problem-solving, course-based undergraduate research, and community learning practices in four science courses: biochemistry lab, plant biology, introductory chemistry, and genetics. Assessment of these curricular interventions to date reveals gains in both content knowledge and metacognition (in this case, students’ ability to gauge accurately their grasp of course materials). Data also indicate that students who have a hands-on component (e.g., a lab section) in a lecture course achieve higher grades and show more significant knowledge gains than their counterparts who took a lecture-only version of the course. In 2016-17, there were 950 students enrolled in the HHMI-funded courses, 60 percent of whom identified as female and 21 percent of whom identified as an underrepresented minority. Insights from further data analysis on both the AAU and HHMI grants will be incorporated into Learning Collaborative programs as they develop.

In 2017, as part of the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan, Brown launched the Presidential Scholars Program to help recruit high-achieving students from lower- and middle-income families, many of whom will also be from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic
groups and/or are first-generation college students. With a cohort-based approach, the program offers mentoring, research opportunities, exposure to academic and professional networks, social support, and a culture of high expectations. Scholars enter into either a STEM track or a humanities and social sciences track (although they may switch), each of which is staffed by a faculty member and a team of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.

**Projections**

- Under the leadership of the Dean of the College, Brown will continue to expand on new curricular initiatives in the arena of experiential learning (e.g. research opportunities, community engaged scholarship programs and internships) as well as continue to develop a range of structured co-curricular initiatives in such area as leadership, civic participation, and integrative learning.
- The Learning Collaborative will build upon current pilot efforts and expand programming to strengthen essential competencies for liberal arts education.
- The College will regularly evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, drawing upon new assessment expertise in the Sheridan Center.
- Through the curriculum reviews and other processes, the Dean of the College will ensure that departments are incorporating themes of diversity and inclusion into their curricula.
- Through the Learning Collaborative and initiatives such as the Presidential Scholars program and the New Scientist Collective, the College will work to strengthen STEM education, including promotion of greater diversity and retention in these concentrations.

**C. Graduate Degree Programs**

**Description**

Doctoral- and master's-level education is an essential part of Brown's mission to serve the community, the nation, and the world through discovery and the creation of new knowledge. Brown currently offers 51 PhD programs and 32 master's programs with total FTE enrollment of 1,546 PhD students and 943 master's students. Strengthening graduate programs and enhancing the graduate student experience are central to Brown's strategic vision for academic excellence. Our goal is to make Brown's standing as a graduate and research institution equal to its reputation for undergraduate education. The plan includes targeted increases of 120 PhD students and 95 master's students, either to bring prioritized programs to scale, or to build new programs in areas of strategic focus. Efforts to improve graduate student financial support, promote program innovation, strengthen the graduate community, and create distinctive opportunities for intellectual and professional development are ongoing. Brown upholds the rigorous standards and policies for graduate programs that have been established by the faculty through external and internal evaluation, data collection, and benchmarking – practices that are in the process of being strengthened.

---

2 This section omits MD education since the Warren Alpert Medical School is separately accredited by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education, which also oversees medical student financial aid.
Appraisal

Graduate School Reorganization

A 2014 internal study of the Graduate School’s organization and benchmarking against peer schools led to a significant restructuring following the appointment of a new dean in 2016. Staff reorganization resulted in new full-time associate dean positions (for Diversity Initiatives, Master’s Education, Student Development, and Student Support), a Deputy Title IX Coordinator, and reshaped administrative and financial roles. Capabilities for assessment of and support for both programs and students have improved. Meanwhile, changes in the University’s Office of Global Engagement, including the addition of an Associate Provost for Global Engagement with a focus on students, is improving resources and services for the significant body of international graduate students. In 2016, following a generous donation, the University Library reconfigured space to create the Vincent J. Wernig Graduate Student Reading Room.

Program Approval and Review

New graduate programs must be approved by the host department(s), the Graduate Council, the Academic Priorities Committee (APC), the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), and the Corporation (see Standard 4A). In parallel, the Provost’s office assesses the business plan and financial sustainability of each graduate program. Programs must address educational needs, reflect Brown’s mission and priorities, and provide appropriately rigorous curriculum and requirements. Faculty must have ownership of instruction, governance, and advising. Plans must also cover space, administration, and finances. Since 2012, all PhD and master’s programs have been required to develop handbooks, which are reviewed by the Graduate School, with information on program requirements and expectations, degree timelines and milestones for satisfactory academic progress, grievance procedures, and support resources.

External department reviews typically give considerable attention to PhD programs, and these observations and recommendations are taken up in subsequent Graduate Council reviews along with thorough examination of data on admissions, student demographics, academic performance measures, and student experience. The Graduate Council meets with program leaders to discuss the review findings and sends them a letter summarizing the recommendations. Following a stocktaking of its process for program evaluation, the Graduate Council is instituting a number of modifications in order to better support programs during their reviews and encourage ongoing continuous improvement afterward.

The E-Series forms summarize actions stemming from graduate program reviews. The review of Mathematics, for example, noted a shortage of advanced research topic courses for graduate students. In response, we are increasing the number of named assistant professors and adding a lecturer to allow modified teaching loads so that research-active senior faculty may focus on advanced seminars and sponsored research activity that will also involve graduate students. Computer Science will also increase faculty size and add an additional lecturer position to teach more service courses, while increased research activity from new faculty will help enlarge the PhD cohort. Other actions include increasing funding for Literary Arts MFA students, providing Economics PhD students with significantly improved space, and bringing greater structure to the transition from coursework to dissertation writing in Philosophy. Philosophy also created a summer “pipeline” program to help diversify the pool of applicants for doctoral study.

Historically, terminal and standalone master’s programs were not reviewed systematically. External department reviews focused on master’s programs when they were the only graduate
offering, for example Literary Arts (2010) and Education (2015). Master’s programs in Public Health were evaluated as part of the School’s recent CEPH accreditation process (2013-16). In 2015, Brown sought external evaluations for the IE-Brown Executive MBA when it was being converted to a full joint degree program, and a NEASC Substantive Change review followed in 2016. An overall assessment of the Brown/Trinity MFA in Acting and Directing program in 2016-17 included an external review component.

In spring 2017, Graduate Council determined metrics of excellence for master’s programs. In 2017-18, the Associate Dean of Master’s Education is carrying out an intensive review of 27 master's programs, the results of which will be reported to the APC, the Graduate Council, and the FEC. Going forward, master's programs will be part of the regular program review process. The Graduate Council will also be requesting an update on the outcomes of program reviews every three years. Review cycles were built into the approvals for executive master’s programs. The first of these, the Executive Master in Healthcare Leadership, was reviewed in fall 2017.

Graduate Program Structure and Content

For PhD students, the University guarantees five years of tuition coverage, an academic year stipend, and health and dental insurance. In some fields (particularly the humanities and some social sciences), the demands of field-based research and training (e.g., languages) often require a sixth year. Brown does not guarantee sixth-year funding, but over the last few years it has instituted a number of mechanisms to provide support for virtually all PhD students who have made good progress but need an additional semester or year beyond the five-year guarantee to finish their dissertations. (Enhanced provisions for parental relief and childcare needs, discussed below, may extend a student’s time and funding). Most students in the physical and life sciences receive summer support, mainly through faculty grants and research reserves. In the humanities and social sciences, however, funding lagged significantly behind peer institutions. Starting in 2017-18, a reorganization of the Graduate School’s finances has allowed all PhD students in these fields to receive year-round stipends, placing those programs on a more competitive footing while also roughly equalizing doctoral funding across all divisions.

External and Graduate Council reviews are helpful as programs calibrate their requirements so that students can finish in an appropriate amount of time. With variations across departments and divisions, each PhD program has clear milestones, including an evaluation or qualifying review in the second year, and written or oral qualifying exams, usually in the third year, to progress to candidacy. Departments typically require approval of a dissertation prospectus and submission and defense of a dissertation that makes a substantial original contribution to the field. The normal residency requirement is three academic years of full-time study beyond the bachelor's degree. Graduate work (e.g., a master's degree) done elsewhere may count toward as much as one year of the residency requirement, subject to approval by the program’s Director of Graduate Studies. PhD and master’s students must obtain a B or higher to pass a course.

Engineering is the largest PhD program, with 115 students; Computational Biology with a Computer Science focus is the smallest with two students (as of Fall 2017). Overall, Brown’s PhD programs tend to be smaller than those at peer institutions. The size of programs in the physical and life sciences depends not only upon faculty research awards and training grants, but also on the availability of suitable infrastructure for research. New and renovated space for Engineering, physical sciences, and biomedical sciences is in process or being planned. Some targeted growth of doctoral programs in the social sciences has already taken place in conjunction with Brown’s strategic plan. The humanities are characterized by small programs in
small departments. Some new initiatives through the Cogut Institute for the Humanities are helping to create more of a collective identity among humanities graduate students.

Since its last self-study, Brown has added six new master’s programs (not including Executive Master’s programs), and total master’s enrollments have more than doubled from 377 in Fall 2007 to 790 in Fall 2017. Master’s programs vary in purpose and structure. ScM degrees require completion of an independent research paper of publishable quality or otherwise demonstrating an appropriate level of knowledge and skills. Each year, around 100 master’s students file theses, and many more complete required capstone projects. Programs oriented toward professions (e.g. Computer Science, Biotechnology) assess the body of students’ coursework to demonstrate that they have acquired the necessary skills and knowledge. Other programs also include an experiential component such as an internship (MPA, AM in Public Humanities) or student teaching (MAT). MFA students must complete a written creative thesis (Literary Arts and Playwriting), a directed show (Directing), or performance in theses and professional showcases (Acting) evaluated by MFA faculty. Executive Master’s students complete a Critical Challenge Project (CCP) around a significant organizational issue drawing upon their own work experience that demonstrates the application of knowledge and skills acquired through the program.

Relationship to Undergraduate Education

Brown continues to define itself as a “university college” (see Standard 1) in which undergraduate education remains of central importance within a sophisticated culture of research and advanced study. The education of graduate students and undergraduates is an interdependent system. Strong graduate programs attract faculty at the forefront of their fields, and Brown undergraduates want to learn from such scholars. When undergraduates admitted to Brown choose to matriculate at another institution, only around 5 percent choose to attend a four-year college; the rest all go to other research universities. As elsewhere, undergraduates are increasingly availing themselves of fifth-year master’s programs, and more Brown programs are creating this option. Meanwhile, the student-centered approach, opportunities to form close relationships with faculty, and a sense of campus community that are hallmarks of Brown’s reputation for excellence in undergraduate education also help attract students to our graduate programs. Graduate students also benefit from serving as teaching assistants in undergraduate classes, as primary instructors in the laboratory for undergraduate researchers, in academic support settings like the Writing Center, and in a host of other formal and informal connections.

In graduate classes, faculty offer much more advanced and precise framings and questions than in undergraduate teaching, and they structure the content and pedagogy for the requirements of professional disciplinary training. Most faculty who teach graduate courses incorporate their own research into their graduate classes, inviting students to engage with the field’s scholarship, sources, and debates through research projects, literature reviews, book reviews, and/or other kinds of research-based and field-engaged projects.

Undergraduates and graduate students may sit alongside one another in certain classes. Courses with the 1000-level designation can carry both graduate and undergraduate credit. It is expected that instructors will require different kinds of work from advanced undergraduates and lower-level graduate students. In climate surveys, graduate students in some divisions report that it would strengthen their community and educational experience to create graduate-only versions of some courses. The Graduate School and the Registrar’s office recently brought more structure to the approval process for graduate students enrolling in courses below the
1000-level. Instructors are now required to submit an amended syllabus for such students to ensure the appropriate level of work and assignments for graduate students.

**Advising and Career Preparation**

Academic resources for graduate students include their program’s Director of Graduate Studies, their faculty mentor(s), and, for PhD students, their advisory committees. Additional support from the Graduate School includes the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean of Master’s Education, both of whom work closely with the associate deans of Student Support, Diversity Initiatives, and Student Development to help students, faculty, and staff in the interpretation and application of policies; to provide guidance on processes and procedures; to assist in problem resolution; and to convey information about opportunities and resources that may be available to support everyone involved. The Dean of the Graduate School meets frequently with students individually and in groups. Students in the Division of Biology and Medicine are supported by the Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

A critical dimension of excellence in graduate education is preparing students for success in their chosen field, whether academic, professional, or both. The Office of Institutional Research gathers data on outcomes for current PhD and master’s students across the University, as well as for alumni at specific intervals after graduation (one, five, and 10 years out). In 2016, Brown also conducted a climate survey of graduate students. These data help evaluate and inform our efforts to prepare graduate students for their careers.

Higher education and research (e.g., biotech, computing/information technology, and pharmaceuticals) constitute the largest career destinations for PhD students. In most divisions, the majority of PhD graduates in higher education held positions in the professorial ranks. Postdoctoral fellowships play a much greater role in early academic careers in the life sciences.

**Percentage of PhD Alumni Working in Higher Education or Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years After Graduation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life &amp; Medical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life &amp; Medical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PhD Graduates with Rank of Professor, Associate or Assistant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years After Graduation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, 30 percent of master’s graduates are in K-12 or higher education (including pursuit of other advanced degrees). In the humanities the major employment sectors are (in order) higher education, arts and culture, and K-12 education, which account for 73 percent of the total. In the physical sciences, 38 percent of alumni are in computing/information technology positions, due in part to the fact that Computer Science has the division’s largest master’s program. The greatest number of master’s alumni in the life sciences went into health and human services, scientific research, and pharmaceutical jobs (19, 16, and 15 percent, respectively). The master’s programs in Education are among Brown’s largest, leading to K-12 education being the largest employment sector for master’s alumni in the social sciences (43 percent).

Across all divisions, a strong majority of PhD and master’s alumni reported being well prepared by their programs for their current jobs.

Professional Development

The Graduate School and individual programs offer students many opportunities for academic and professional development, including funding for research travel and participation in professional conferences, training on ethical research practices and compliance with federal requirements, and workshops to build communication and presentation skills. Individual PhD programs offer professionalization seminars geared toward the particular requirements of success in their field. A number of programs help prepare for non-academic professional practice, especially in the arts (both PhD and MFA programs), the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree, and master’s programs in Computer Science and Engineering. Students in the Executive Master’s programs offered through the School of Professional Studies are already working professionals but often find their enhanced knowledge and skills lead to a more advanced professional position during or shortly after completing their program.

Because our faculty are expected to be excellent teachers as well as outstanding researchers (see Standard 6), Brown is well placed to train PhD students for their future classroom roles. PhD students work under faculty supervision as Teaching or Research Assistants, with somewhat different arrangements depending upon their division. Graduate students who are English language learners are evaluated and if needed given additional proficiency training before they are permitted to instruct Brown undergraduates. Advanced PhD students may also teach courses independently (an expectation built into some programs) subject to meeting
certain criteria and obtaining approval from the College Curriculum Council. Assessment and feedback comes through student evaluations and in-class observation. MFA students in Literary Arts and Playwriting are also given mentored opportunities to teach undergraduates as part of their training, and it is also possible for those in Acting and Directing to teach or work with undergraduates in other ways.

In the last few years, the Graduate School has either created or expanded several special programs in which students can acquire significant teaching experience. The Deans’ Faculty Fellows program allows as many as 10 students who will complete requirements for the PhD by January 15 of their sixth year to be appointed as Visiting Assistant Professors in the following term during which they teach or co-teach a course in their areas of expertise developed in consultation with a faculty mentor. The Brown-Wheaton Faculty Fellows program provides four fifth- or sixth-year students with a mentored opportunity to teach a one-semester course at Wheaton College (Mass.), gaining the experience of faculty life at an outstanding liberal arts college. The Brown-Tougaloo Faculty Fellows program provides selected advanced graduate students with a semester-long mentored opportunity at Tougaloo College, teaching up to two courses. Brown has also joined with other regional institutions to offer a free annual Teaching at Teaching-Intensive Institutions workshop designed to introduce graduate students to faculty careers at colleges and universities that primarily emphasize instruction.

The Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning is a major resource for graduate students seeking to enhance their teaching skills and acquire qualifications to help them in future job searches. In 2016-17, about 100 PhD students completed the Center’s “Reflective Teaching” certificate, with 94 percent of participants rating the certificate somewhat or extremely valuable and reporting significantly increased confidence in their ability to create an inclusive and respectful learning environment as well as their capacity to implement strategies that actively engage students. Sheridan offers other certificates focusing on course design, professional development, and teaching consultation.

Some special opportunities complement and extend the knowledge and skills students gain from their disciplinary degrees. The Open Graduate Education program, funded by the Mellon Foundation, enables PhD students to apply to a master’s program in a complementary field that advances their intellectual and professional goals. Internal fellowships at Brown’s centers, institutes, and collections provide opportunities for advanced doctoral students in the humanities and social sciences to develop their dissertations as part of a community scholars from a range of fields. Doctoral Certificates offer interdisciplinary or specialized qualifications to complement disciplinary doctoral degree programs through completing a focused set of three to five courses as well as a capstone or other required learning component.³

PhD programs have become increasingly attentive to the need to prepare students for a broader range of careers. The need for such preparation is perhaps felt most strongly in the humanities (31 percent of doctoral students in those fields reported receiving advice on careers outside academia), but is present in all divisions. The Graduate School and CareerLAB have invested greater effort in helping students learn about careers outside traditional faculty and research positions. The Brown Executive Scholars Training program allows selected students to explore careers in higher education administration through a seminar series with senior University leaders and mentoring from other officers. The Graduate Career Options Conference brings Graduate School alumni back to campus to discuss career paths beyond academia.

³ Although these programs are called certificates, no separate document is produced by the Registrar; rather the field of advanced specialization is recognized on students’ transcripts.
Graduate Community

In 2015, the Provost charged a planning group composed of graduate students, faculty, and representatives from key student service and administrative offices with reviewing the graduate student experience and developing recommendations for improving support for learning, teaching, and professional development, and for creating a more welcoming community. Following open forums and focus groups with students, review of survey data, and assessment of certain service areas, recommendations were implemented that have improved communication about resources for graduate students, increased inclusivity of Graduate School programs, provided more support to graduate student groups, and instituted a more generous parental relief policy that provides a full semester (or summer) of stipend support and the option to “stop the clock” on program and funding deadlines.

The report also led to the creation of a Graduate Community Fellows program, piloted in 2016-17. Fellows work in pairs to develop special events or resources for the graduate student community that celebrate diversity, promote belonging and inclusion, and connect individuals across disciplines. The Fellows Program invites projects on several themes: Race and Social Justice, International Community, Wellness and Health, Family-Friendly, and Master’s Student Community. In addition to project funding, the student organizers receive modest individual awards. Additional recommendations to expand study and meeting space exclusively for graduate students are under consideration as part of the University’s space planning.

Building in part on this work, Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion called for further graduate community-building efforts. The Graduate School launched a series of initiatives to strengthen the graduate experience while also empowering students to effect change. For example, the Brown Graduate Resources for Improving Professional Structures (B-GRIPS) piloted in 2016-17, is a peer resource group that provides training in conflict resolution/management and problem-solving techniques. For underrepresented minority students in particular, the Graduate School sponsors multicultural graduate student events several times each year, including dinners with invited guest speakers, academic achievement and cultural celebrations, and social-networking activities.

The Associate Dean of Student Support, a position established in 2016, provides graduate students with advice on personal and academic challenges and serves as liaison to Campus Life and Student Services (see Standard 5B). Graduate students are also served by Brown’s new First-Generation College and Low-Income Student Center, and the Graduate School has committed to providing $18,000 in Yellow Ribbon benefits for up to 10 student veterans on a first-come, first-served basis. (In addition, Brown offers Yellow Ribbon support for up to 50 undergraduate, three graduate biology, one medical, and nine Executive Master’s students.) The Graduate School is also working closely with the Office of Student Veterans and Commissioning Programs to identify veteran applicants and support them after they matriculate.

Student and Employee Accessibility Services (SEAS) has extended evening and weekend hours to make services more accessible for graduate students. Counseling and Psychological Services has also begun to offer Saturday hours exclusively for graduate students. Partnerships among graduate students, the Graduate Student Council and other student organizations, and offices such as the Graduate School, the Brown Center for Students of Color, the LGBTQ Center, the Sarah Doyle Women’s Center, the Chaplain’s Office, and Counseling and Psychological Services provide graduate students with resources and support around racial,
gendered, and sexual violence. Programs list these resources in their handbooks, and all of these organizations maintain websites and social media presences.

Brown is working to improve services for international students. There are currently two full-time positions on campus dedicated to English Language Learning (ELL), both housed in the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning. The Provost has funded a two-year position dedicated exclusively to graduate ELL writing support and invited a proposal for a comprehensive ELL plan that would include permanent, expanded support for graduate students, as well as intensive English language training for new and continuing graduate students. The Office of Global Engagement is working closely with the Graduate School and the Graduate Student Council to calibrate and expand services for international students, who will also benefit from the planned physical consolidation of international support services.

Students in blended format Executive Master's programs find their community both in intensive residential experiences and in the online learning platform designed for collaborative cohort learning experiences. These mid-career learners tend to have well-established support systems in their personal and professional lives and do not need to draw upon resources as heavily as the residential student community. Nevertheless, University services are made available as needed, including guidance on “brushing up” skills (e.g., math and statistics), writing instruction, library and research facilities, and meeting disciplinary or emotional challenges.

Projections

- The Graduate School will enhance its tools for evaluating PhD programs to help guide allocation of resources and support targeted program growth.
- The Associate Dean of Master's Education will initiate a regular review process for master’s programs involving the Graduate Council, the Academic Priorities Committee, and the Faculty Executive Committee.
- Where appropriate, the Graduate School will work with programs on strengthening the assessment of international students’ preparation for graduate study at Brown.
- Improved research on employer needs and student aspirations as well as enhanced use of electronic media and other outreach efforts to potential students will help to strengthen applicant pools, especially for master’s programs.

D. Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit

Description

Brown rigorously and scrupulously oversees the academic credit it awards in all its programs, guided by clear rules and policies established by the faculty. Brown has direct control over courses and programs leading to its degrees, and institutional processes and procedures serve to monitor the content of dual and joint degree programs and transfer credits. Policies regarding transfer and other kinds of non-institutional credit are clear and easily accessed. The University is in compliance with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education’s minimum degree requirements, including the federal credit hour.
Appraisal

Degree Programs

Brown awards three undergraduate degrees: Bachelor of Arts (AB) and Bachelor of Science (ScB), which are expected to be completed in four years of full-time study, as well as a five-year combined AB-ScB. Degree requirements are specified in detail in the University Bulletin and on the College’s website. The AB and ScB degrees require a minimum of 30 full course credits (120 semester credits), although around 75 percent of students graduate with 31 or more courses, and roughly half complete 32 or more courses. The combined AB-ScB degree requires 38 course credits (152 semester credits). Around 20 percent of Brown students complete more than one concentration within the standard four years. They receive one degree (either the AB or the ScB), but both concentrations are noted on official transcripts.

The Brown-RISD Dual Degree Program allows students to earn both a Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) from the Rhode Island School of Design and the AB or the ScB at Brown, normally within five years. As published in the program’s handbook and online, students must complete at least 156 credit hours including at least 60 credit hours (15 course credits) at Brown during fall or spring terms (summer courses, study abroad, and shared credits from RISD do not count toward this requirement). Students must also satisfy RISD’s major and distribution requirements; in many cases, courses taken at Brown may be counted toward the latter.

At the master’s level, Brown offers the Master of Arts (AM), Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), Master of Science (ScM), Master of Public Affairs (MPA), Master of Public Health (MPH), Master of Fine Arts (MFA), and Executive Master’s programs. Program requirements are published on the Graduate School website and in the University Bulletin. A concurrent Baccalaureate-Master’s degree option allows students to complete an AB, ScB, or AB-ScB and an AM or ScM simultaneously over the course of eight or nine semesters (if earning an AB or ScB), or 10 or 11 semesters (if earning an AB-ScB). Students must meet all the requirements for both degrees, but are permitted to count a maximum of two courses toward both. Students pursuing either a concurrent AB or ScB along with an AM or ScM need a minimum of 36 full course credits (144 semester credits), and students pursuing the AB-ScB option and a master’s degree need a minimum of 44 full course credits (176 semester credits). In May 2017, the faculty increased the minimum number of course credits for the concurrent degree from 34 to 36. Between 2010-11 and 2016-17, concurrent degree students averaged 37.3 credits.

Brown undergraduates can also pursue a fifth-year master’s degree, to which they may be admitted at any time before they complete the bachelor’s degree. They must complete their undergraduate degree in four years and meet the minimum 30 course credits in order to proceed. Two course credits may be applied toward their master’s requirements, which are approved as part of the application process and vetted by the graduate program and the Graduate Council. The remaining graduate courses are completed in the fifth year. Although students earn the course credits required for both degrees, the modified course load during the fifth year reduces the cost of the master’s degree by two tuition credits. Students tend to take more than the minimum number of 36 courses. From 2009-10 to 2016-17, fifth-year master’s students averaged 38.8 course credits, with more than 70 percent completing 38 or more courses.
Course Offerings

The number and frequency of courses offered are sufficient for students to complete their degrees within the expected length of time. Courses@Brown, a search engine and registration tool introduced in 2016, has significantly improved the accessibility and completeness of course information available to students and advisors. Undergraduate concentration requirements are available on the Focal Point website (see Standard 4B) and published annually in the University Bulletin. The Bulletin now also publishes details about each master’s program. Requirements for all graduate programs are publicly available on the Graduate School’s website as well as each program’s website and handbook. Academic year classes are delivered by faculty who are expected to be present on campus during the semester. Faculty are also expected to hold regular office hours, which should be noted on course syllabi. Online courses carry the same expectations of faculty availability as in-person classes, although it may occur in virtual form.

Brown offers more than 2,500 undergraduate courses for around 80 concentrations. Our 96 percent six-year graduation rate indicates students have access to the required and elective courses they need to graduate in a timely way. With oversight from the College Curriculum Council (CCC), each academic unit is responsible for ensuring that its course offerings enable students to complete the concentration on schedule. The majority of concentration requirements are offered at least annually, and some large-enrollment courses are offered every semester. Courses that have not been offered for five years automatically become inactive and must be approved by the CCC before they can be offered again. Directors of Undergraduate Studies can approve course substitutions on a case-by-case basis to minimize disruptions to a student’s course plan resulting from course unavailability. Brown’s current policy of allowing undergraduates to drop courses until the last day of the semester is under review.

Graduate course offerings are also sufficient to enable on-time completion, although course requirements and timeline expectations vary across programs. Between 2007-08 and 2016-17, the average time for completion of AM and ScM degrees was approximately 1.6 years. For PhD students, the average time to complete all requirements but the dissertation was just shy of three years. External and Graduate Council reviews look at PhD program requirements, and a systematic process for review of master’s programs is being developed (see Standard 4C). Executive Master’s programs proceed in a lock-step sequence, offering their courses once per cohort. Only students who choose to delay program completion are prevented from graduating within the published program length. Proposals for new graduate programs must include specific course requirements, identify the faculty who will be available to provide instruction, and attest to the viability of completing the program within its standard timeframe.

Registration for all degree candidates is performed centrally and overseen by the Office of the University Registrar. The majority of registration activity is done via a secure online process that requires student authentication. All students who are expected to be enrolled for a given semester are required to register for an appropriate course load based on their program of study and within a specified timeframe. Those who are not registered for coursework are thereby separated from active degree-seeking status from the institution.

Course Content and Approval

Departments control the content, design, and delivery of all undergraduate and graduate programs in keeping with standards in the relevant fields and with Brown’s institutional standards as overseen by the CCC, chaired by the Dean of the College, and the Graduate Council, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School. Each council includes elected faculty and
student representatives plus members of the dean’s senior staff. Programs are regularly evaluated as part of external department reviews overseen by the APC, and the CCC and Graduate Council review undergraduate and graduate curricula, respectively (see Standards 4A, 4B, and 4C). These bodies, the full faculty, and ultimately the Corporation are responsible for review and approval of new concentrations and graduate programs.

The content of individual courses that make up academic programs is determined by the faculty member(s) responsible for the course. As described in Standard 6, University senior administration (offices of the Dean of the Faculty, Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, and Dean of the School of Public Health) oversee all aspects of the faculty search and evaluation process to ensure that the faculty are qualified to meet programs’ instructional needs and maintain professional standards. New courses are approved at the department level, by the relevant school or division, and the Registrar. Course proposal guidelines and related resources are available on the Registrar’s website. The Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning website offers resources for designing new course syllabi.

Once approved, a short outline of the course is published in the University Bulletin, and a more detailed syllabus should be posted on Courses@Brown at least one week before the start of the semester. Faculty teaching the course in subsequent years may make minor changes to the content of courses provided that they remain consistent with the published course outline. Major changes must be re-submitted for approval. Departments ensure that faculty follow these guidelines through annual reviews of professional accomplishments, as well as through the tenure and promotion process.

**Award of Credit**

At Brown, students receive course credit for work completed as part of a lecture, seminar, lab, or studio class; for supervised independent studies; and for courses transferred from accredited U.S. institutions or their equivalents abroad (see below). Credit for coursework completed at Brown is awarded at the discretion of the instructor responsible for the design and delivery of the class. Brown’s grading system is described on the Registrar’s website and elsewhere.

One Brown course credit is equivalent to four semester credits (there are also a few half-credit courses). Consistent with Federal and Commission policies, work for a Brown course credit (“seat time,” required activities, and out-of-class work) is expected to total at least 180 hours for the semester. Many courses exceed this minimum requirement. Since Fall 2016, faculty are expected to include on their syllabi reasonable expectations for the number of hours that students will spend on fulfilling course requirements as well as a statement of learning goals for the class. This new requirement and associated guidelines were announced by the Provost to department chairs and to all faculty. Subsequently, the College and the Graduate School, assisted by the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning, provided multiple information sessions and training opportunities to assist faculty with designing or redesigning syllabi.

Departments are urged to review their course offerings to ensure that they are adhering to the credit hour standard, and proposals for new courses must include time expectations in order to be approved by CCC and the Graduate Council. Faculty are also asked to make syllabi available online to help students make informed choices in the open curriculum environment. Although some faculty and students have been critical, others have seen the requirement as useful. As one student wrote, “Both professors and students will get more out of a class when both sides are made more fully aware of the effort required to thrive in a course.”
Brown awards credit for several types of faculty-supervised independent study, the approval criteria, work expectations, and assessment procedures for which are described in detail in the Bulletin and on the College’s website. Brown does not typically award credit for experiential or non-collegiate sponsored learning, but Academic Internships allow students to combine independent study with outside work experience for course credit. Rigorous academic work must complement the internship and the project is advised and evaluated by faculty. The Brown in Washington, DC program, a new collaboration between the Swearer Center for Public Service and the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, enables juniors and seniors to spend a semester in the capital interning with a public or nonprofit sector agency and completing complementary Brown coursework. The internship serves as a practicum with specific learning goals, assignments, and assessment appropriate for a four-credit course. “Professional tracks” in Computer Science and Economics, and soon (pending ABET approval) in Engineering, involve a pair of two-to-four month full-time professional or internship experiences (typically in industry) related to the student’s concentration. Students do not receive academic credit for this experience, but they must write a reflective essay that is reviewed by the concentration advisor.

Brown only awards credit for pre-college work in the case of international examinations such as British A Levels or the International Baccalaureate. Some departments require students to submit course descriptions, syllabi, and/or samples of work (such as papers or exams) completed in international diploma/certificate courses before determining whether or not to grant equivalent course credit. The transcribed course credits count toward Brown’s 30-course (minimum) graduation requirement. Students who wish to use international exam scores to obtain credit for more than two Brown equivalent courses are required to accept advanced standing and finish their Brown degree in fewer than eight semesters. Advanced Placement (AP) exams are not eligible for course credit, but depending upon departmental policies students may use certain AP scores to enroll in higher-level courses and satisfy concentration requirements. Some departments allow automatic transcript notation of AP credit(s) on the sole basis of qualifying AP test scores, while others allow AP credit(s) retroactively upon successful completion of an advanced course. Still other departments grant no AP credits whatsoever.

**Transfer of Credit**

Undergraduates must complete at least 50 percent of their minimum required credits (60 semester hours) while in residence at the University. Brown does not have articulation agreements or make use of extra-institutional services for prior learning assessment or credit recommendation. Through a cross-registration agreement, Brown students may take up to four RISD courses and may petition the Committee on Academic Standing for permission to take additional courses. RISD courses are recorded on Brown transcripts (and vice versa) and not treated as transfer courses when taken during the fall, spring, or winter sessions.

Brown awards transfer credit for certain international examinations (see above), for undergraduate courses taken at accredited four-year and two-year institutions, and for courses taken in study abroad programs. The maximum number of transfer courses that may be used toward graduation requirements is 15. No more than four of these may be summer courses and no more than eight courses may be transferred in any one year. Generally, only courses in disciplines taught at Brown are eligible for transfer credit, with the exception of foreign languages not regularly offered at Brown. Transferability of courses is determined by the student’s program or department, based on comparability and relevance of coursework. Transfer credit policies are described in detail on the College’s website and on the Transfer
Prior to matriculation, undergraduate transfer credits are reviewed by the Office of College Admission and the Office of the Dean of the College. For enrolled students, credit for a course taken at another regionally accredited college or university requires submission of the syllabus and course materials for review and approval by the relevant academic department. A transfer course can only be approved as Brown-equivalent by the Brown instructor teaching the corresponding course or the faculty member serving as the department's transfer credit liaison. To count toward concentration requirements, the student's concentration advisor must also review the content of the transfer course. Students must have an official transcript mailed to the Registrar.

As detailed on the Office of International Programs (OIP) website, Brown students can transfer credit for courses completed through several semester- and year-long study abroad programs run by Brown in 12 countries and summer programs in four countries; five programs offered through the Consortium for Advanced Studies Abroad (CASA), of which Brown is a member; and from OIP-approved programs offered by outside organizations. Students must petition to study on any other program. Credits for Brown-run or CASA programs transfer automatically on completion of the approval process. To receive credit for non-Brown programs, students must arrange for a transcript to be sent to the Registrar. On a non-credit basis, Brown is also launching a new international internship program that provides signature research or work experiences for students to gain professional competencies in a global setting. These internships will be designed under faculty supervision and will be available as an alternative to students who are often unable to participate in traditional study abroad programs. The program will require at least intermediate-level language proficiency.

At the graduate level, Brown awards transfer credit for graduate-level courses taken at an accredited institution. Procedures and policies pertaining to graduate transfer credit are described on the webpages of the Registrar and the Graduate School and on the Transfer Credit Form. A maximum of one course may be transferred to master's degrees requiring eight courses, while students in programs requiring 14 course credits may transfer up to two courses. Executive Master's programs do not accept transfer credit of any kind. A maximum of eight courses may be transferred to the PhD. The department’s Director of Graduate Studies must approve transfer of course credit, and students must have an official transcript mailed to the Registrar. Graduate students are also able to receive credit for research done away from Brown. When there is no transcript to show that the student was effectively engaged in full-time study or research, students are required to submit proof of holding a fellowship (e.g., Fulbright) and/or letters from research institutions where they have worked. In the absence of a transcript, a Dean's signature is required for the Registrar to accept transfer of credits.

Brown participates in Exchange Scholar programs that enable advanced graduate students to study for one or two semesters at other leading universities. Those courses are recorded on Brown’s academic record and official transcript. For a set of PhD students in Neuroscience, coursework at Brown for their first year is followed by training at the National Institutes of Health while continuing to be advised by Brown faculty committees. The Division of Biology and Medicine also offers a master’s program in Biology at Pfizer in Groton, Conn., accredited by the Connecticut Department of Education. In the past, Brown has not assessed these partnerships on a regular basis. The Graduate Council, working as appropriate with BioMed, has been charged with developing suitable review processes.
Brown undergraduates are expected to complete all degree requirements in eight semesters of full-time study, and must pass a specified number of courses each semester with a grade of C or better in order to maintain good academic standing. Brown’s policies pertaining to Academic Standing of undergraduate students, based on guidelines in Faculty Rules and Regulations, are published on the Dean of the College’s website. Detailed procedures are documented in the Handbook of the Committee on Academic Standing (CAS), a standing faculty committee staffed by the Office of the Dean of the College (see also Standard 8). Following CAS review each term, students who are falling short of academic progress requirements are placed on warning, serious warning, or suspension. Students who pass no courses in a given semester or fewer than five courses in two sequential semesters are eligible for suspension (a mandatory one-year separation). Exceptions to these rules are made when documented disabilities, health, or family issues significantly interfere with students’ ability to focus on their studies.

Students on warning or serious warning may improve their academic standing by taking courses in Brown’s Summer Session. Since 2016, transfer credit earned from approved courses successfully completed elsewhere (with a grade of C or better) can also be counted toward academic standing. Undergraduate students may apply for leaves of absence (personal, employment, or military service) or for medical leaves. Students on personal leaves may return to studies with notification and review by the published deadlines. Students on medical leaves are approved for return through the Medical Leave Committee.

For graduate students, expectations for academic progress are determined by the program and published in graduate program handbooks, available online and in hard copy. All programs are expected to update each student’s standing annually in the Graduate School Information System (GSIM) according to the following categories: good; satisfactory; warning; or termination. The Graduate School is explicitly including updates of graduate students’ status in GSIM as part of the annual graduate program progress evaluations, which determine the allocation of PhD admission slots for the following year.

Students on academic warning are notified by the Director of Graduate Studies and/or the department chair or program director no later than the end of the current term’s exam period. Students receive letters explaining concerns, how they can be remedied, and deadlines to meet concrete benchmarks. They must return to good or satisfactory status within one semester (or one program term for Executive Master’s students) and receive ongoing mentoring. Students who do not meet the conditions of the letter are terminated. The Graduate School works closely with faculty to navigate cases of academic peril. Policies are publicly available on the Graduate School website, in the Graduate Handbook, and in all graduate program handbooks.

Leave options available to graduate students include: Family Leave; Medical or Psychological Leave; Professional Development Leave for an approved opportunity to advance the student’s academic or career goals; Probationary Leave for problems with academic performance; and Personal Leave. (Parental Relief following the birth or adoption of a child is not a leave, but suspends students’ academic responsibilities for a defined period.) Leave procedures are published in the Graduate Handbook. For Executive Master’s programs, short and long-term leave of absence policies, as well as withdrawal guidelines, are posted on the Student Resource site within the Program and University Policies for Students handbook.

Graduation requirements for bachelor’s degrees are published in electronic form in the Bulletin. The Graduate School website lists general graduation requirements for all master’s and PhD
degrees. Individual programs may have additional requirements, which are published in electronic form on their websites. Beginning in 2017-18, all master's degree requirements will be listed in the Bulletin alongside those of undergraduate and doctoral programs. Graduation requirements for Executive Master's programs are published on program websites and in the Student Resource pages within the Program and University Policies for Students handbook. Requirements are discussed during orientation and students are asked to review and acknowledge receipt of degree requirements.

The bulk of the degree certification process rests with the Registrar, in coordination with the College (for undergraduates) and the Graduate School (for graduate students). The Registrar’s office closely examines each degree candidate’s internal records to ensure that they have met the minimum cumulative course credit requirements for the degree, fulfilled the residency requirement (number of credits in residence versus transfer as well as semesters of full time enrollment), and (for undergraduates) satisfied the two-part Writing Requirement. Successful completion of the undergraduate concentration is individually certified by the student’s concentration advisor, with course substitutions duly noted. The Advising Sidekick (ASK) site helps advisors compare students’ internal records with concentration requirements, highlighting any deficiencies. Official certification is communicated to the Registrar’s office. At the master’s level, successful completion of the program is certified by the program’s Director of Graduate Study and communicated to the Registrar’s office. Master’s theses, if required, are vetted by the Graduate School and the result communicated to the Registrar’s office.

**Academic Code**

As detailed in the Academic Code for undergraduates and the Graduate Academic Code Handbook for graduate students, Brown expects students to maintain academic integrity in all circumstances. Academic discipline is overseen by the faculty’s Standing Committee on the Academic Code, the members of which adjudicate individual cases. The Deputy Dean of the College is the lead Academic Code Administrator for undergraduate cases, assisted by two other College deans, and the Graduate School’s Associate Dean of Academic Affairs plays the same role for graduate student cases. Allegations against undergraduates and graduate students are handled through a similar process of panels convened to hear specific charges following an initial screening by the relevant code administrator. To be considered, allegations must be made in writing and accompanied by supporting evidence. Students are promptly notified of charges against them and may appeal decisions. The Graduate School is reviewing the academic code hearing process and updating the Graduate Academic Code Handbook.

Before they can matriculate, undergraduates must successfully complete mandatory online training covering key elements of the Academic Code and definitions of plagiarism and other violations. During orientation, international students and other groups also participate in special sessions on academic integrity, and first-year advisors are strongly encouraged to discuss these topics in their first meetings with students. Many faculty opt to have students upload written assignments through Turnititin. A number of departments, especially Computer Science, use the Measurement of Software Similarity (MOSS) tool to analyze student assignments. Brown’s learning management system, Canvas, integrates with Brown’s two-step verification system to ensure that only authenticated users have access to submit assignments via course sites.

In light of national reports about standards of academic integrity as well as an uptick in the frequency of cases at Brown, the Dean of the College has convened an Academic Integrity Committee of faculty, students, and administrators to develop new approaches to academic misconduct by students. Working with student government, the Dean of the College will also
plan student-centered activities, such as an academic integrity week, in order to foster campus discussion and engagement with this issue. Given the unique set of issues around collaboration boundaries in coding assignments, several Computer Science faculty members have been appointed to the Committee on the Academic Code and will hear many of the cases arising in the department’s courses. It is hoped this approach will lead to adjudicating the high volume of cases more speedily and to creating an effective feedback mechanism for the department and individual faculty to adjust practices in project assignments. Computer Science will also be considering other approaches, such as providing students with quicker access to their MOSS scores in order to deter excessive code sharing or unpermitted collaboration.

The Graduate School also requires that all new graduate students complete an online tutorial before arriving on campus, and the Academic Code is reinforced during orientation. Representatives from the Graduate School provide additional departmental training on request or if circumstances warrant. Specialized training for international graduate students is under development. In the Division of Biology and Medicine, students must complete Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training during their first semester and RCR refresher training in their fourth year. RCR training is also open to undergraduate students, master’s students, postdoctoral researchers, junior faculty, and staff from across the University.

**Summer, Winter, and Online Courses**

Brown has been expanding its credit-bearing course offerings and programs beyond the traditional academic calendar and beyond the physical campus. The seven-week Summer Session offers both on-campus and online courses. The new Wintersession piloted in December 2016-January 2017 (and to be evaluated after three years) offers intensive on-campus, destination, and online courses. Wintersession course proposals are reviewed by a subcommittee of the College Curriculum Council, while Summer Session courses are reviewed by a curriculum committee in the School of Professional Studies. Courses are required to meet the same standards as those offered during the regular academic year.

Brown began offering for-credit online courses following the 2012 report of a committee chaired by the Dean of the College. In 2016-17, Brown offered nine online summer courses, an online Wintersession course, and one online course each in the fall and spring semesters. To date, online courses have had a maximum enrollment of 20 students, with some capped at 17. In June 2017, the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements approved Brown as an institutional participant in the SARA initiative. Online courses have the same expectations for student work and assessment as on-campus courses and are approved through the same processes of review. Online instruction is directly supervised by members of the teaching staff (or sometimes, in the Summer Session, advanced graduate students), with access to the same resources that support on-campus instruction. Students studying online in both summer and Wintersession courses must participate daily in order to complete coursework and engage in virtual discussions. Executive Master’s programs combine online coursework with intensive residential sessions. The readings, videos, and assignments of online modules are designed to elicit thoughtful, substantive student contributions. The asynchronous course design, which meets federal credit hour standards, allows working mid-career professional learners to complete individual and team assignments from many time zones.

Brown’s courses and academic resources are protected by Shibboleth authentication. Brown participates in the inCommon federated identity management service and employs two-factor authentication. In addition, Brown’s online courses are designed to promote academic honesty by engaging students in interactive, authentic assignments that foster thoughtful, substantive
contributions. Faculty have frequent interaction with online students through personalized feedback, guided group discussions, individual conferences, and other communications.

**Projections**

- The work of the Academic Integrity Committee convened by the Dean of the College will result in a new plan for mitigating academic misconduct by undergraduates.
- The College Curriculum Council and Faculty Executive Committee will consider two measures to further promote academic rigor in the context of Brown’s open curriculum: (1) revising the course withdrawal deadline from the last day of classes to mid-semester; and (2) requiring permission for any student to enroll in fewer than four courses (a policy that currently applies to varsity athletes and international students).
- The Graduate Council will develop a review process for Exchange Scholar programs.
- The Graduate Council will review, and as needed revise, the graduate Academic Code process.
Standard Five: Students

A. Admissions

Description

Brown enrolls students from the pre-college to the mid-career professional level. At its core, however, are the undergraduate, master’s, medical, and doctoral programs. This section will focus mainly on undergraduate and graduate admissions, with some notes about other groups. Admission standards and processes as well as financial aid policies for the Warren Alpert Medical School are addressed through LCME accreditation reviews on an eight-year cycle (most recently in 2013), so are not taken up here.

Appraisal

Undergraduate Admission

During the 2000s, Brown experienced rapid growth in its undergraduate applicant pool. In 2017, a total of 32,723 students applied to Brown’s Class of 2021, 59 percent more than the 20,633 applicants 10 years earlier. Over the same period, the acceptance rate fell from 13.7 percent to 8.6 percent, while yield has ranged between a high of 59.3 percent and a low of 53.3 percent. The Factbook on the Office of Institutional Research website provides extensive data on undergraduate admission over the last decade.
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Applicant growth was accompanied by an upward drift in enrollment, passing 6,000 in 2010. In some areas, this growth began to create strain on academic support, student life, and residential services. In 2016, integrated academic and financial planning led senior administration and the Corporation to fix the size of entering classes at 1,665 to achieve a level of enrollment considered sustainable for Brown’s budget and infrastructure as well as for achieving the University’s strategic goals for educational excellence and campus community.
The Office of College Admission is responsible for the selection of first-year, transfer, and Resumed Undergraduate Education (RUE) students to the undergraduate programs at Brown. Admission staff work toward identifying and enrolling candidates who will bring exceptional academic strengths to our classrooms and contribute to the life of the campus community in myriad ways. Brown’s outreach efforts are targeted to attract the most academically motivated and intellectually curious students. Our recruitment, both across the United States and the world, continues to support and enhance the diversity of Brown’s student body, evidenced by the number of enrolling students who are the first generation in their families to attend college, students of color, students from all socioeconomic backgrounds, members of historically underrepresented groups in higher education, international students, and students interested in studying across all academic disciplines in the liberal arts.

Applicants for the Class of 2021 came from 8,650 high schools, and those admitted represented 1,844 schools with great geographical breadth. California, New York, and Massachusetts were the states with most admitted students, and the top five countries of international origin were India, China, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Korea. Women made up 55 percent of the entering cohort, and men 45 percent. First-generation and legacy students were roughly balanced at 13 percent and 12 percent, respectively. Overall, 40 percent of entering students identified as students of color, including 21 percent Asian-Americans, 11 percent Latino/as, 9 percent African-Americans, and 1.4 percent Native Americans. There were 212 recruited athletes (13 percent). By academic division, 32 percent of entering students said they wanted to concentrate in the physical sciences, 28 percent in the social sciences, 21 percent in the life sciences, and 14 percent in the humanities; 5 percent were undecided. About 40 students chose to take a gap year. Special program admissions included 60 students to the Program in Liberal Medical Education and 15 students to the Brown-RISD Dual Degree program. More than 90 percent of the entering class ranked in the top 10 percent of their high school classes. Matriculants’ SAT scores were typically in the top 4 percent and more than 62 percent are candidates for advanced placement based on AP scores.

Recruitment efforts highlight not only the appeal of the open curriculum but also Brown’s robust commitment to academic advising. The advising initiatives highlighted include faculty-peer
advising teams; peer advisors for women, athletes, international students, and students of color; advising resources coordinated by the Science Center for STEM concentrators; designated advisors for students interested in health careers, business, and law; and newly created positions to advise DACA and undocumented students and to provide financial advising focused on the needs of low-income students.

The admission process gives each application a thorough and thoughtful holistic review. Every applicant to Brown is reviewed by at least two readers and then moved through a committee process for determining acceptance to the College. Brown is committed to ensuring that applications to Brown are afforded as much scrutiny and opportunity as each deserves. Without exception, Brown admits only candidates for whom we have reasonable confidence in the students' abilities to succeed academically and graduate from Brown, borne out by a six-year graduation rate of 96 percent.

The Board of Admission relies on the student's high school record, standardized test results, and recommendations from teachers and counselors when reviewing candidates for admission. While there are no specific course requirements for admission to Brown, admitted students will have ideally taken all of the fundamental courses that are essential preparation for university-level studies, including four years of English; a foreign language for four years or the equivalent; biology, physics, and chemistry; at least three and preferably four years of math; and at least two years of history. Brown also encourages study of music and art. The Board looks for students who stretch themselves in more than one academic area and who are exceptionally eager to learn and willing to accept academic challenges. Senior year curriculum and performance are important indicators of potential as a Brown student. Applicants who take a lighter senior year course load, or who show signs of underperforming academically will generally not be admitted. We would always prefer to see that students have opted for the most rigorous approach to their high school education. In many high schools, this means pursuing the AP or IB version of a course.

Admission staff identify a small number of cases each year where students face particular personal challenges and work with the Dean of the College's office to ensure that they receive targeted advising and access to appropriate campus resources. Admission staff sit on the Committee for Academic Standing (see Standard 4D). The information shared in these meetings is used by the Office of College Admission to review application credentials for students who have experienced academic issues at Brown and to identify patterns or trends in high school preparation that may have contributed to their challenges.

*Undergraduate Financial Aid*

The vast majority of Brown undergraduates are admitted on a need-blind basis. Three undergraduate populations are admitted on a need-aware basis: international students, Resumed Undergraduate Education students, and transfer students. In 2016-17, 43 percent of all undergraduates received University scholarships averaging $41,723. (The Office of Financial Aid actually provides services for about 60 percent of undergraduates since a substantial number come to Brown with outside scholarships that must be managed through the institution.) Notwithstanding the volatility of the financial aid landscape, Brown has been able to maintain and increase its commitment to undergraduate aid. Brown spent $116.5 million on scholarship support in 2016-17, compared to $70 million in 2009-10, a compound annual growth rate of 7.5 percent compared to 4 percent average growth for tuition and required fees over the same period. Since the start of the Plan for Academic Enrichment in 2002, Brown has increased
its funding of financial aid programs by about 130 percent. Our current fundraising campaign includes a goal of $500 million for undergraduate financial aid.

Since the last accreditation review, Brown has launched a number of initiatives to strengthen the aid it provides and support students’ academic success. In 2008, new financial aid policies eliminated loan requirements for students whose family income was below $100,000 (roughly 64 percent of aided students), eliminated family contributions from most students whose families earned below $60,000 (roughly 34 percent of aided students), and reduced the need for loans for students in all other income categories. More recently, Brown’s aid formula has decreased the expected parent contribution from families with annual incomes of $100,000 to $200,000 the “middle income” of students and families applying to Brown. However, data on applications and admission yields showed that Brown has continued to lag behind its better-resourced peers – particularly those that had eliminated loans from financial aid packages – in applications and yields from this middle income group. In September 2017, Brown launched The Brown Promise: The Future of Financial Aid at Brown, a $120 million fundraising effort to support replacing packaged loans with grants. Because of strong initial fundraising success, the President announced in December 2017 that loans would be eliminated from the financial aid packages of new and continuing students, beginning with the 2018-19 academic year.

In order to continue attracting the nation’s most highly qualified undergraduate students, Brown must constantly evaluate its aid policies. In this effort, the Office of Financial Aid is informed by an Advisory Board that includes student representatives. For the last few years, a coordinated effort involving staff from the College, Financial Aid, Campus Life, the Brown Center for Student of Color, and Student Financial Services, along with representatives from Undergraduate Council of Students, has focused on the financial pressures facing first-generation and low-income students. This resulted in the allocation of additional funds for the health insurance needs of all aided students and for student financial emergencies.

Becoming need-blind for all undergraduates is a longer-term goal. Even so, while Brown remains need-aware for international, transfer, and RUE students, aid budgets for these groups have increased over the years. In addition to growing the pool of aid funds for international students, Brown instituted an annual review of international students’ financial need and underwrites one trip home each year. Meanwhile, a major gift for the RUE program has significantly enhanced financial support for these students and is enabling an expansion in the number of exceptional non-traditional undergraduates (including veterans) at Brown.

Graduate Admission (PhD and Master’s Programs)

Admission to PhD and master’s programs is a partnership between the Graduate School and the host departments. Department faculty review applications and forward their admission lists to the Graduate School, which reviews and approves admission to all graduate programs except the MD. The Dean of the Graduate School approves admission to all PhD programs and, since 2016, the Associate Dean for Master’s Education approves admission to all master’s programs. The Graduate School has recently joined the National Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals and the New England Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals, which will provide new opportunities to gather and share best practices in the field.

Most graduate program application materials are received centrally by the Graduate School and forwarded to individual departments for review by the faculty. The Warren Alpert Medical School uses the American Medical College Application Service (AMCAS) for the MD program, although applications to its master’s program in Medical Science are routed through the Graduate
School’s admission system and are subject to Graduate School approval. The School of Public Health now uses the Schools of Public Health Application Service (SOPHAS), which is standard across the field, but the Graduate School continues to approve admissions to its master’s and PhD programs. Candidates applying to the joint IE-Brown Executive MBA program are first reviewed by a committee at the IE Business School, and then are reviewed by two program faculty at Brown University. If both bodies of review recommend acceptance, the application is then forwarded to the Associate Dean of Master’s Education for final review and acceptance.

Brown graduate admission requirements are publicized in the Graduate Handbook and on the Graduate School website. Program-specific admission requirements are available in program handbooks and on program websites. Criteria for admission to Brown graduate programs are set by the individual departments, subject to review and approval by the Graduate Council. Applicants must furnish undergraduate and graduate transcripts, GRE scores, letters of recommendation, personal statements, and writing samples. Certain programs also require interviews. Faculty strive to admit applicants who show the most potential as scholars and/or professionals and whose interests and goals are well suited to those of Brown’s program.

Most graduate students are admitted directly into degree programs as degree candidates. In rare cases, a master’s program may request that a student be admitted as a non-degree student in order to allow him or her to take supplementary coursework prior to admission. The program must make a compelling case for this type of admission. Students are also admitted competitively on a transfer basis from other institutions, although the number of such admissions is very small. Brown allows the transfer of a maximum of two courses of credit toward a master’s degree and a maximum of eight toward the PhD. Transferability of courses is determined by the student’s program or department, based on comparability and relevance of coursework taken elsewhere (see Standard 4D).

Executive Master’s students must not only meet academic standards but must also have a significant record of professional experience that aligns with the programs. For example, applicants for the Executive Master of Healthcare Leadership program must hold a position of significant responsibility in some aspect of the healthcare industry. Admissions procedures are publicly available to prospective students on program webpages. In addition to standard application materials, Executive Master’s applicants must also provide a description of a proposed Critical Challenge Project (see Standard 4C). Steps for application review are also publicly available and clearly stated. Candidates for admission are initially reviewed by the program Admissions Committee comprised of the program director, academic director, faculty associated with the program area of expertise, and/or associate deans as appropriate. Qualified candidates are interviewed by the program director and academic director. When candidates are recommended for acceptance by the Admission Committee, their application is forwarded to the Graduate School for final review. Candidates rejected at any stage in the review cycle are not admitted.

Following an audit of data from five years of admission cycles, completion, and student cases, the Graduate School is modifying its central admission policies to support all graduate programs by allowing for a more holistic review if that will best serve programs’ academic goals. In an increasing number of fields, standardized test scores have been reported to be poor predictors of success in graduate school. Heavy reliance on test scores is seen as overly reductive and can work against admitting the students that programs judge to be the most promising based on a larger body of accomplishments. Moreover, National Research Council findings indicate that students entering with a record of research, publications, and professional experience exceed the productivity and time to degree of peers whose backgrounds lack these aspects but who
have higher GREs and GPAs. Faculty productivity is also shown to benefit tremendously from highly qualified students whose GREs and GPAs may not be considered “top” but whose backgrounds demonstrate other qualities for academic and professional success. Beginning with the 2017-18 admission cycle, therefore, the Graduate School has instructed programs to maintain an emphasis on excellence while considering the total applicant. To support more systematic assessment and improvement of graduate programs, admission-related data on selectivity, yield, matriculation, and retention is being incorporated into data dashboards.

Over the last decade, applications to Brown’s PhD programs have grown by 22.5 percent, doubling in the Life and Medical Sciences and including a pronounced increase in the Social Sciences. Growth in the Physical Sciences has been more moderate and growth in the Humanities has fluctuated.

Overall selectivity of PhD programs has remained fairly constant over the last decade, hovering around 10-13 percent, with variation among divisions as shown in the following figure.
In the aggregate, the yield on accepted students has also remained fairly constant at around 41-42 percent.

The size of PhD cohorts is determined by funding available from University and faculty grant resources, as well as by the goal of fostering a community of peers in which PhD students are well supported by mentoring, academic services, professional development, and other training and enrichment opportunities. As described in Standard 4C, all PhD students are funded for five years, including tuition, fees, health and dental insurance, and a stipend, assuming satisfactory academic progress. Virtually all students who require it also receive sixth-year funding. To help programs recruit the best and most promising applicants, the Graduate School also offers several special fellowships providing enhanced stipends. Additionally, the Cogut Center for the Humanities provides Mellon Foundation-funded fellowships for two incoming PhD students.

Master’s programs have seen significant growth at Brown, with applications and enrollments roughly doubling over the last decade.

The 2013 Strategic Planning Committee on Master’s Education recommended that growth should be a function of academic considerations rather than expanding programs just for
revenue. The Provost has also emphasized academic quality, distinctiveness, and student experience as top priorities for master’s programs going forward. Master’s students may receive financial aid from departmental funds or grants, and new programs have been building aid into their financial models. Currently, only the MFA programs in Literary Arts and Playwriting offer multiyear funding that includes tuition, fees, and a stipend.

In conjunction with the implementation of master’s program reviews, master’s program admissions are also receiving new attention. The selectivity of AM and ScM programs varies, recently ranging from 29 percent for the ScM in Computer Science to 96 percent for the AM in American Studies. (The selectivity rate for MFA programs is 2 percent.) Improving master’s program selectivity is an important focus going forward, but it is a nuanced undertaking. Some programs have already reformed their curriculum and structure to improve selectivity (for example, the MPA and the AM in History). Improved capability within the Graduate School to review master’s program admissions will help with achieving a stronger academic profile for master’s students as well as greater diversity in terms of race and ethnicity, educational background, national origin, language, and gender. Most master’s programs lack strategic marketing and recruiting plans and the Graduate School lacks capacity to assist them in the way that the Office of College Admission does for the undergraduate program. Exploring how to draw upon the School of Professional Studies’ substantial Executive Master’s recruiting team could help publicize Brown master’s programs as more than Ivy brand-name programs, and help to attract a larger, better-qualified, and more diverse array of applicants.

The Graduate School is deeply committed to recruiting, admitting, and matriculating students who are diverse in every way, who come from a range of backgrounds and experiences, and who will contribute to the richness of the academic programs and the University. The *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* action plan emphasizes improving the recruitment and retention of underrepresented and diverse graduate students to help shape the future of the academy. The Graduate School’s Associate Dean of Diversity Initiatives consults with departments on admissions practices, recruitment, and retention.

Among the domestic graduate student population in fall 2017, 18 percent were underrepresented minority students, an increase from 13 percent in fall 2009. This represents progress but we are committed to doing better. In addition to advancing diverse recruiting at various annual meetings and conferences around the country, the Graduate School is strengthening relationships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority-serving institutions. In 2016, the Graduate School began waiving the application fee for students from historically underrepresented groups. Since 2017, applications in this category increased by 28 percent for PhD programs and 52 percent for master’s programs.

Many other efforts are contributing to diverse recruitment. Each year, “Super Monday” brings newly admitted underrepresented minority students to campus so that they can interact with faculty, staff, and students from their prospective departments, meet the Graduate School administration and representatives from various centers and offices on campus, and attend a reception and dinner that includes graduate students, faculty, and staff of color from across the campus. Additionally, a new student of color orientation has been introduced for incoming graduate students.

In the area of grant funding, the Initiative to Maximize Student Development (IMSD) has significantly strengthened the diversity and academic achievement of PhD students in the life sciences. A five-year, $3.3-million grant from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences awarded in 2017 will, with additional support from the Provost’s office, allow IMSD to expand
from eight students per year to 20 across all STEM doctoral programs. Efforts to improve retention include partnering with Campus Life, the Brown Center for Students of Color, the First-Generation College and Low-Income Student Center, and the LGBTQ Center to develop more robust support structures for underrepresented students.

During the last decade, the proportion of women in PhD programs has averaged 57 percent in the Life Sciences, 52 percent in the Social Sciences, 51 percent in the Humanities, and 31 percent in the Physical Sciences. Strengthening the presence of women in STEM at all levels (faculty, graduate, undergraduate) is a major commitment under Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion and departments’ own diversity and inclusion plans reflect this goal. The Graduate School is working with departments as well as with other organizations such as Graduate Women in Science and Engineering (GWISE) to improve gender balance in the sciences.

As a percentage of the graduate student body, international students have trended upward in recent years, reaching 37 percent in 2017. Brown requires that non-native speakers of English submit TOEFL or IELTS scores (unless they graduated from a school where instruction was in English), and all potential doctoral TAs must pass proficiency testing on campus. A number of academic programs and the Office of International Student and Scholar Services have raised concerns about the credentials of international students in light of their level of academic preparedness when they arrive on campus. The Graduate School and programs are discussing possible measures for early assessment and greater support, adding components in the application, and other means of assessing markers for English proficiency. (Physics has a video answer to one question, for example.)

**Pre-College and Summer Credit Programs**

Admission to the pre-college program overseen by the School of Professional Studies (SPS) is based upon an assessment of the student's academic excellence, intellectual curiosity, and readiness for participation in an independent academic and living environment. To be considered for the pre-college program, high school students must submit an essay, current academic records, and a letter of recommendation from a teacher who knows their work.

Enrollment in Summer Session courses includes not only Brown undergraduates (who register for classes in the same manner as for the regular academic year), but also undergraduates from other institutions (visiting students) and rising high school seniors (pre-baccalaureates). To be admitted, visiting students must be in good standing at their home institution and show evidence
of sufficient preparation for success in their chosen summer credit course(s). Rising high school seniors wishing to take Summer Session courses must fulfill the same admissions requirements as applicants to the pre-college program, but are evaluated for their preparedness to take college-level coursework alongside college students.

Students enrolled in both pre-college and summer credit programs are provided with services similar to services students receive during the regular academic year, including access to Health Services, Psychological Services, athletic facilities, and academic advising. The Office of Residential Life, in conjunction with SPS, oversees a team of professional interns and undergraduate Resident Advisors who live in the residence halls with the students and, as appropriate to the students’ ages and needs and various program goals, create robust communities as well as ensure the safety and security of campus residents.

**Projections**

*Undergraduate Admissions*

- Application volume will likely continue to grow as a result of demographic trends, but that growth may be unevenly distributed (e.g. gender, ethnicity, geography), and political developments in the United States are likely to affect international applications. The Office of College Admission will evolve its communications and outreach strategies accordingly.

- Brown will continue to enhance the diversity of its undergraduate student body through further strengthening of the campus climate for diversity and inclusion as outlined in *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion*.

- The distribution of student interests across fields may change significantly based on national trends and growth of certain areas at Brown. Senior leadership will consider what kind of academic balance is appropriate for Brown’s overall mission and goals.

*Undergraduate Financial Aid*

- In a climate of increasing public attention to college affordability, Brown must work to balance accessibility with other pressing budgetary needs. The institutions with which we compete for students are also improving their financial aid programs. Fundraising and financial management will enable Brown to maintain aid at a competitive level and enhance scholarship support, including the reduction or elimination of loan requirements for all students. The Office of Financial Aid will continue working to align aid policies more closely with the needs of students and their families.

- Financial Aid officers will continue targeted efforts to work with students and their families on financial skills, which has had beneficial effects and improved the loan default rate. 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.

*Graduate Programs*

- The number of PhD and traditional master’s students will grow by around 100 each, mainly in targeted programs. The Provost’s office and the Graduate School will ensure that growth both contributes to academic quality and is financially sustainable.
Executive Master’s programs in the School of Professional Studies are expected to expand modestly in number and to increase enrollment across all programs to around 300 from approximately 150 currently.

Brown will continue to strengthen efforts to recruit, retain, and support graduate students from historically underrepresented backgrounds.

Improved tracking of graduate student outcomes will allow us provide applicants with better information about whether our programs align with their own academic and professional goals and aid in recruitment. Developing stronger marketing around master’s programs will help to increase their appeal and selectivity.

B. Student Services and Co-Curricular Experiences

Description

Brown offers a comprehensive set of opportunities and services to support the quality, breadth, and diversity of undergraduate and graduate student experiences. The Division of Campus Life and Student Services has primary responsibility for many of these services and for promoting the experience of students in general. With 16 departments and centers, Campus Life supports health and wellness, student engagement and community, and diversity and inclusion. Staff hold the degrees, licenses, and certifications appropriate and necessary for their work, and where required, departments are accredited in their field. Their work is informed by a robust set of advisory and oversight structures, including the Corporation’s Campus Life Committee and the Faculty’s Campus Life Advisory Board. The student experience is also cooperatively supported by Brown’s major academic units and by offices throughout the University.

Appraisal

The current Vice President was appointed in 2016, and the Division of Campus Life is in a phase of restructuring and renewal. In addition to senior-level restructuring in the Vice President’s office, there has also been a series of director hires in critical departments (Counseling and Psychological Services, Residential Education, Student Support Services, and University Health Services), promotions in offices like the Brown Center for Students of Color, and a number of newly created positions to support international students and direct the First Generation, Low-Income Student Center (FLi Center). In the context of the University’s commitments under Building on Distinction and the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion plans, these changes, informed by careful evaluation, are advancing an already strong culture and set of organizational practices in the student services area that developed over the years at Brown.

Student Support and Inclusive Practice

Brown works on an ongoing basis to be responsive to changing student needs and use of services. This involves being attentive to national trends and professional standards, engaging with student feedback and advocacy, and employing analysis of institutional data. Like many higher education institutions across the United States, Brown’s student population is very different from the one it was founded to serve. The 2009 visiting team drew attention to whether Brown was meeting the needs of its changing student body – in particular, its international students and students from less well-resourced high schools and families. As with the rest of the University, Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion is guiding Campus Life’s priorities and helping to define clear goals and strong accountability mechanisms.
For example, greater recognition of the intersectional nature of student identities and experiences prompted a recent reorganization to facilitate collaborations and achieve greater organizational efficiency across Campus Life offices. Physical and mental health services were integrated. A Dean of Students position was created to oversee the identity-based centers and the offices that oversee student support and student conduct. A new Inter-Religious Working Group is now advising the University and the Office of the Chaplains and Religious Life on increasingly pressing matters around religion, religious identity, spiritual practice, and religious literacy at Brown. To increase collaboration and coordination across the many units that work with international students, Brown established the Office of International Student and Visitor Experience in 2013 to serve as a central contact point for advising, referral, and advocacy. This led to an expansion of the Office of Global Engagement and the recent launch of Global Brown Community and Support as a one-stop referral source for international students on campus. Further growth and coordination of services for international students is planned.

Notwithstanding the constrained resources of recent years, Brown has added new levels of support for students in a number of key areas. Staff and programming at the LGBTQ Center has grown, in part responding to increased demand for additional expertise and support for transgender students and employees. The Office of Student Veterans and Commissioning Programs was established in 2012 to better serve increased veteran enrollment and students from military families as well as students pursuing ROTC opportunities, which were expanded to include Naval and Air Force options. Brown changed its undergraduate admission policy to consider undocumented and DACA applicants as part of the need-blind domestic pool, and support resources for these students has been expanded. For the highest-need undergraduates, Brown established a dedicated support center and program director, a new assistant dean position in the College, and complementary expansion of budgeted funds for academic needs, emergency funds, and room and food access during semester breaks.

Celebrating its 40th anniversary, the Brown Center for Students of Color serves as a gathering place and source of advocacy and support for communities of color on campus. Beginning in 2011, Center staffing grew from three to five professional staff as part of an effort to improve coordination of programmatic support available to students of color. In 2014, the Center, then known as the Third World Center, undertook a broad-based strategic planning process and external review to update its mission and vision for the future. Recent actions include creating programming for South-West Asian and North-African (SWANA) students, establishing a Social Justice Peer Educators program, and, in collaboration with the Provost’s office, adding a coordinator position associated with the new Native American and Indigenous Studies Initiative.

For the last several years, graduate student advocacy intensified, bringing greater focus on how to address their needs and concerns. As detailed in Standard 4C, this has led to numerous enhancements in programming and staff support in the Graduate School and stronger coordination between the Graduate School and Campus Life. The Medical School has also increased student support through the creation of an Assistant Dean for Student Affairs in 2016, as well as through increasing the capacity of the Associate Dean for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs. In response to steps taken by the Trump administration, Brown has strengthened support resources for both international students and for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival and undocumented students. Campus announcements about policies, services, and actions are available in several places including the President’s website and the Provost’s website.
Athletics

The Director of Athletics was hired in 2012 and, following broad consultation, developed a vision for athletics and physical education as integral parts of Brown’s educational mission according to the following principles: 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. As a Division I NCAA institution, Brown is a member of the Ivy League and complies with the rules and regulations set forth by the NCAA and the League for its 38 varsity teams. (In 2014, Brown elevated Women’s Rugby to varsity status.) The department receives ongoing participation and advice from the Campus Life Advisory Board Subcommittee on Athletics, (comprised of faculty, staff, and students) and the President’s Advisory Council on Athletics (comprised of alumni). Completion of the Jonathan M. Nelson Fitness and Katherine Moran Coleman Aquatics Center in 2012 ushered in a transformation of Brown’s athletics facilities. Other renovations of athletic facilities and fields have been carried out and additional projects are part of the BrownTogether fundraising campaign.

Athletics helps promote the health and wellness of students on campus by providing an increasing range of activities for individual and group fitness as well as for the intramural and club communities. Training care for varsity athletes received a huge boost with the construction of the Zucconi Strength and Conditioning Center and employment of a new strength coach who, with his staff, provides highly individualized conditioning or rehabilitation plans tailored to each athlete’s sport, position, season, and particular strengths and weaknesses. Brown has been a leader in concussion prevention, policy, and management, with a number of our athletic coaches and staff participating as members of Ivy League or Conference concussion policy committees (e.g., football, women’s ice hockey). Faculty continue to work with our athletes to conduct research aimed at understanding and mitigating concussion risk. A joint concussion management team involving Health Services, Athletics, Student Support deans, the College, Student and Employee Accessibility Services, and Counseling and Psychological Services meets weekly throughout the year to review every student case to coordinate care. To cultivate leadership and strengthen the social tenor of teams, Athletics partnered with Victory Leadership Academy to create programs targeting two specific groups of varsity athletes: team captains and sophomores. The reasons for focusing on captains are obvious. The focus on sophomores is an effort to develop group dynamic awareness and skills among future team leaders who are also in a position to shape the behavior of first-year students. Student evaluations have been very positive, noting the benefits of work around the challenges of peer leadership in a team, real-time applicable learning, and building connections across teams.

Health and Wellness

Demand for health-related services has been increasing at a rapid rate, including responding to students with special needs as noted in the 2009 review, as well as student advocacy. From 2011-12 through 2015-16, when the overall student body grew by an average annual rate of 1.4 percent, Health Services patient encounters rose by an average of 2.5 percent. University Health Services currently manages more than 28,000 patient encounters per year. In 2016-17, funding was provided for an additional clinical care position. Changing to accreditation by the Accreditation Association for Ambulatory Health Care Inc. in 2013 has helped improve standards (Health Services had been accredited by the Joint Commission since 1986). The University uses health data to evaluate and improve services, for example the coordinated effort around concussion management noted above. Accessibility-related student needs have grown
along with the student population (including the summer pre-college program) and required growth of staff, funding, and services in Student and Employee Accessibility Services.

The pressure on health-related services has perhaps been felt most intensely in the area of mental health. Between 2011-12 and 2015-16, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) appointments and crisis calls rose by an annual average of 5.2 percent. In 2014, the University established a Mental Health Community Council, including both internal and external experts, to evaluate mental health policies and resources. Several significant changes have resulted, including a significant increase in the number and diversity of staff in both CAPS and Student Support Services. CAPS continues to offer a short-term therapy model but has eliminated the fixed session limit, and restructured schedules have improved crisis response. A dedicated position within CAPS facilitates community referrals in partnership with students and providers.

Use of 24/7 and emergency resources has increased, which has required careful evaluation of how best to meet students’ needs. After a careful review, the University closed its overnight in-patient unit in Health Services and expanded triage and after-hours services through contracting with a nursing triage service and ProtoCall counselors for mental health. These changes were undertaken in concert with establishing, then increasing live-in, professional staff in the University’s residence halls. Campus Life is currently undertaking a review of Student Support Services, including the University’s administrator-on-call system.

Promoting better community standards and norms around alcohol and substance abuse has been integrated into the design of expanded support for the residential experience, including increased professional and student staffing and new dedicated advising for Greek and Program Houses and students living off-campus. The School of Public Health’s Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies has also been a critical resource and partner. In 2012, the Center conducted a survey of undergraduates’ behavior and perceptions of alcohol use, the data from which were used to inform a subsequent external review by two nationally recognized prevention experts and an internal Alcohol and Social Event Review in 2014-15. The University has implemented recommendations from this review, which have focused on changing the campus culture around alcohol use, decreasing access to unsafe social event spaces, clarification and consistent implementation of policies and procedures, and alcohol-free options. Campus Life is just beginning the process of evaluating the impact of these measures.

In 2014, the President established a Sexual Assault Task Force (SATF) to undertake a comprehensive review of Brown’s current practices, policies, and procedures relating to sexual assault and sexual misconduct (see Standards 2 and 9). This work led Brown to institute a new University-wide policy on prohibited conduct and attendant complaint processes for faculty, student, and staff respondents. The University created and staffed a Title IX Office and established an Oversight and Advisory Board of faculty, students, and administrators to provide ongoing review and advocacy. Three new positions were established in Campus Life: two confidential Sexual Harassment and Assault Resources and Education (SHARE) advocates and one focused on men’s health and masculinity-related programming. The Oversight and Advisory Board’s June 2016 report found that a majority of SATF recommendations have been implemented and offered additional recommendations for advancing Brown’s commitments in this area, including more training and support for student peer advisors, and outreach and communications to graduate and medical students. Brown also helped organize the Association of American Universities’ 27-institution Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct to establish baseline comparative data across peer institutions.
While many of the enhancements to physical and mental health services benefit all students, the University and Campus Life have also evaluated and expanded services with an explicit focus on better meeting the needs of graduate and medical students. Health Services, Counseling and Psychological Services, and Student and Employee Accessibility Services have expanded hours into the evenings and weekends with the explicit goal of increased availability to graduate and medical students. The Graduate School and the Medical School have added student support deans who also serve as critical collaborators with the Division. In addition to wellness services already offered, the Warren Alpert Medical School is also beginning to integrate mindfulness and resiliency training into its curricular and co-curricular program. We recognize that more work remains to be done, and we continue to receive feedback that graduate and medical students perceive services as designed with undergraduates in mind.

Facilities and Infrastructure

Both through the final stages of the Plan for Academic Enrichment and now under Building on Distinction, the University has continued to invest in facilities and infrastructure to support the student experience. While there has been new construction (most notably the new fitness and aquatics center noted above), primary focus has been on renovating and reimagining existing facilities. In 2010, the historical Faunce House reopened as the Stephen Robert ’62 Campus Center. Recently, a study of mail services resulted in the University contracting with an outside vendor and a redesign of the mailroom and its services to meet changing student use, including a significant increase in package services.

A 2010 review of the residential experience resulted in a reconceptualization of how residential offerings and community evolve throughout the undergraduate experience in concert with the academic curriculum. Two renovated residential areas (Keeney Quad and, on the Pembroke campus, Miller, Metcalf, and Andrews halls) now serve as home for Brown’s first-year experience. Sophomore year residential options and junior and senior experiences were also re-aligned and supported by the full renovation of 315 Thayer Street from a rental facility to additional junior and senior housing. Through the budget process during the last several years, the rates for individual rooms and suites have converged to remove financial considerations from students’ living preferences. Residential capacity has been strained by the upward drift of the undergraduate population in recent years. Among its peers (with the exception of Cornell), Brown has the highest percentage of students (seniors and, by petition, some juniors) living outside the residence halls.

There have also been notable investments to expand and improve space for graduate and medical students. The renovation of the Campus Center included dedicated graduate student space. Reconfiguration within the Rockefeller Library has created a new set of graduate student spaces that are also available to medical students. The innovative Medical Education Building, which opened in 2011, includes three areas (called academies) dedicated to informal connection and community building among medical students. The South Street Landing redevelopment project (see Standard 7C) includes an adjacent residential building geared toward graduate and medical students, currently under construction.

Campus Life, in partnership with the University’s Computing and Information Services, continues to seek technology solutions to improve service delivery and support evaluation and assessment efforts. BearBucks is an integrated platform and portal for managing use of copy, print, dining, Bookstore, and residential service points. During the last decade, new systems have been implemented in the areas of student activities, student conduct, and health records.
Brown is at the early stages of planning for a new health and wellness center and residence hall. This new building will incorporate physical health services and counseling and psychological services (currently in separate locations) and provide expanded space and resources for wellness education. The residence hall will have a wellness theme, providing housing for students who want to live in a healthy environment and participate in wellness programming that serves the entire campus. Sufficient funds have been raised to begin programming the building, with the goal of moving to architect selection in the summer of 2018.

**Communication and Guidance**

The many entry points that exist for students to access University services and programs create a challenge for students attempting to navigate and understand these services and for the University in communicating effectively to students on how to best use them. Campus Life and its partners across campus use multiple modes and strategies to connect students with University services. All offices and services maintain websites. Campus Life has focused on expanding web-based information for graduate and medical students, as well as for parents and families, including the launching of a new Parents and Families website. Some offices and services have integrated use of social media into their outreach efforts, though there remain untapped opportunities. The general decline in student use of email creates challenges for communicating with students broadly, including at critical moments. In the event of an emergency, the Brown Alert system can broadcast messages via text and through a siren and PA announcements. The Student Digital Experience project now underway is studying ways to revamp communication with undergraduates (see Standard 9).

Communication with Brown undergraduates begins during the recruitment and admission phases of their experience, including a three-day, on-campus program in April for admitted students. After matriculation, publications and weekly communications coordinated through the Office of the Dean of the College focus students on what they need to know to support their transition and when they need to know it. Campus Life and the Dean of the College organize a four-day, intensive orientation program with continued orientation activities throughout the first week of classes. Approximately a third of incoming students also participate either in one of the optional pre-orientation programs or in the University’s three-day international student orientation, and Brown offers a dedicated orientation program for incoming transfer, visiting, veteran, and resumed undergraduates (see also Standard 4D).

As discussed in Standard 4C, the Graduate School organizes a one-day orientation program for graduate students to supplement departmental orientations. With international students representing approximately 40 percent of the graduate student population, the University is now in its fourth year of an expanded international orientation of graduate students. Improving the orientation and onboarding experience of graduate students is an issue under review. The Medical School offers a one-week orientation integrating traditional orientation events with introductory lectures to introduce students to the curriculum.

Community and academic standards and expectations are articulated in Academic Codes for graduate, undergraduate, and medical students (see Standard 4D) and in an all-student Code of Student Conduct. There is a mandatory module in our required online pre-arrival tutorial that introduces students to these documents, in addition to copies provided in orientation materials and online. The Code of Student Conduct and related procedures are reviewed and evaluated every five years. The University community has been engaged in dialogue related to issues of student protest, academic freedom, and creating an inclusive campus environment, including a University-sponsored seminar series.
Brown’s student services maintain a culture of open and accessible offices, including publicized open hours and information on how to make an appointment. At the same time, Brown recognizes that students come to Brown with different levels of agency and a broad range of cultural norms. Brown offices, including the Dean of the College, Financial Aid, and Counseling and Psychological Services, focus on outreach to and presence in a diverse set of student spaces, including Brown’s identity centers and offices and the Fitness Center.

The support, development, and training of peer advising systems, including the Meiklejohn Peer Advising system as part of first-year academic advising, and Residential Peer Leaders, serve as critical complements to the informal network of peer advising and word of mouth (see Standard 4B). Community-building programs for graduate students are discussed in Standard 4C. For medical students, peer support systems include Al's Pals, which pairs first-year medical students with second-year "pals"; the Medical Student Wellness Board, which coordinates regular wellness activities and group reflective sessions, and the Student Health Council, which offers formal peer counseling for struggling students. Additionally, SOS (Step One Support) provides students with peer groups with whom to study for their first major board examination.

Faculty and staff partners are also important sources of referral and outreach to students. Campus Life upgraded its Helping a Student in Distress site, offers annual training to the many faculty and staff that serve as first-year advisors, and uses gatherings of department chairs and administrators engage these partners. The Graduate School recently developed a poster and website that coordinates information about graduate student resources for distribution to departments and Directors of Graduate Studies. The Medical School is in the process of developing a similar resource.

Assessment and Evaluation

As the foregoing has indicated, Campus Life and Student Services has a strong culture of assessment, evaluation, and accountability that is used to drive improvement and identify emerging service needs throughout the Division. The Corporation Committee on Campus Life meets three times a year to receive and discuss reports on major questions or projects involving the student body and to provide guidance (see Standard 3). These meetings also provide an opportunity for ongoing engagement between student leaders and Corporation members. During each Corporation weekend, this committee convenes a breakfast conversation with each major student population (undergraduate, graduate, medical) on a rotating basis. Each Corporation meeting now includes dedicated discussion sessions with students on a set topic such as the international student experience, needs of first-generation in college and low-income students, mental health, sexual assault, and academic advising.

As part of the faculty governance structure, the Campus Life Advisory Board (CLAB) provides on-going feedback, concept testing, and advice on campus life issues. CLAB and its two subcommittees (one on alcohol and drugs and one on athletics and recreation) play an important role in assessing needs, evaluating the effectiveness of policies and programs, and planning new initiatives. In recent years, CLAB has addressed issues such as gender-neutral housing, recommendations from the Review of Alcohol and Social Event Policy, and academic progress and advising for varsity athletes. The Advisory Council on Athletics established by the President in 2003 is composed of alumni and friends to provide input on issues, decisions, and policies relating to Brown’s teams and student-athletes. Students also comprise advisory boards for several Campus Life departments, including the Interreligious Advisory Board (Chaplains’ office), Greek Council, Program House Council, and Residential Council (all
Residential Life), the Student Advisory Board for the Brown Center for Students of Color, the Club Sport Council, and Student Athlete Advisory Committee (Athletics and Recreation).

Campus Life departments are reviewed externally or internally on a periodic basis, including mandated annual reports to NCAA and to the Department of Education under the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA). We undertake comprehensive reviews of Code of Student Conduct every five years. As noted above, Health Services receives accreditation reviews, and the Brown Outdoor Leadership Training (BOLT) program was recently accredited by the Association for Experiential Education. Also as noted, the Brown Center for Students of Color (then the Third World Center) undertook a self-study, external review, and strategic planning effort, and Student Support Services is currently engaged in a self-study.

Campus Life engages in robust data gathering and analysis to monitor its services and improve them as necessary, as well as for accountability reporting. The Division has developed a comprehensive set of Strategic Indicators in Campus Life, drawing in particular from the Enrolled Student Survey and Senior Survey conducted by the Consortium on Financing Higher Education, which allows for benchmarking against 34 other schools with similar missions and student bodies.

At the departmental level, Health Services undertakes Continuous Quality Improvement data management, as required for good medical practice and AAAHE certification. It also conducts an annual survey of students who have not used Health Services in the last year to identify barriers to care. (In the spring 2016 survey of non-users, 90 percent indicated they had not used Health Services in the last 12 months because they had not needed any medical care.)

Student and Employee Accessibility Services (SEAS) conducted a recent survey of students to get feedback on their experience with SEAS staff, experience with faculty, and use of accommodations, as well as to solicit suggestions for improvement. SEAS staff are now working with Computing and Information Systems to enhance the case management system for more accurate and useful utilization data and analytics to improve planning and responsiveness. The LGBTQ Center also conducts a survey of LGBTQ students and their allies every few years to assess the effectiveness of its services and identify new service needs. The Center also recently organized both a Town Hall-style meeting and a focus group.

Residential Life has engaged in several recent assessment efforts, including an in-depth survey of all students in residence to assess perception of facilities, program, and experience, and two small surveys of all on-campus residents: one to assess climate in the residence halls, specifically with regard to respect, listening, and freedom to share opinions, and a second survey to assess facilities standards. Students consistently noted a need for more frequent painting and strong desire for better light management in the residence halls. Survey results also revealed that students do not know how to report facilities problems or broken items, which prompted the Residential Council to launch an informational campaign.

Projections

- Campus Life and Student Services will produce a strategic plan including clear goals with metrics for assessment. Critical areas for this exercise will include maximizing internal collaborations, better integrating student support with academic support, reviewing space and resource allocations, enhancing professional development, increasing staff diversity and capacity for working with an increasingly diverse student community, fostering greater interaction across student communities, continuing the
process of improving the residential experience and quality of student residences, and strengthening student participation in the division’s work.

- Campus Life and Student Services will better connect its services to graduate and medical students and correct the perception that it only supports undergraduates.
- Campus Life and Student Services will implement a self-assessment and planning process for its departments on a five-to-seven-year cycle.
- Through accountability to the goals articulated in its diversity and inclusion action plan, Campus Life and Student Services will foster and support a community of mutual respect that strives to counteract inequality and injustice.
Standard Six: Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship

A. Faculty and Academic Staff

Description

Brown is highly committed to recruiting, retaining, and supporting a faculty of outstanding scholars and teachers. In 2017-18, Brown had 758 regular faculty, defined as tenured full professors (54 percent) and associate professors (18 percent), tenure-track assistant professors (19 percent), and full-time lecturers and senior lecturers on multiyear contracts (9 percent). This count does not include research faculty, clinical faculty, Professors of the Practice, postdoctoral fellows, or visiting and adjunct faculty. Since 2011-12, the number of regular faculty has been rising moderately in keeping with the goals of Building on Distinction and growth in student numbers. Among Brown’s full-time faculty, 96 percent hold the PhD or appropriate terminal degree in their field. The small percentage of faculty without a terminal degree includes, for example, noted artists who do not hold a graduate degree but are qualified to teach MFA students based on their exceptional standing the field, creative production, and earned awards.

The University maintains clear statements and policies pertaining to academic freedom, professional conduct, expectations for career advancement, and other aspects of faculty work. Brown has strengthened its standards and procedures for hiring, promotion, and tenure; launched new initiatives that provide attractive intellectual opportunities for excellent scholars; improved support for faculty research; expanded the breadth of expertise available to students; and created a range of mechanisms to achieve ambitious goals for faculty diversification.

The Office of Institutional Research website provides a highly detailed set of faculty data. The Handbook of Academic Administration, available on the University’s website, contains definitions of ranks and responsibilities (chapter 4), procedures for faculty searches and hiring (chapters 5 and 6), policies covering the entire review, promotion, and tenure process (chapters 8, 9, and 10), and grievance procedures relating to promotion and tenure (chapter 10). The Faculty Rules and Regulations contain further descriptions of faculty responsibilities, including teaching, advising, and service. The Faculty Rules also include the charges of the Medical Faculty Executive Committee, the Committee on Grievances, and the Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity, all of which have oversight of grievance procedures in specific areas of faculty life. At the departmental level, every unit with faculty lines is required to maintain a Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure document enumerating the qualifications and performance expected at each rank. These documents, which are approved by the responsible dean, are distributed to faculty at the time of hire and are available to them on demand.

Appraisal

Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is a fundamental value at Brown, embodied in a statement of principles adopted by the Corporation in 1966 and reprinted in the University Bulletin. In light of increased public attention to issues surrounding academic speech and academic freedom, Brown has underscored the importance of unfettered and respectful speech on campus. The President has made public statements reaffirming Brown’s commitment to free speech, and the President and Provost launched the “Reaffirming University Values: Campus Dialogue and Discourse” project to encourage open discussion of contentious issues. Faculty governance, a related core value,
is described in Standard 3. In April 2017, a portion of the monthly faculty meeting was devoted to discussion of academic freedom and freedom of expression, in part considering whether the 1966 statement continues to hold up in today's context.

**Hiring, Tenure, and Promotion**

Searches and hiring are managed at the department level with a high degree of faculty participation and close and careful oversight by the relevant dean as well as the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity. Faculty are all recommended for appointments by a process carried out within a department, center, or institute. Offers must be approved by the University's senior administration, which ensures that the composition of the faculty reflects the institution's mission, programs, and commitment to diversity.

Faculty are appointed in three major academic divisions: the Dean of the Faculty (which includes the School of Engineering), the Division of Biology and Medicine, and the School of Public Health. The offices of faculty affairs in each area coordinate closely on policies and share data through a single database. The adoption of the Interfolio faculty recruitment system in 2012 has provided further uniformity to search processes across divisions. Brown strictly adheres to federal equal opportunity guidelines and legal requirements concerning hiring. Each hire receives a letter signed by a dean stating the nature and term of the appointment and conditions for reappointment when appropriate. Faculty are appointed at the appropriate rank according to each department's approved Standards and Criteria.

In 2014-15, the proportion of regular-faculty searches that resulted in a hire was 77 percent, and of those hires, 89 percent were the top choice candidate. In 2016-17, those figures were 82 percent and 85 percent, respectively. The overall proportion of searches resulting in a hire varies each year depending upon the mix of junior and senior searches. Anecdotally, our strategic plan and integrative themes in particular have been important for enhancing Brown’s attractiveness in a number of successful recent hires of highly accomplished scholars.

Brown’s last reaccreditation process led to strengthening the processes for reviewing, reappointing, and promoting tenure-track assistant professors (described in detail in the 2013 *Fifth-Year Interim Report*). Among the most important changes were dean’s approval of the annual review letters sent to assistant professors, extension of the probationary period to eight years for fuller assessment, a greater number of tenure review letters required, and dean’s approval of the lists of referees. Our goal is not to deny tenure more often, but rather to reduce the number of weak cases brought forward by providing greater clarity in communication with junior faculty about expectations and performance, better mentoring, and more rigorous protocols for external evaluation.

Since implementing the new procedures, the percentage of assistant professors hired who ultimately receive tenure at Brown has averaged 67.4 percent (for the cohorts hired from 2004-05 through 2008-09). Because of the small numbers of cases involved, the cohort tenure rate can swing year-to-year as a result of a few decisions, hence the importance of monitoring the multicohort average. Notwithstanding the strengthened tenure process, our overall tenure ratio (the percentage of tenure-line faculty holding tenure) has crept up slightly to 78 percent in 2016-17. While this is quite consistent with many of our peer institutions (e.g., Cornell, MIT, Penn, Princeton, Stanford), we view 75 percent or a bit lower as the ideal. An inhibiting factor is a slowdown in retirements following the conclusion of an incentive program. The Provost and deans report annually on faculty tenure composition to the Corporation Committee on Academic Affairs.
Faculty Diversity

The *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* action plan incorporates Brown’s goal of doubling the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty from historically underrepresented groups by 2021. In 2013-14 (the base year), 7.6 percent (51 of 668) of tenure-line faculty were from historically underrepresented groups, roughly consistent with the preceding six years. In 2017-18, a marked upward trend saw that proportion rise to 11 percent (74 of 688). We believe we are on target to meet or exceed our goal. In the 2015-16 hiring cycle, one-third of faculty hires under the Dean of the Faculty were from historically underrepresented groups; in 2017-18, the proportion was 43 percent. Diversity goals also include further increasing the number of women in the physical sciences, which has trended upward over the last decade but with some setbacks to growth in the last few years from departures.

Brown’s faculty diversification efforts are helped by several new or strengthened University-wide programs aimed at attracting and supporting faculty from underrepresented groups, including:

- **Target of Opportunity Program**, which in effect lends faculty lines to departments until they are incorporated into the regular roster with the next retirement or departure. The “target” line is then returned to the Dean of the Faculty for reinvestment in diverse hiring elsewhere. This flexibility enables departments to augment faculty diversity in a regular search (for example, if more than one diverse candidate is shortlisted) or through an individualized recruitment.
- **Presidential Diversity Postdoctoral Fellowships**, which allow Brown to identify promising recent PhD graduates from underrepresented groups, who may then be recruited into tenure-track faculty positions.
- **Provost’s Visiting Professors**, offering short-term appointments at Brown to exceptional senior faculty from historically underrepresented groups.
- **Andrew W. Mellon Gateway Fellowships**, which support postdoctoral fellowships for diverse scholars in the humanities and related social science in advance of taking up regular tenure-track assistant professor positions for which they have been hired.
Moreover, all academic departments were required to develop their own unit-level diversity and inclusion plans, which include identifying opportunities for increasing faculty diversity within their specific context. These plans were completed during the 2015-16 academic year, were reviewed by the senior administration, and are available internally on the University’s website.

Workload and Expectations

Brown is committed to the pursuit of research paired with teaching and the belief that these two areas of faculty life are mutually supportive. Faculty frequently have the opportunity to teach advanced seminars on their own work and collaborate with Brown undergraduates on their research, for instance through the Undergraduate Teaching and Research Award program. Anecdotally, many faculty state that their teaching and research complement, enhance, and inform each other, although we have not tracked this connection in a systematic way. The University considers scholarship and teaching to be equally important, and instructs academic units and the Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC) to weigh these the most heavily in consideration for tenure and promotion. Research and teaching are also weighed most heavily in consideration of annual salary merit raises.

Teaching and service assignments at the departmental level are made by the department chair. University committee assignments are made by the administration (for ad-hoc University-level committees, such as high-level search committees and task forces) and for standing University committees through faculty vote on a slate of candidates assembled by the Faculty Nominations Committee. The aim is to distribute service responsibilities equitably across the faculty at the departmental and University levels. Teaching loads are set within departments and standardized in keeping with disciplinary norms at peer institutions. Loads are reviewed on an ongoing basis and occasionally adjusted to maximize Brown’s competitiveness without detracting from the quality of instruction. Recently, for example, after extensive benchmarking and a thorough study of the impact on the undergraduate and graduate curricula, Political Science went from four to three courses per year for full-time regular faculty members.

Brown has historically limited faculty’s ability to reduce teaching loads or buy-out courses with external funding. (Faculty may not generally reduce their course load below one course per semester.) While this creates some tension between the University’s research and pedagogical missions, Brown is committed to ensuring that all of its faculty regularly teach undergraduate and graduate courses. Leave on Special Assignment may be granted in exceptional cases. The faculty recently approved a policy change that will permit faculty, with approval from their department chairs and relevant dean, to cluster their courses in one semester to help make more time for major projects such as applying for large, multi-investigator grants. If the Wintersession proves to be sustainable, it will allow faculty to teach a single intensive course in December and January in place of one of their regular semester courses (see Standard 4B).

Faculty Climate

To help assess the faculty’s overall satisfaction with the conditions of their work, Brown worked with the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), a consortium based at Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, to administer a survey of regular faculty in spring 2016. The survey covered a broad range of issues including support for research and teaching, governance, tenure and promotion processes, and personal and family policies. We also added questions about campus climate around diversity similar to those on climate surveys sent to Brown students and staff. Faculty were encouraged to complete the survey in
messages from the Provost and the chairs of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED), a standing faculty governance body. The response rate of 49 percent was about average for all COACHE institutions.

The survey results were on the whole very positive. Among peer institutions, Brown ranked first or second in all of COACHE’s 25 benchmark areas (aggregations of the roughly 200 survey questions), and in 20 of them scored in the top 30 percent of all participating institutions.4 (According to the COACHE staff, such rankings are highly unusual.) Ratings are exceptionally strong on shared governance, and there is a high degree of trust and confidence in senior leadership. Collaboration, mentoring, and policies related to tenure and promotion are also areas of significant strength. The customized questions related to campus diversity, departmental culture, and classroom dynamics revealed no significant areas of concern.

While there are no areas of particular concern based on how COACHE defines areas of weakness,5 a careful review of the data suggests that there are some issues that we can work to address. Pre-tenure faculty report less satisfaction than other groups. Asian faculty appear to be less satisfied than their colleagues (including underrepresented minorities). White faculty are less satisfied on some dimensions than faculty from underrepresented groups. In addition, women are less satisfied than men. There are also some divisional variations, with BioMed faculty significantly less satisfied in a number of areas. Overall, Brown’s faculty was less satisfied than at peer institutions with respect to personal and family-friendly policies, including the lack of a generous tuition benefit, policies for spousal hiring, and availability of childcare.

Ratings related to research, service, and teaching were high, but faculty find expectations about service unclear and would like to see more course relief for major service commitments. Satisfaction with support for grant preparation is relatively low, and there is evidence of unhappiness with library resources and with the provision of research equipment. Fortunately, these are all issues on which the University is already working (for example, through reorganization and improvement of sponsored research support and new investment in research cores). Mentoring is highly regarded in general, but associate professors are less satisfied than other groups.

A Campus Climate Survey conducted in 2016 raised another area of concern regarding the faculty. Across the University, only 52 percent of staff respondents agreed with the statement “Brown is a place where staff members are treated with respect by faculty.” In some departments, agreement was considerably lower than the University-wide figure. In response, the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity and the Provost’s office organized a series of focus groups with staff to understand the issues more clearly. The resulting information was presented and discussed at the Provost’s 2017 retreat with senior academic leaders, who committed to identifying ways to improve faculty and staff relations in their units.

**Academic Staffing Levels**

Between 2004-05 and 2017-18, Brown grew professorial-track and lecturer-track regular faculty by 20 percent, while the undergraduate population has grown by 16 percent. Regular faculty

---

4 Peer institutions were Dartmouth, Georgetown, Tufts, University of Virginia, and Vanderbilt. The overall cohort comprised the 89 research institutions that have administered the survey in the previous three years.

5 Defined as ranking fifth or sixth among peers and in the bottom 30 percent of the cohort.
teach approximately two-thirds of students and a similar proportion of courses, a pattern that is roughly consistent across divisions. The remainder is taught by visitors, Professors of the Practice, adjuncts, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students. Adjuncts and visitors are mainly employed to teach certain specialized courses or to cover specific needs caused by faculty leaves. In recent years, a number of temporary faculty positions were regularized as lecturers. Independent teaching by qualified and mentored graduate students is considered a form of professional development (see Standard 4C).

The adequacy of the numbers of faculty and administrative staff is reviewed in deans’ annual meetings with the departments and programs they oversee. External and internal reviews of academic departments and centers (see Standard 4A) also assess the qualifications of the faculty. Some of these reviews have led to changes in faculty size, staffing structure, and curriculum (see E-Series forms). Furthermore, some of Brown’s programs are subject to separate accreditation that considers whether faculty numbers are sufficient for their academic mission. Brown’s strategic plan is driving moderate faculty growth in a few departments.

**Evaluation and Compensation**

Individual faculty are evaluated annually by the head(s) of their academic unit(s) based on their contributions to research (including practice-based scholarship), teaching, and service and according to the applicable Standards and Criteria document(s). They report their activities via a web portal, and their chairs or directors have access to their reports as well as centrally produced reports on their teaching. (In the Division of Biology and Medicine and School of Public Health, parallel processes apply to research faculty and faculty in clinician and research tracks.) In addition, the processes of tenure and promotion for regular and research faculty are periods of intense internal and external evaluation of the faculty member in terms of the same triad of research, teaching, and service. External awards and recruitment efforts from peer
institutions also provide evidence for assessing faculty quality. The Dean of the Faculty’s website publicizes faculty accomplishments.

All academic departments were required to develop self-evaluation documents describing valid criteria for assessing their research and teaching. These informed the development of data dashboards with the most common self-evaluation metrics such as awards and honors, publications, grants, and citations. Where possible, we employ comparative data from Academic Analytics and other sources. Student evaluations are available to faculty, department chairs, and departmental directors of undergraduate and graduate studies, but central administrators involved in the reappointment processes do not have access to this information outside of individual reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases.

Faculty compensation is rigorously benchmarked against data from peers and internal data collected and prepared annually by the Office of Institutional Research. (Data on median faculty salaries by rank and division are also available in the University’s public Factbook.) This information helps inform setting the University-wide faculty salary merit pool in consultation with the relevant deans as part of the annual budget process (see Standard 7B). For the last several years, while the University has been working to close its budget gap at the same time as forging ahead with its strategic goals, faculty salary increase pools (including funds for retentions, promotions, and equity) have been low. Salaries continue to track those of peer institutions, but low salary increase pools over the last few years have made recruitment and retention efforts more challenging. A goal of our fundraising campaign is to double the percentage of faculty salaries supported by endowment from 17 percent to 34 percent. Beyond the added financial support, more endowed chairs will help with recruiting, rewarding, and retaining excellent faculty.

Individual faculty salaries are reviewed and set annually on the basis of a recommendation by the department chair to the appropriate dean. The dean meets with each chair and discusses each individual faculty member’s performance with regard to research, teaching, and service. The dean makes the final determination of merit increases. Adjunct and visiting faculty salaries are also monitored for equity by the appropriate dean. Faculty may request an equity review from the dean if they believe that their salaries are inequitable. Each year, five to 10 faculty request such reviews, and some of these result in base salary adjustments. CFED receives an annual report on faculty salary equity from the Dean of the Faculty’s office, and may request additional data or reports on equity as appropriate.

The Dean of the Faculty’s office recently conducted a comparative analysis of Brown’s compensation and leave policy for lecturer-track faculty. In 2015-16, the median salary of Brown lecturers was approximately 17 percent higher than the median for lecturers in the arts and sciences reported to the Association of American Universities Data Exchange.

Support for Scholarship

In 2012, as part of the strategic planning process, faculty were surveyed in an effort to identify what they view as the most important resources they need in order to excel at research and teaching. The survey not only asked faculty about their prioritized resource needs, it also sought to develop a better understanding of academic collaborations with colleagues across the campus and use of core research facilities to help us assess the importance of physical proximity and adjacency for scholarship. This work has informed numerous decisions for improving support for scholarship. A new Faculty Resources Survey was launched in fall 2017.
Time for scholarship is a major resource. Brown has a sabbatical leave policy for tenure-track faculty that is competitive with our Ivy-plus peers (see chapter 13 of the Handbook). A post-tenure sabbatical (one semester at full salary) was introduced in 2014. We also support a generous scholarly leave policy for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Distinguished Senior Lecturers (one semester of leave at full salary after 12 semesters in residence). This appears to be the most generous policy among our peers, only two of which had public information describing a far more limited availability of professional development leaves for lecturers. To provide transparency and inspire the most productive uses of faculty leaves, the Dean of the Faculty publishes an annual Sabbatical Research Newsletter. Start-up funds for new faculty have been improved in recent years and are now competitive with what peers offer.

The University also provides a suite of internal funding opportunities at different levels to support a range of research needs, including Seed Grants (up to $50,000), grant resubmission awards (up to $15,000), Salomon Research Grants (up to $15,000), Faculty Development Funds for research and research-related travel (up to $3,000), Humanities Research Fund awards (up to $1,800), and the Faculty Research Travel Fund (up to $600). The University also has resources for faculty to bring scholars from other institutions to Brown for lectures and similar events, and many centers and programs also provide funds for enhancing research and teaching. Faculty are also supported in their efforts to secure external funding by the office of the Vice President for Research, the Office of Foundation Relations, and staff in the offices of the relevant deans and the Provost. Pedagogical and teaching support is described below.

With the ongoing uncertainties around the future of federal research funding, Brown has been developing contingency plans to ensure that critical research taking place at Brown can continue with minimal disruption. In the short term, we have allocated $5 million from reserves over the next five years to support existing research projects and to prevent interruptions in the support of grant-funded graduate students and staff should current funding be reduced or terminated precipitously. Over the longer term, we are working to diversify sources of research funding by expanding the range of federal agencies from which we seek funds, developing the partnerships necessary for larger-scale awards, deepening foundation support, and building strategic collaborations with industry. We are also working closely with peer institutions and national associations to argue for the fundamental importance of federal support for research and education for our nation’s economic strength, national security, and global leadership.

Brown’s recent and current infrastructure investments include a number of major projects to strengthen the University’s research capacity. This includes new construction and significant renovation projects for the Division of Applied Mathematics, the Brown Institute for Brain Science, the Department of Chemistry, the Data Science Initiative, the Department of Neuroscience, and the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs. Brown is also investing more in its 24 shared core research facilities (12 of which are in the Division of Biology and Medicine) plus an animal care facility, which are essential for providing scientists with access to equipment and technologies that they could not support individually in their own laboratories. Cores are also critical for building multidisciplinary research programs, increasing grant competitiveness, recruiting top faculty, and attracting excellent students and postdocs.

Developing such facilities and making certain that their equipment remains up-to-date can be difficult and expensive. In the last few years, core infrastructure investment outside of BioMed has been sporadic – often driven by faculty recruitment and retention issues. The School of Engineering’s external review pointed out these shortcomings and led to a University-wide core infrastructure study. The results include better governance and oversight as well as a commitment to increase central budget support. Ensuring systematic, ongoing investment in
laboratory cores will be challenging in our current financial environment but critical for supporting the University’s research mission.

**Professional Conduct**

Brown has a strong set of rules governing professional conduct by faculty. The Faculty Rules and Regulations contain a statement on dishonesty or misconduct in research and policies for handling alleged violations (5.12.I.b, 5.12.II.b, 1.2.V.b.). The Office of the Vice President for Research oversees the policy and process for handling such cases. The Handbook contains sections covering expectations regarding confidentiality (2.7.1), sexual and other forms of discrimination and harassment (2.7.2, 2.7.3, and chapter 3), drugs and alcohol in the workplace (2.7.4), and general conditions of employment (chapter 4). Many other University policies (including Titles VI, VII, and IX) apply equally to faculty and staff. The University recently revised its Title IX process, established an Office of Title IX, and instituted mandatory training for all faculty, students, and staff. Reviews of policies under Titles VI and VII are underway. The Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity oversees the process for adjudicating complaints from students directed against faculty or staff. In addition, the University runs many training sessions on ethical and responsible conduct, including training on research related to human and animal subjects, on inclusive pedagogy, on supporting LGBTQ students, on responsibly handling data, and on preventing discrimination and sexual violence.

**Other Instructional Staff**

The University recently created the Professor of the Practice category (with appointments at the assistant, associate, and full levels possible) to enhance undergraduate and graduate instruction with faculty whose qualifications derive mainly from their expertise outside the academy. We also added the rank of Distinguished Senior Lecturer as a third stage of advancement on the lecturer track to recognize outstanding contributions. As noted above, the Dean of the Faculty’s office has made a concerted effort to better integrate long-serving adjunct and visiting faculty into the institution by hiring them into lecturer positions with multiyear contracts and benefits. Other adjunct and visiting faculty members who are hired with a significant teaching load for more than one semester are now being offered more competitive salaries (rather than being paid on a per-course basis) and are provided with a subsidy to partially offset the cost of health insurance purchased through the University. In Executive Master’s programs, instruction is provided by both full-time Brown faculty and adjunct practitioner faculty with significant professional experience and making important contributions in their fields. A number of these adjuncts also hold terminal degrees (e.g., MD, JD).

Librarians provide instruction through standalone workshops covering a wide range of topics including citing and publishing research data, grant compliance, using online images, data visualization, copyright, EndNote, and many more. Portions of these workshops may also be included in class sessions at the invitation of faculty. Additionally, faculty frequently ask librarians to provide in-class instruction on other specific skills (e.g., identifying and searching related disciplinary resources, such as PubMed or SciFinder). In 2016-17, librarians taught slightly more than 300 classes with a total of about 5,000 participants. Five librarians have teaching certificates from the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning. According to the 2015 Enrolled Student Survey, 65 percent of students who attended library classes and presentations reported them to be somewhat or very helpful. Unfortunately, only 30 percent of students responding to the survey had made use of these resources. Similarly, although 80 percent of students who sought research help from the library said it was helpful, only 42
percent of students report seeking such help. Further study of our effectiveness in teaching information literacy is needed.

Teaching Assistant, Teaching Associate, and courtesy faculty appointments are described in the Handbook (section 4.7.4-4.8). Selection, training, supervision, and evaluation for these categories are conducted by departments and, for graduate students holding those positions, the Graduate School. Teaching Assistants do not have primary responsibility for a course but provide supervised instruction under the faculty member responsible for the course. The offices of the Dean of the Faculty, Dean of the College, and Dean of the Graduate School work together to review related policies and practices periodically and to collaborate when corrective action is needed. Independent teaching by graduate students is taken up in Standard 4C.

Brown also has a robust undergraduate teaching assistant program, with approximately 800 students who at some point during the year hold a position titled TA or similar. They play an important role in the departments of Computer Science and Economics in particular. Undergraduate TAs have normally taken and excelled in the course for which they are serving as assistants. The College Curriculum Council established a set of Guidelines for Undergraduate Teaching Assistants (2009) that address the appropriate degree of training, range of responsibilities, and workload for these positions. The Sheridan Center is hiring a staff member to develop more robust University-wide undergraduate TA opportunities.

Projections

- The Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences, and the Dean of the School of Public Health will work closely with their departments to achieve Brown’s goals for faculty diversification. This arena for hiring, already competitive, has become much more so as other institutions set similar goals.
- The deans must manage faculty hiring to serve both strategic initiatives and core departmental needs.
- Notwithstanding budgetary constraints, the Provost and financial leadership will need to prioritize greater faculty salary growth. Similarly, base support for core research infrastructure must grow.
- Academic leadership will need to support faculty in broadening the base of research funding support as federal appropriations decrease, severely in some fields.
- The President, Provost, and senior leadership, working with the Division of Advancement will pursue the campaign goal of raising 120 new endowed chairs to provide better support for existing faculty and underwrite moderate faculty growth.
- The Dean of the Faculty will explore policies to help faculty manage the twin imperatives of teaching and research without compromising the University’s standards for either.
- Academic and faculty leadership will determine the best ways to address issues raised by the COACHE and Climate surveys.
- The University Librarian and Office of the Dean of the College will investigate the efficacy of current information literacy instruction.
B. Teaching and Learning

Description

Teaching and learning are fundamental to our institutional mission, and their centrality within a research university setting is one of Brown’s hallmarks. This mission and our student-focused orientation are reflected throughout the University’s policies, practices, and structures relating to expectations and support for faculty (see above). Continued development of innovative educational models and curricula is one of Building on Distinction’s main pillars, and these goals are being actively pursued at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

Appraisal

Instructional Variety and Innovation

Brown encourages teaching innovation in multiple ways. Regular faculty may introduce new courses through a streamlined process, and the barriers to team-teaching are low. The Dean of the College sponsors curricular development grants, the Undergraduate Teaching and Research Award program, Global Experiential Learning and Teaching grants (for seminars with an embedded international travel component), and other funding opportunities. Other recent innovations include flipped/active learning classes, online courses, and group independent studies. The Digital Teaching and Learning website describes services to support these new instructional formats. A pilot Wintersession now supports intensive courses (see Standard 4D). At the graduate level, certificates of specialization, the Open Graduate Education program, and fellowships at campus research centers are giving students new ways to pursue their intellectual and professional objectives (see Standard 4C). The new blended-format Executive Master’s Programs through the School of Professional Studies are providing a seedbed for testing new instructional approaches that are starting to be explored by other graduate programs.

Variety in perspective and approach is not only important at the pedagogical level but is fundamental to realizing the ideals of liberal learning. Accordingly, review of concentration requirements and instruction by the College Curriculum Council include consideration of the number and variety of faculty involved (see Standard 4B). Outcomes are defined for a particular course, but faculty have the flexibility to decide how to meet those goals. Most courses with multiple sections, while overseen by a faculty member to ensure consistency of content, allow for a range of teaching styles. Efforts to advance faculty diversity contribute to intellectual variety, and the establishment of Professor of the Practice positions will also extend the range of experience and expertise from which students can learn. When needed, the Office of the Dean of the Faculty provides funds to hire adjuncts and visitors to assure that faculty with the required qualifications are present to deliver the curriculum. This may occur when regular faculty are on leave or when a particular level of expertise is needed for a particular course.

As described above, research and instruction are highly integrated at Brown, and faculty research activity regularly leads to new ideas for the classroom. Moreover, faculty research activity itself provides the basis for education at the leading edge of discovery. Undergraduate and graduate students play significant roles in research endeavors. Undergraduate students are afforded many opportunities for research with faculty directors through Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistantships, faculty grants, independent studies, and honors thesis work. Graduate students carry out original research in conjunction with faculty funded through the Graduate School, external grants, and departmental resources.
Over the last few years, faculty have been successful in obtaining grants from AAU and HHMI for innovative approaches to teaching introductory STEM courses (see Standard 4B). Brown is offering a small but growing number of fully online for-credit courses, initially as part of the Summer Session but now also during the regular academic year. The Engaged Scholars Program, currently offered by 11 units, creates a pathway for motivated students to work with faculty on designing a thoughtful academic program that integrates social change practice within their concentration. The Office of the Dean of the College and the Swearer Center for Public Service are instituting reviews for Engaged Scholar concentrations on a three-year cycle with reference to a set of learning goals and competencies specific to engaged scholarship. The Wintersession, piloted with 10 courses in 2017, is geared toward subjects and pedagogies that benefit from intensive study in a concentrated period of time.

**Evaluation of Teaching and Advising**

Brown systematically communicates the high priority it gives to the quality of the teaching and learning experience. Teaching ability and commitment are criteria for appointments, reappointment, and promotion. Teaching standards and methods of assessment are included in departmental Standards and Criteria documents and departmental metrics reports. Faculty are asked to report each year on teaching and advising activities, and efforts to improve. Educational content, including individual courses, concentration requirements, and departmental curricula are reviewed at the department level and at the University level by the College Curriculum Council or Graduate Council (see Standards 4B and 4C). It is taken up in the regular cycle of external departmental reviews (see Standard 4A) and in some cases by professional accreditation boards, such as ABET for Engineering, and CEPH for Public Health.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness occurs at multiple levels. As a member of COFHE, Brown has access to comparative data from surveys of graduating seniors pertaining to overall satisfaction with instruction and self-reported learning gains (see Standard 8). Brown’s primary tools for assessing the effectiveness of individual courses (regardless of format) are student course evaluations and faculty peer evaluations. In recent years, the Tenure, Promotion, and Appointments Committee has emphasized multiple modes of assessment. Course evaluations contain both standard questions as well as course- or discipline-specific questions. They are used at the department level to improve teaching and learning, as well as to assess course content and instructor effectiveness. They are available to faculty and their department chairs. Senior administrators may request teaching evaluations from department chairs as needed, but they are not available centrally on a systematic basis. Teaching is also assessed through faculty-peer observations and review of teaching materials, including syllabi, course websites, assignments, grading, etc. Many departments now include peer review of teaching in their Standards and Criteria document as a standard part of evaluation. The Sheridan Center provides information and resources for departments and individual faculty who participate in the peer review process. For faculty seeking to improve their teaching skills, the Sheridan Center also offers informative classroom observations (see Standard 8).

The Faculty Rules and Regulations state that “academic advising is central to the objectives and educational values of the University and is primarily the faculty’s responsibility.” The importance of advising in Brown’s open curriculum is described in detail in Standard 4B. Participation in advising is built into departmental and University expectations. Undergraduate students are assigned a first-year advisor drawn from a pool of full-time faculty and qualified staff. Training and support are provided by the Dean of the College to all advisors. Some may elect to take part in the TEAM advising program, which provides specialized training and support (see Standard 4B). Students generally continue with their first-year advisors through the sophomore
year, although they may also elect to change advisors. Brown has recently launched an optional advising feedback form. For juniors and seniors, each concentration has at least one faculty advisor (large concentrations have numerous advisors). The Office of the Dean of the College provides training, guidance materials, and a new online course for new advisors. Departmental staff provide administrative support. Brown complements faculty advising through strong systems of student peer advisors. One example is the Meiklejohn Peer Advising Program, but there are many other University and departmental peer advising programs.

Graduate student advising is personalized, supported, and rewarded. Each program has a designated Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) appointed by the department chair or director. In larger programs, a DGS may get a course release in order to devote sufficient time to the task. Training and resources are provided by the Graduate School. Administrative support is provided by the department. Masters’ students are advised by faculty or program staff.

Support for Teaching and Learning

The importance Brown attaches to teaching excellence and innovation is reflected in a wide array of resources and infrastructure for faculty and other instructors. Teaching and pedagogical support is available through the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning, which includes the Writing Center, Academic Tutoring, and English Language Learning (see Standard 4B). Further support for instructional innovation using technology is available from experts at both Computing and Information Services and the School for Professional Studies. Teaching Assistants can also find English language training and assistance through the Graduate School and the Center for Language Studies (see Standard 4C). The University continually upgrades learning spaces and teaching equipment to ensure that the spaces for teaching are appropriate to the delivery systems (see Standard 7C). Canvas, Brown’s learning management system, is a robust, accessibility-compliant and mobile-friendly platform for course materials, including multimedia content and integration with other online tools. Brown has an office of Student and Employee Accessibility Services that supports both faculty and students to ensure that methods of instruction are tailored to the individual needs of people with disabilities. Beyond Brown, many faculty are active members of professional societies (MLA, ASEE, AHA, etc.) that offer professional development related to teaching in their respective disciplines, and almost all are largely active researchers and bring their current work to their teaching.

Projections

- Brown’s courses will continue offering diverse and novel subjects, formats, and learning opportunities through multiple innovations and ongoing experiment, including Professors of the Practice, Wintersession, destination and travel courses, and online offerings.

- Academic leadership will continue working with faculty to strengthen evaluation of and support for teaching effectiveness. This will include exploration of how teaching evaluation data could be used on a more systematic basis outside of departments.
Standard Seven: Institutional Resources

A. Human Resources

Description

Brown employs approximately 3,000 full- and part-time staff, who are hired, evaluated, and compensated through clear and well-documented policies that are fully compliant with federal and state employment laws, informed by data gathering and benchmarking, and support the University’s strategic goals. (See Standard 6 for discussion of faculty and instructional staff.) The University manages staffing resources to meet changing needs and priorities through identifying organizational and technological opportunities for greater efficiency. Brown supports its employees with a generous benefits package, as well as professional development programs, which help with attracting and retaining staff talent.

Appraisal

Part of Brown's response to the 2008-09 financial crisis involved eliminating close to 80 staff positions. Since then, the University's overall staffing level has risen back to the level of 2009, but the nature and allocation of positions has changed in keeping with new programmatic priorities and imperatives for administrative efficiency. Many areas of recent position growth or redeployment are tied to new strategic initiatives under Building on Distinction, such as the Brown Arts Initiative, the Social Science Research Institute, the Data Science Initiative, and the Nelson Center for Entrepreneurship. Staffing in Campus Life and the Office of the Dean of the College was increased in response to growing demand in important areas like pre-professional and career advising and counseling and psychological services. Positions were also added in other areas of need including Student and Employee Accessibility Services, the Office of Student Veterans and Commissioning Programs, and particularly in the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity to support Title IX compliance.

Growth in these and other areas has been offset in part by reductions made possible through reorganizations and greater administrative efficiency. For example, shared service groups were established to assume transactional financial work from the President’s office and units reporting to the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty. These are now part of the University’s new consolidated financial organization (see Standard 7B). Periodic organizational reviews of departments and centers (such as that for the Graduate School described in Standard 4C) have helped identify opportunities for more efficient staffing models and, in cases, the need for additional staffing. Since 2012, Workday, Brown’s new human capital and financial management system, has been creating further opportunities to streamline work, such as the Brown Business Center consolidating a number of formerly dispersed human resources and financial business functions (e.g. I-9 processing, new employee onboarding, and cashiering).

All job descriptions include information on the minimum qualifications required for the position, and hiring reports required at the end of the recruitment process include information on the preferred candidate’s skills and experience to ensure that they meet the minimum qualifications. New staff hires are provided with a copy of their position description during the interview process or upon being hired. Offer letters outline basic employment terms, and more detailed information is available on the Administrative Policies website, which centralizes all human resources policies. Union staff will also find detailed employment terms in their union contract. All incoming staff are required to complete an electronic onboarding process in Workday that
includes a direct link to human resources policies, in particular those related to the terms and conditions of Brown employment. All human resources policies are reviewed on a three-year cycle (unless legal, regulatory, systems, or other changes require earlier review), and relevant personnel receive training on new or changed policies. Questions or concerns regarding employment terms can be addressed through online policy resources and in person with University Human Resources staff or the University Ombudsperson. Union contracts include grievance procedures involving a three-step process that results in either resolution or arbitration.

Brown requires all staff to participate in a performance development and management process. This process was revised in 2016-17 to streamline forms and performance ratings, improve the quality of feedback provided, and make it easier to provide feedback throughout the year. The process includes a formal self-assessment prepared by the staff member, which is followed by a written performance assessment completed by the manager. The manager and staff member discuss the past year’s accomplishments and challenges, and both parties sign the written review form. Additional milestones to support this effort include a written probationary period review for new employees, a goal-setting and professional development template, and a structured mid-year check-in form.

Performance ratings factor directly into the distribution of merit increases. As part of its ongoing efforts to recruit and retain excellent staff, Brown monitors staff compensation levels closely through participation in surveys, the data from which help inform the setting of the staff salary increase pool as part of the University’s annual budget process (see Standard 7B). External and internal benchmarking helps Brown set salaries for new hires, internal promotions, and equity adjustments. Data suggest that salaries in some job families are below market. Market escalation for some positions and lack of local skilled workforce for some jobs are also challenges. As a smaller-scale university, Brown is working to strengthen career ladders and internal mobility. As with faculty salaries, the low staff merit pools of recent years are not sustainable, and central bonus funds have been modest. In exit interviews, the percentage of voluntarily departing staff who cite salary issues as their main reason for leaving is on the rise.

On the positive side, Brown offers a generous benefits package and a variety of programs to support work/life balance, including flexible work arrangements. Human Resources reviews the University’s benefits programs annually to make sure that they are meeting the needs of employees while delivering good value for employees and the University. For example, since the last self-study, Brown added a childcare subsidy program for employees and graduate students as well as a wellness incentive program. In 2016-17, Brown examined its benefits programs from the perspective of millennial employees with a goal of determining how their benefits needs might differ from those of other employees. And the release of Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion sent a very strong signal to all Brown staff and the rest of the Brown community that the University is committed to strengthening our workplace for all employees.

The Center for Learning and Professional Development (CLPD) provides customized training for individual staff and for teams as well as more traditional skills training in areas such as communications, customer service, financial and business services, and supervisory skills. Programming needs are informed by periodic online needs assessments and focus groups. In 2015-16, CLPD conducted 98 instructor-led training sessions for more than 1,600 staff participants. It also provides a wide variety of online modules and self-directed training tools. CLPD’s new Leadership Certification Program had 175 participants in 2016-17, and the program is expanding in response to demand. This program is required for all newly promoted or hired managers. A new Staff Mentoring Program launched in 2016 pairs early- and mid-
career professionals with higher-level staff to foster professional development and career growth while building an inclusive culture of diverse networks.

Projections

- University Human Resources will continue to promote hiring practices, professional development, and mentorship programs that will increase the diversity of staff, strengthen workplace inclusiveness, and advance careers.
- The budget process will give weight to improving compensation for job families that are significantly below market and strengthening retention of the highest performing staff.

B. Financial Resources

Description

Brown continues to maintain a very strong financial profile while managing the impact of national and global economic challenges. High demand for its educational programs, loyal and generous alumni, an endowment exceeding $3 billion, and more than $4 billion of net assets all contribute to the University’s financial strength and top-tier Aa1/AA+ bond rating. Brown has also diversified its revenue sources in recent years with larger shares for sponsored research and master’s programs in the Graduate School and the School of Professional Studies.

Financial sustainability is one of the pillars of Brown’s strategic plan, and it has been strengthened by reorganized finance, fundraising, and investment functions that are delivering more collaborative and cohesive approach to managing and generating resources. Enhancements to budgeting, multiyear forecasting, and financial reporting are contributing to more informed decisions around revenue management, cost control, and capital investment. Current projects like the comprehensive review of reserve balances and the replacement of the budget system with an integrated Workday module are pointed at the same targets: to increase the quality and transparency of financial information and enable the allocation of existing and new resources to their most strategic applications.

Appraisal

Brown’s financial resources are dedicated to the support of its educational and research mission, as reflected in the University’s annual tax returns, audited financial statements, and tax-exempt 501(c)(3) status. Brown receives no state subsidy. Unrelated income is minimal and primarily attributed to partnership investments held by the University.

Governance oversight of Brown’s financial health rests primarily with the Corporation Committee on Budget and Finance, which reviews and approves long-term financial plans and the President’s annual budget recommendations. The committee submits its recommendations for tuition and fees, endowment payout, and the overall University budget to the full Corporation for approval. After the close of each fiscal year, KPMG LLP, Brown’s independent auditor, reviews the University’s operations and financial statements. The auditors also meet with senior officers and the Corporation Audit Committee to discuss any issues or concerns they may have. In its most recent financial statement audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, KPMG issued an unqualified opinion.

The Audit Committee assesses risk and has oversight responsibility for Brown’s internal
financial controls. The Audit Committee is supported by a Risk Management Committee consisting of leaders of key academic and administrative units. KPMG issues reports, as required by the Federal Uniform Guidance on Government Auditing Standards (formerly A-133), on the University’s federal funds. All Corporation members, faculty and staff are required to complete conflict of interest and commitment (COI) disclosures forms on an annual basis. Investment Office staff and Corporation Members on the Investment Committee have additional specialized COI requirements. Following an audit of Brown’s COI policies, a more unified set of protocols was developed (see Standard 9). A central website for financial and human resources policies is available to all University constituents, and policies relating to fundraising, grants and contracts, and risk management are also available on Brown websites.

The University preserves and enhances resources through the prudent management of operating revenues and expenses, as well as capital assets. Operating revenues for 2016-17 were $902 million, and net property, plant, and equipment assets were $1.1 billion at year-end. Brown’s financial leadership meets regularly with expert advisors to ensure that the University is applying best practices to its management of investments and debt. At fiscal year-end 2017, total long-term debt was $774 million and endowment and other long-term investments were $3.9 billion, an increase of 10.7 percent over the prior year end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Financial Results, 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Total assets increased by 7.4 percent due to an endowment return of 13.4 percent that, after consideration of gifts and distributions, drove an increase in long-term investments of 10.7 percent or $379 million. Total liabilities decreased slightly by 1.2 percent due primarily to a reduction of $71 million of long-term debt. The total net asset increase of 10.1 percent was distributed fairly evenly across restricted and unrestricted assets, strengthening the balance sheet and liquidity position of Brown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total operating revenues grew by 7.2 percent, exceeding the 5.2-percent growth rate of operating expenses to produce a $20-million change in net assets from operations. Both gross and net tuition and fees grew at comparable rates, and government grants and contracts increased by 6.9 percent in a difficult and increasingly competitive research environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-operating revenues improved from a negative $121 million in 2016 to a positive $364 million, largely on the back of much improved investment results. As noted earlier, the investment return of $409 million was the most significant contributor to a total net asset gain of $384 million that enhanced the capital strength and overall financial condition of the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration prepares reports for the Budget and Finance Committee of the Corporation three times each year. The Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer leads a recently consolidated Finance Division uniting formerly separate financial units to increase efficiency and transparency. The Budget, Controller’s, and Treasurer’s offices are now working collaboratively with offices of Academic Finance and Administration (AFA), Risk Management, Procurement, Accounts Payable, and Tax Services to serve the University community with a unified voice and service-oriented culture. Bringing these resources together has produced a more sustainable Finance Division with greater advancement opportunity for our staff and more bench strength to weather inevitable employee turnover. The current structure also enables the University to respond more rapidly to emerging financial demands and event risks.

82
Brown has significantly improved its capabilities for integrating academic and financial planning by implementing multiyear forecasting and scenario analysis. Income and expense assumptions are based on intensive internal review and historical trends. Testing key assumptions like net tuition growth, endowment payout, research revenue growth, and compensation increases has identified opportunities and potential threats that require deeper analysis. Over time, this in-depth analysis will enhance our financial planning and provide substantial support for more robust enterprise risk management.

In 2012-13, Brown partnered with Workday to design and implement a cloud-based enterprise resource planning system that replaced financial and human resource systems that had outgrown their usefulness. Workday has transformed University operations with more efficient processes, improved data integrity and access, and significantly enhanced controls. While gains have already been substantial, work continues to replace satellite systems with additional Workday applications. We expect to roll out Workday Planning in 2018. This new functionality will consolidate multiple tools that exist outside the central system, streamlining and integrating the budgeting and forecasting process at both the unit and central levels.

Tuition accounts for slightly more than half of Brown’s income and 62 percent of the core Educational and General 2017-18 budget (which excludes Auxiliaries, the Division of Biology and Medicine, and the School of Public Health). The University’s academic reputation ensures a deep demand among prospective students, with admission rates below 9 percent for undergraduates, about 3 percent for medical students, and similar figures for a number of graduate programs. While undergraduates still account for the largest share of tuition income, targeted growth of master’s and executive programs is helping to diversify income.

The Enrollment Management Committee has been revamped in order to ensure that the model for projecting enrollment is both pedagogically and financially sustainable. The committee is also responsible for reviewing whether outcomes of enrollment and financial aid policies are meeting our institutional objectives. Enrollment targets and financial aid projections are vetted through the annual budget process and ultimately approved by the Corporation. As part of its long-term financial plan, Brown is capping the growth of undergraduate students to maintain the quality of the educational and student life experience. When the cap is phased in, undergraduate FTEs of 6,662 in 2017 will grow modestly by 2.5 percent to 6,833.

To ensure that proposed new programs meet the University’s academic standards, they must be approved by the Provost, the Academic Priorities Committee, the full faculty, and the Corporation. The Provost and Chief Financial Officer undertake a separate review to ensure financial viability. In cases where Brown embarks upon programs that expand its educational mission into new areas, as was recently the case with the Executive MBA joint degree program with the IE Business School in Madrid, the University seeks substantive change approval from the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education to demonstrate consistency with the University’s overall mission and goals.

Endowment distributions and spendable gifts are substantial elements of total revenue. Maintaining the future purchasing power and growing the endowment’s capacity to support future operating needs are critical financial sustainability objectives. Brown’s endowment is invested globally in stocks, bonds, private companies, and real assets. The Investment Office works to create a flexible, balanced portfolio designed to include multiple drivers of return that can compensate for each other under different kinds of market conditions.
The Corporation’s Investment Committee is responsible for the management of the University’s invested funds and securities. It formulates the policies for how the endowment is managed, including asset allocation ranges as well as liquidity and risk guidelines. The Investment Office makes asset allocation decisions within the approved parameters and hires and oversees external investment managers. The University also makes direct investments in order to access opportunities not readily available through external managers or when such investments are more cost effective. The Investment Office maintains strong internal controls to ensure that the endowment is in compliance with investment policies at all times.

The endowment returned 13.4 percent in the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, outperforming the aggregate benchmark return of 11.4 percent. Against a universe of 145 peer colleges and universities as reported by Cambridge Associates, Brown’s endowment has achieved a top quartile ranking over 3-, 5-, and ten-year periods. Endowment income used for operations was $165 million in 2017. A reduction in the payout rate to 5.07 percent of the prior 12-quarter average endowment value was intended to address widespread concern about the level of future investment returns as well as the desire, over time, to increase the portion of the University revenue that comes from this source by growing the endowment through compounding earnings. While this action created short-term budget pressure, careful management resulted in sufficient support for the University’s core academic mission. Our current forecast anticipates a small operating surplus for 2017-18. Plans call for further reducing the payout rate to 4.5 percent over several years.

By the end of November 2017, Brown had received $1.616 billion in gifts and pledges toward its capital campaign goal of $3 billion. Campaign goals are carefully mapped onto the University’s strategic and operational plans (see Standard 2). The Provost chairs a Strategic Plan Coordinating Committee consisting of senior academic, financial, and fundraising officers to ensure that fundraising activity remains closely aligned with strategic plan goals and the multiyear financial forecast. (Case statements and giving opportunities are also reviewed by the President, Provost, and other senior academic leaders.) This effort is supported by robust campaign reporting and accounting to track gifts in relation to the strategic goals and financial plans and to ensure that funds are used as donors intended.

Brown’s strategic plan calls for increased sponsored research activities in areas like biomedicine, brain science, data science, engineering, environmental science, and public health. During the last five years, total grant awards increased by 39 percent from $139 million to $194 million. Investments in the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) have improved our ability to forecast and monitor sponsored research awards and indirect costs. Initiatives are also underway to upgrade systems, solidify governance and business models for research cores, expand seed funding and targeted incentives, and improve research space. A new Office of Industry Engagement and Commercial Venturing (IECV) has been added to the OVPR to develop relationships with corporation and other third parties who can offset widespread concern about the future level of government support for research, as well as grow a more diversified base of sponsorship for the long term.

The University Resources Committee (URC) is charged with making budget recommendations to the President, who in turn transmits the URC report along with her own recommendations to the Budget and Finance Committee for final decision-making (see Standard 3). The URC is chaired by the Provost and includes elected student, faculty, and staff representatives, as well as administrative leaders. The URC reviews Brown’s overall financial condition, weighs the major parameters for the upcoming year’s operating budget, and advises on long-term financial plans. During its deliberations, the URC holds an open forum for the University community.
In 2015, Brown implemented a new and more rigorous internal budget review process in conjunction with and to support the work of the URC. Overseen by the Vice President for Finance and CFO, in-depth meetings between senior officers and the financial leadership team afford more expert review of major cost centers and revenue projections, allowing for closer examination of opportunities to reallocate resources within and across units and to prioritize proposed investments so that the information that is brought to the URC for consideration has been fully vetted. After the budget is approved by the Corporation, senior officers receive a budget target as the basis for producing a detailed operating budget for their unit.

During the last decade, Brown has successfully managed through financial challenges while continuing to invest in critical academic priorities. As detailed in the 2013 Fifth-Year Interim Report, Brown responded to the financial crash of 2008-09 and 20-percent reduction in the value of its endowment with a number of budget-reducing actions while protecting investments in core academic activities. Further budget balancing was accomplished by a Deficit Reduction Working Group in 2015. Going forward, enhancing financial sustainability requires a variety of initiatives across the entire scope of University activities. Recent actions to reduce the endowment payout and cap undergraduate admissions involved difficult decisions to constrain current revenue in exchange for greater future endowment income, and maintenance of the highest quality student experience. Investments in systems and skills improve productivity and the quality of information that informs management decisions. Expanding our Advancement reach and sophistication, and building our research capacity require current expenditures for longer-term revenue diversification. Strategically allocating capital and targeting expenditures ensures that we are funding the initiatives that are most important to the overall success of Building on Distinction, and positions us to compete most effectively against a peer group of institutions that have very substantial financial resources.

**Projections**

- Planned revenue and expense initiatives will produce sustainable operating surpluses over the five- and 10-year planning periods.
- Increased giving to the endowment combined with planned reductions in distributions for spending are expected to result in a significantly larger endowment over the next decade that will be able to cover an increasing share of operating expenses.
- Growth rates for annual giving and sponsored research will exceed planned total tuition growth, thereby contributing to a gradual diversification of revenue sources.
- While working to recognize and reward faculty and staff at a competitive level, careful attention to headcounts and opportunities for increasing organizational efficiency will help manage the overall growth of salary and benefits as a component of the budget.
- More timely investments in plant and strategic sourcing initiatives will limit growth in property and other operating costs.

**C. Information, Physical, and Technological Resources**

**Description**

Brown’s infrastructure for scholarship, teaching, and student life has developed significantly since our last self-study. We are in the process of strengthening core research facilities used by
clusters of investigators (see Standard 4A). The University Library supports access to research and teaching resources in a wide variety of physical and electronic formats, serves as a hub for digital scholarship, and participates in the educational mission through instruction in the use of these resources (see Standard 6). The campus and physical plant are also being transformed through new construction, adaptive re-use and renovation, and major systems renewal, all undergirded by a capital planning process that focuses on University priorities and commitment to greater environmental sustainability. Information technology services and management has taken major strides with the introduction of major new systems, more powerful research computing and Wi-Fi networks, availability of software that campus constituents request and use, and new staff capabilities for partnering with faculty on data-driven initiatives. In all these areas, Brown seeks to be forward-thinking while at the same time trying to find new ways to manage costs and be more effective.

Appraisal

Library

The Brown University Library plays a key role in how scholarship is generated, communicated, collected, preserved, disseminated, interpreted, and re-used by Brown faculty and students. It consists of five physical locations on the main campus, a “book-less” reading room at the Warren Alpert School of Medicine, and an off-campus high-density shelving facility. With more than 5 million items and 70 percent of the collections budget currently being spent on online resources, the Library is integral to the academic life of faculty and students on campus. Last year more than 250,000 print-based items circulated, and 2 million full-text, subscription-based articles were downloaded by faculty and students. More than a million visitors came into the libraries last year. Data collection since 2012 shows consistent and high student usage. In spring 2017, 98 percent of undergraduates, 77 percent of graduate students, and 65 percent of medical students visited the main Rockefeller or Sciences libraries. With 120 full-time and 12 part-time employees, many of whom offer extensive discipline-based backgrounds and advanced technological expertise, the Library has worked to revise and re-purpose positions to keep pace with the evolving role of libraries and changing service needs.

The Library is moving beyond its traditional functions as a place for the distribution and consumption of knowledge. In recent years, it has made great strides in supporting cutting-edge, collaborative, interdisciplinary projects by faculty and students and promoting the increasingly technologically sophisticated research and pedagogy currently underway across campus. The Library both provides and develops resources, as well as a range of services and workspaces, to meet the needs of scholars in the digital age.

Library staff support digital scholarship through consulting and collaborating in the development and execution of digital humanities projects, assisting faculty in preparing digitized and born-digital materials for instruction, providing training and guidance in developing data management plans, offering repository and web archiving services that allow Brown scholars to use and preserve their digital assets, and consulting on issues involving the life cycle of digital scholarly content. To help manage accessing, preserving, and tracking of Brown’s digital assets, the Library partners with faculty and other campus centers to provide data management support across the disciplines. Additionally, the Library is pioneering new infrastructure for digital scholarly production and, with the aid of a Mellon Foundation grant, prototyping a model of digital publication development. The Library also consistently partners with faculty in developing grant applications in the digital humanities and seeks to align its staffing and services with the shifting landscape in teaching, learning, and research.
Equally important is the Library’s ongoing support for traditional methods of teaching and research. Much of this support is embedded in the exploratory development of an open source dynamic discovery tool that integrates the Library’s online catalog, online indexes and full-text content, the Brown Digital Repository, and other resources, empowering users to search multiple databases simultaneously and quickly identify relevant resources regardless of the location or source (e.g., physical or digital, on campus or off, locally owned or remotely subscribed to). In addition, subject and course guides developed by librarians are integrated into the Canvas learning management system along with librarians’ contact information, giving students direct (chat and email) access to subject specialists who can assist their research.

In 2017, following a detailed self-study process, the Library had its first external review since 2004. Significant challenges include the unrelenting inflation in the cost of materials and subscriptions, a library management system that is at the end of its useful life, new demands on collections and support services from evolving academic priorities and new types of materials, and keeping staff expertise aligned with the changing mission and functions of libraries.

**Physical Plant**

Brown’s campus consists of 234 buildings, 6.9 million gross square feet (gsf), 150 acres of land on the East Side of Providence, and another 379 acres located in Bristol, Rhode Island. The value of the campus buildings and improvements is more than $3 billion. By age, 55 percent of the space is more than 50 years old, 22 percent is 25 to 50 years old, 9 percent is 10 to 25 years old, and 14 percent is less than 10 years old. The average building renovation age is 64 years old. By function, 46 percent of campus space consists of academic buildings (including research laboratories), 31 percent is residence halls and student life, 15 percent is for administrative support and auxiliary housing, and 8 percent for athletics. Recent, current, or pending [construction projects](#) include buildings for the School of Engineering and the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, and a Performing Arts Center. As described in Standard 2, the anticipated move of a number of Brown administrative offices to the South Street Landing redevelopment will be followed by a series of renovations and moves that will improve academic programs and student experience.

There are 194 non-lab undergraduate classrooms (124,247 square feet), 109 of which are managed centrally by the Registrar with the rest managed by academic departments. In addition, the main campus has more than 150 class-lab and class-studio rooms. There is installed AV equipment in 97 percent of the Registrar-managed rooms, and Media Services provides technology for other classrooms. Brown’s residence halls support approximately 4,850 beds in 46 buildings that total 1.7 million gsf, or 25 percent of all campus space.

Since the last accreditation review, Brown has significantly enhanced its physical plant through new construction, renovation, and renewal projects, and a great deal of new capital work is underway or planned. Since 2005, the physical plant’s Net Asset Value (NAV) has risen from 74 percent to 83 percent, which is in line with peer institutions. Brown undertook full renovations of several academic buildings, invested more than $90 million in residence hall renewal (upgrading more than 50 percent of the beds on campus), and carried out other capital renewal work to improve the quality of academic space. Utilities infrastructure received $80 million in upgrades between 2005 and 2010, increasing reliability, efficiency, and capability.

*Building on Distinction* is the basis for all current space planning work. The *Handbook for Physical Planning*, created by the Sasaki consulting firm in 2013 as part of the strategic
planning process, focuses on managing the inevitable growth of the campus in the coming decades while enhancing the character of the campus and the surrounding neighborhood. A series of area master plans focuses on particular aspects of campus planning so that over time individual projects are coordinated and advance the University’s larger goals. Individual project plans with clearly defined oversight, project scope, budget, and funding sources ensure the expectations are set appropriately. Internal coordination ensures that each project plan includes critical networking, data, renewal, and infrastructure work in order to leverage each project to the maximum benefit.

Brown’s processes for assessing and prioritizing the University’s capital needs have generated a list that includes more than $500 million in facilities renewal projects and more than $500 million in new construction totaling 500,000 gsf. If the Capital Plan is fully realized, it will add approximately $56 million of incremental operating costs. The capital planning process was reorganized in 2015 for greater transparency and stakeholder inclusion. The Capital Planning Committee, chaired by the Provost and including deans and senior administrators, establishes capital priorities in relation to the strategic plan, evaluates and approves project proposals, and vets financial and programmatic changes in projects. The Provost also chairs a Capital Planning Working Group that meets monthly to review specific details of the capital plan, which are reported to the full Capital Planning Committee, the Corporation Committee on Facilities and Campus Planning, and the Corporation Committee on Budget and Finance.

Facilities Management has annual operating expenses of $68 million and employs 281 buildings and grounds workers along with 118 professional and support personnel. In addition, outside contractors provide daily services as well as project-related and preventative maintenance work. Facilities Management has an in-house 24/7 response center and works closely with Brown’s Department of Environmental Health and Safety and numerous state and local agencies to ensure that the University is in compliance with all applicable local codes and ordinances.

In 2012, Facilities worked with the consulting firm Sightlines to develop an Integrated Facilities Plan and a more strategic approach to facilities renewal projects. The estimated annual cost of maintaining a NAV of 83 percent is $50 million. Brown has been steadily increasing the operating budget for facilities renewal (currently $8 million) with the goal of reaching $25 million, or half of the target level of investment. This level of operating support for renewal would allow us to be less dependent on debt and ensure that we can plan the most pressing renewal projects in the most cost effective and timely manner. Phase 2 of the Utility Masterplan is now underway, consisting of $30 million of infrastructure upgrades. Facilities has spent $7 million to date on additional high temperature hot water distribution system improvements and electrical system upgrades and has approval to spend another $5 million during the next three years.

A preventive maintenance strategy, developed with the participation of campus stakeholders, has resulted in significant reduction in reactive maintenance, equipment failures and reduced utility and energy costs associated with how equipment is operated. Reactive maintenance work orders have dropped by 43 percent since 2012 and preventative maintenance work orders have increased by 200 percent. Moreover, Facilities Management has also been able to redirect and reinvest approximately 24,500 labor hours into operations to lower operating costs associated with maintenance of equipment, and key data collection and equipment life cycle

---

6 Examples of area plans that have been done in the past include: Campus Heritage Plan, Utilities Master Plan, Academic Facilities Plan, Master Plan for The Walk, Campus Life Plan, Undergraduate Housing Plan, Graduate Student Housing Plan, Transportation Plan, Materials Handling Plan, Multi-year Facilities Renewal Plan, Plan for the Houses, Accessibility Plan, and the Classroom Task Force Findings.
information is being shared among Facilities Management units to make better-informed decisions.

Approximately 78 percent of the University’s space is in buildings that are mostly or fully accessible, 7 percent is in buildings with some accessibility, and 15 percent is in buildings that are not accessible. Brown’s Facility Design and Construction Standards now include specific accessibility guidelines that supplement ADA guidelines. A campus accessibility map, available online and in print, shows each building’s score and color codes all campus sidewalks and walkways to indicate their level of accessibility. During the last 10 years, Brown has significantly improved the accessibility of its academic buildings and residence halls, and more projects are in the pipeline. The larger and more recent academic facilities (90 percent of total academic space) are accessible, but many older buildings and converted houses used for academic programs are still not accessible. For residential facilities, 75 percent of the space (more than half of the buildings) is accessible. To reach the goal of making all academic and residential space accessible to all members of the community, Facilities has an annual budget of $100,000 for timely response to specific impediments, and capital funds support larger projects such as the addition of elevators. The current renovation of Wilson Hall, will eliminate the last significant block of centrally scheduled classrooms that lack accessibility.

Brown is strongly committed to environmental sustainability. In the last eight years, Brown has completed $27 million in energy efficiency improvements, resulting in more than $5 million in annual energy savings, with many more investments planned for the future. In 2014-15, recycling initiatives diverted 23 percent of Brown’s total waste from the landfill. Following a campus-wide assessment of energy efficiency, renewable energy options, and opportunities for reducing Brown’s Greenhouse Gas (GHG) footprint, the University approved using less carbon-intensive fuels and set a target of reducing GHG emissions by 42 percent by 2020. In 2015-16, Brown’s GHG output was 27 percent lower than 2006-07 while total utilities expenses were virtually unchanged, even with the addition of new buildings and new energy-consuming infrastructure to support teaching and research. Among peer institutions that report on GHG, Brown’s emissions are the lowest in both absolute terms and when normalized to the size of the student population.

In the fall of 2017, the President charged two committees to examine and make recommendations on different aspects of sustainability. One committee is charged with proposing new targets for reducing GHG emissions after the University reaches the 2020 goals. It is currently focusing on possible shifts to renewable sources of electricity. The second committee is examining how to enhance sustainable business and investment practices.

Information Technology

Brown is taking a highly strategic view of the role information technology should play in advancing its mission and priorities. The President has called for creating a cohesive digital ecosystem for the University that provides faculty, staff, students, and alumni with the tools and capacities needed to support education and research, business operations, volunteer engagement, and communications. This vision for information technology at Brown is strongly integrated with realizing the University’s aspirations through creating more efficient and effective processes to manage resources and fuel collaboration at all levels of the institution, strengthening communications to better engage and connect all of Brown’s stakeholders, and increasing the ability to access and use data for decision-making and evaluation. The systems and capabilities that constitute this ecosystem must also be integrated with each other to achieve the kind of data sharing required to realize these goals and allow for efficient
maintenance. Under the direction of the Chief Information Officer, Computing and Information Services (CIS) is playing a central role in advancing Brown’s digital transformation strategy. In recent years, CIS has overseen multiple upgrades and expansions of the High Performance Computing (HPC) cluster to support research. Last year alone, HPC facilitated the work of more than 500 researchers who ran more than 5 million jobs consuming more than 40 million core hours. High Performance Data storage pools have been expanded for fast computing access. High Performance InfiniBand networking interconnects providing 40-gigabit-per-second (gbps) speeds have been upgraded and expanded across the entire cluster. Specialized virtual compute/data/web environments have been created for research groups. A state-of-the-art virtual reality system called the YURT has been built with NSF funding. A visualization lab has been outfitted with workstations for use by students working on graphics, virtual reality, and image processing projects. In addition, CIS became the first IT division among the Ivy League to house a Data Science Practice group to work with Brown faculty and administrators across campus to support research and decision-making processes.

Technology improvements to support teaching and learning include upgraded automated lecture capture, implementation of the Adobe Anywhere platform in response to increased use of video production in Brown courses, and adoption of the Canvas learning management system which supports student-centered learning while increasing data on how students learn and how faculty teach. In 2016-17, 74 percent of Brown courses were using Canvas compared to a peak of 56 percent for the previous system. In addition, a new website provides unified access to information, tools, and support for the Brown community’s digital teaching and learning activities (encompassing services from CIS, Sheridan Center, School of Professional Studies, and the Library).

Widely used and heavily requested software and services such as Office 365, Adobe Creative Cloud, and Dropbox have been made available for all faculty, students, and staff for installation on both Brown-owned and personally owned computers. Faculty, staff, and students now also have access to online skills development services through Lynda.com and language learning options through Rosetta Stone, which is also available to alumni. Brown’s old TV system, which required an Ethernet connection, has been replaced with Philo, which works over Wi-Fi and is compatible with mobile devices.

During the last few years, a number of completed or in-progress projects have been revamping or introducing new enterprise applications, including new systems for research administration, identity management, course selection and registration, faculty activity reporting, recreational sports management, and credit card deposits. IT security is a major concern as attacks increase. To help reduce risk and liability, CIS has built a secure computing and storage environment called Stronghold that enables Brown researchers to analyze sensitive data, while complying with regulatory or contractual requirements. Stronghold is currently self-certified to meet the security requirements and controls for HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) and is undergoing the certification process for FISMA (Federal Information Security Management Act) and CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Security). In addition, the University implemented two-step verification for access to most institutional digital services. This is already protecting important Brown applications such as our HR system, student information system, and learning management system; by the end of the year, all CIS system administration console access will be protected by two-step verification. CIS commissioned a security assessment, including penetration testing and searching for evidence of previous breaches, and continues to provide education to the Brown community about phishing scams.

Supporting all this progress is the significant improvements in IT infrastructure and support. In
response to exploding demand from the proliferation of mobile devices and use of streaming video, the wireless network has been upgraded, more than tripling the number of access points on campus and boosting availability by 150 percent and bandwidth by 300 percent. Brown launched a 10-gbps research network that connects the state’s universities. The speed of this research network allows Brown to connect with researchers around the world and interact with complex data sets in real time. CIS also redesigned the IT Service Center space to be more welcoming and service-oriented and increased hours of service. In addition, IT help is also now available through an easy-to-use chat and self-service knowledgebase.

These advances over the last five years in Brown’s IT infrastructure for discovery, teaching, dissemination, communication, preservation of knowledge, and administrative functions have established a strong base on which to build an innovative, integrated digital ecosystem that will both support and advance the University’s strategic goals.

Projections

- The Library will respond to evolving research and teaching methods, modes of learning, and methods for creating, preserving, and providing access to scholarly assets. At the same time, it must grapple with escalating materials costs, new service needs, updates in staff expertise, and the implementation of a new library management system.

- Carefully managed funding for new building projects and renovations will support the University’s strategic plan by creating additional, improved, and more accessible facilities for research, teaching, and student life. New space for academic programs will open following the relocation of many administrative offices to the Jewelry District. Completion of the next phase of the Utility Master Plan will increase campus efficiency, while Brown will also strive to achieve its Greenhouse Gas Emissions reduction goal.

- Brown will build upon recent work by CIS to make significant progress toward its digital transformation goals for creating a cohesive digital ecosystem that will involve involving cultural and organizational change along with technological advances. Key areas of attention will be business processes, consolidation of systems and platforms, improved communications and information delivery, increasing opportunities to showcase the quality of our teaching and research, and strengthening analytics for decision-making.
Standard Eight: Educational Effectiveness

Description

Brown’s organizational culture increasingly depends upon data collection and analysis to support the University’s academic mission. This has been particularly the case with the launch of Building on Distinction and Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion, both of which have called for robust metrics for evaluating the impact of programmatic investments. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) supports assessment efforts for the University. Schools, departments, and centers have all instituted more systematic evaluation practices, and new initiatives are required to define metrics for gauging their success. Like most institutions that provide a liberal education for undergraduates, Brown struggles with identifying concrete measures for an ultimately ineffable process of intellectual and personal formation. Nevertheless, we recognize the need to employ the best techniques possible to understand and evaluate the value of our curriculum. This is being accomplished in part through new structures and approaches to assess the cultivation of core competencies and the educational impact of co-curricular experiences. At the graduate level, new processes are improving how we track academic and professional markers while in school as well as better monitoring of career outcomes.

A. Undergraduate Programs

Appraisal

Brown employs a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods to assess and improve the undergraduate student learning experience. In addition to collecting data on enrollment, degrees, courses, admissions and financial aid, tuition, and faculty, OIR conducts surveys of admitted students, entering students, new students, first-year students, enrolled students, senior students, alumni, parents, and the campus climate. A number of these surveys are conducted as part of the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE), which allows for comparison with similar data from 34 peer institutions. OIR also uses the Common Data Set, which provides important benchmark information to the University.

Data Collection and Assessment

Brown uses the data it collects to improve educational practices on multiple levels (see also Section 4B). Most broadly, students complete a senior survey in which they report the skills they have gained throughout their time at Brown, such as thinking critically and developing global awareness. Department chairs review the senior survey responses for their respective concentrations on a bi-annual basis. Additionally, the Office of the Dean of the College reviews senior survey responses with respect to assessing the efficacy, usefulness, and availability of advising in individual disciplines. During concentration reviews, department chairs and directors of undergraduate study, along with the College Curriculum Council subcommittee, review the senior survey responses with an eye toward identifying areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. In particular, senior surveys have informed improvements in advising as well as the articulation of departmental learning goals.

Participation in other kinds of studies and information sharing also helps inform our work. For instance, the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement offers colleges and universities an opportunity to evaluate student voter registration and voting rates and, for interested campuses, “a closer examination of their campus climate for political learning and
engagement, and correlations between specific student learning experiences and voting. Studies such as this help gauge the extent to which Brown is fulfilling its commitment to educating the whole person and equipping students to engage with their communities, nation, and the world beyond graduation.

**Sheridan Center and the Brown Learning Collaborative**

The Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning, overseen by the Dean of the College and under new leadership, is slated to play a much greater role in assessment to improve student learning opportunities. For example, the Center recently conducted a study of the reasons that Brown undergraduates drop classes after the add/drop period in the fourth week of the term (students may drop a course until the day before the end of each term). Students were asked to attribute the reasons for their course drop decisions (including if they were likely to drop when they signed up) and what factors might have retained them in the course. Analysis of the results will be used to help improve student learning experiences and inform instructional practices. The Sheridan Center also uses student survey data to anchor faculty and graduate student professional development. For example, a workshop on Inclusive Teaching in STEM begins with Enrolled Student Survey data about the reasons students give for their departure from a STEM major. In an effort to support assessment more broadly, the Sheridan Center has hired a new staff member focused on assessment, who is charged with helping faculty and departments use data to improve student learning experiences and environments.

The Sheridan Center offers course consultations and teaching observations to provide formative feedback to instructors. In 2015-16, Sheridan conducted 101 video-based teaching observations, primarily as part of a requirement for a large certificate program that the Center offers on reflective teaching. In 2016 ratings of the service, the vast majority (85 percent) of respondents indicated that the consultant was effective at discussing the feedback, and almost three-quarters (72 percent) would participate in another observation. The Center is beginning pilots of another formative feedback option that combines observations and brief focus groups or surveys with students (elsewhere termed “Small Group Instructional Diagnosis” or “midterm student feedback”). Research suggests that this approach has a strong impact on student ratings and intended changes to teaching, and we anticipate that it will complement and extend the impact of our existing offerings.

The new Brown Learning Collaborative that is being established under the Sheridan Center (see Standard 4B) will also help to strengthen our capacity to evaluate our educational model, as illustrated by the design of its first two pilot projects. One project is a year-long institute to support teams (faculty, TAs, undergraduates) in writing-across-the-curriculum course development. The other, building upon the work of Brown’s AAU and HHMI grants (see Standard 4B), seeks to enhance the capabilities of the undergraduate fellows through a course on the theory and practice of problem solving and ongoing formative feedback. Key anticipated learning outcomes of these pilots, including enhanced student metacognition and skill development, will be assessed through direct and indirect measures. Participating faculty and TAs will also be asked to evaluate the programs’ efficacy in enhancing their teaching.

**Learning Goals and Course Evaluations**

Brown employs a tiered approach to cultivating learning goals. At the institutional level, the 12 liberal learning goals (see Standard 4B) reflect Brown’s mission “to serve the community, the nation, and the world by discovering, communicating, and preserving knowledge and understanding in a spirit of free inquiry, and by educating and preparing students to discharge
the offices of life with usefulness and reputation." Guided by the liberal learning goals and grounded in their respective disciplinary knowledge and methods, every department and program has developed a set of learning goals for their respective concentrations. Focal Point, Brown’s interactive concentration search tool, displays these goals for each of Brown’s concentrations. As students explore their academic options, the learning goals are a prominent consideration of the concentration. Faculty then align their individual course objectives with departmental learning goals, as evidenced by their syllabi.

Concentrations are reviewed on a regular cycle, informed by a preceding comprehensive departmental review by outside evaluators (see Standard 4A and B). The quantitative data amassed for concentration reviews include historic trends for concentrators (race/ethnicity, gender, status as an international student, percentage earning honors and graduating with Latin honors and Phi Beta Kappa); number of courses offered; enrollments; departmental participation in University curricular programs (such as writing-designated courses, First-Year Seminars, etc.); course enrollments and grade distribution. Qualitative data on concentrations and curricula is also collected by the CCC’s student representative, who reaches out to a small sample of students. Feedback from this group is then incorporated into the review and report. As noted in Standard 4B, these reviews are being expanded in the current round to look at departments’ broader curricula.

For individual courses, faculty are required to offer course evaluations for students to provide feedback about the instructor, course content, and workload. Evaluations also capture feedback on graduate and (since 2016) undergraduate teaching assistants. The centralized online course evaluation system has a grade block feature that requires students to either complete an evaluation or actively opt-out before seeing their final grade. Students complete evaluations at a rate of 80 to 90 percent. In addition to questions included in all course evaluations, departments may add questions of particular relevance to their discipline. Faculty and department chairs regularly review these course evaluations to inform their decisions about individual courses and departmental offerings (see also Standard 6). Departments are encouraged to incorporate multiple review methods in assessing faculty efficacy and providing feedback.

**Assessing and Supporting Academic Performance**

Brown’s six-year graduation rate has been stable at 95 to 96 percent for some time. The retention rate holds steady at about 98 percent. Based on students entering in fall 2010, Brown has a higher graduation rate than most other institutions, surpassed only by Yale, Dartmouth, Harvard, Pomona, and Princeton, and equal to Columbia. Responsibility of overseeing progress toward degree completion, rates of progression, retention, and graduation lies with the Committee on Academic Standing (CAS), comprised of eight voting members (three faculty members, the University Registrar, and four academic deans) and a larger non-voting body of academic deans and directors. The Committee is responsible for all actions pertaining to undergraduate academic regulations, as stipulated by Brown’s Faculty Rules, and is empowered to approve exceptions to academic regulations in individual cases (see Standard 4B). CAS also regularly monitors the academic progress of undergraduates, ensures that candidates for the baccalaureate degree have met all degree requirements, informs students whose progress toward the degree is deficient, and oversees the separation and readmission of students.

In January and June of each year, CAS reviews the progress of all students presenting academic concerns based on faculty-approved guidelines. Once final grades become available,
the Registrar’s Office composes a list of students whose cumulative course totals place them on Academic Suspension, Serious Warning, or Academic Warning. The Committee discusses each student at the level of Academic Suspension. In advance of the CAS discussion, an academic dean is assigned to talk with each student (and conduct other research as needed) to discern the factors that have interfered with their academic progress. In many cases, the causes are mainly non-academic. The student support services deans in the Office of Student Life provide the Committee with a list of students whom they believe should be extended special consideration. CAS also receives special reports for students with concussions, as well as input from Student and Employee Accessibility Services (SEAS).

Once CAS has determined an appropriate course of action, the academic dean assigned to the student’s case communicates with the student, who also receives formal written notification. Often CAS requires or recommends (depending on the situation) that the student take additional steps such as attending academic support workshops, exploring a change in course of study, or connecting with additional resources. In these cases, and upon a student’s approved return to campus from a Committee-mandated separation from the University, students are also assigned to an academic dean with whom they are required to meet one or more times in the subsequent semester. The percentage of students who do not ultimately graduate in six years is approximately 4 to 5 percent.

Other proactive interventions also contribute to students’ high rates of success at Brown. Faculty have an opportunity to flag any student experiencing academic difficulty in their courses via a “mid-semester check.” Each student who receives a mid-semester check is assigned to an academic dean and has a conversation about the factors — academic or otherwise — that have led to these difficulties. Students are then connected with our tutoring programs, an academic coach, or other resources as appropriate. Faculty also use writing checks (see Standard 4B), to ensure that students who are not at the appropriate writing skill level can be identified and supported by the Writing Center. Furthermore, CAS is in the process of finalizing a dashboard that will provide more timely and regular information for Brown students placed on warning and serious warning (including students from historically underrepresented groups, international students, low-income students, etc.) so that the Dean’s office can readily track student success across all groupings and over multiple years. The Dean’s office is currently in the testing phase of dynamic analytics, with the next step being predictive analytics.

To support the academic success of all students, Brown has enhanced academic support for undergraduates who show signs of being at risk of academic difficulty. The number of students participating in academic programs has increased substantially over last couple of years. The College’s Academic Support office offers academic skills workshops and peer-led group tutoring for a set of often challenging introductory courses. In 2016-17, the tutoring program served 46 courses and delivered 311 peer-led group tutoring sessions to a total of 1,132 undergraduates. Nearly all participants (98 percent) noted in survey feedback that they found the session helpful for their learning. In recent years, Academic Support has also developed a peer academic coaching program. Currently, 10 undergraduate and five graduate students are employed as academic coaches to support undergraduate students. The number of students requesting academic coaches and the number of students attending workshops have more than doubled from the fall semester of 2014 to the fall semester of 2016.

*Diversity and Inclusion*

Since 2006, fewer than half of undergraduates have identified as white (currently 44 percent), with students from historically underrepresented groups being the next largest group. Students
identifying as female comprise 53 percent of the undergraduate population. Around 13 percent of undergraduates do not have parents who completed a college degree. Brown also continues to attract students from around the world, with students in the class of 2021 representing 61 different countries. The Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan (DIAP) includes a number of significant curricular initiatives to strengthen diversity and inclusion as central values of liberal learning at Brown. Of particular note, the Provost charged a task force with addressing the Diverse Perspectives in Liberal Learning (DPLL) course designation. In surveying the undergraduate population, the task force found that this designation was rarely used and too expansive to be meaningful. Based on this work, Brown has developed more rigorous criteria for identifying diversity-relevant courses and will replace DPLL with a new course designation referencing the diversity and inclusion plan: DIAP Courses: Race, Gender, and Inequality. Standard 4B describes a number of other new and enhanced efforts to promote and support a diverse undergraduate population.

CAS maintains demographic information and monitors certain cohorts to gauge and if necessary, address any disparities in rates of academic probation. One such example is the “serious warning in lieu of academic suspension” program (SL), developed in 2010 to provide additional support for students who were not making sufficient academic progress because of under-preparation related to study habits and skills necessary to excel in their chosen course of study at the level required at Brown. Instead of being academically suspended, students facing these transition difficulties agree to a series of conditions for their continued enrollment on a trial basis: (a) they enroll in three instead of four full-credit courses; (b) they participate in a series of academic skills workshops; (c) they meet regularly with the dean for academic support to ensure that they are selecting appropriate courses and using available resources; and (d) they participate in bi-weekly academic support group. For example, during the spring semester of 2016, 80 percent of the students who participated in this program successfully completed three courses in which they registered and were permitted to continue their academic work at Brown in the subsequent semester.

As part of the broader institutional diversity and inclusion plan, the College recently established a Degree Completion Planning and Tracking Team to provide more effective planning and coordinated support across different student demographics. This team has developed a coherent strategy for following up with “Enrollment Terminated Requirements Pending (ETRP)” students in collaboration with other units and academic departments that includes use of a new degree completion worksheet and a coordinated communication strategy. Beginning in spring 2016, students placed on Academic Warning and Serious Warning will receive information in their CAS letters about early and direct access to Academic Support Services, including academic coaching, tutoring, writing, and ELL support. CAS communications will also include an affirming narrative from upperclass students who have overcome probation.

Athletics

Brown has more than 900 undergraduate student athletes competing in 38 varsity sports, one of the largest programs in the United States. Coaches work with the Office of College Admission so that the student-athletes who come to Brown are attracted to its open curriculum and will be academically successful. Per Ivy League rules, our coaching staffs are accountable for recruiting student-athletes who align with the overall student body. Each sport is responsible for meeting a target Academic Index goal given to them by the Athletic Department and based on the profile of the undergraduate population. Many student-athletes exceed the campus-wide Athletic Index.
Recruited athletes require special monitoring and support in light of NCAA and Ivy League rules, as well as to ensure that they have full academic opportunity notwithstanding the demands of team participation. In addition to a tutoring program funded in part by the Ivy League, student-athletes have access to the full range of academic support available to all Brown students, including the Writing Center, peer-group tutoring, academic coaching and workshops, among others. In 2016, the NCAA rated Brown first in the country among Division I teams for student-athletes’ academic performance. This high level of achievement has been consistent: Brown ranked second for the four preceding years. In both 2015 and 2016, 10 Brown students received Academic All-Ivy designations. Individual teams also garner academic honors. In 2016, gymnastics tallied 12 National Association of Collegiate Gymnastics Coaches/Women All-Academic honorees and earned one of the top 10 team GPAs in the nation. The Women’s Basketball Coaches Association placed Brown on its Top 25 Academic Team Honor Roll in 2013 and 2014.

Student-athletes’ six-year graduation rate is comparable to that of non-athletes, but a 2016 data study showed that student-athletes are over-represented in academic progress warnings for first-year and sophomore students. These students face special pressures in adapting to the pace and intensity of both academic and athletic competition and practice and travel schedules compared with their high school experiences. In every sense, the speed of play and demands of academic and athletic life at Brown pose challenges for their transition. Over time, student athletes do appear to adapt, recover, and graduate with their peer non-athletes.

Several measures have been undertaken and are in process to strengthen academic performance and support of student athletes, particularly in their early transitional years. The Deputy Dean of the College, who leads academic advising and chairs the Committee on Academic Standing, now sits on the Athletic Advisory Committee. The Deputy Dean has met with athletic coaches to detail Brown’s academic progress requirements, as distinct from NCAA eligibility requirements, and to highlight academic advising and support programs available to students. At the beginning of the academic year, practice schedules can cause student-athletes to miss important information conveyed during orientation. Accordingly, the Dean of the College will begin conducting a special orientation for incoming athletes in August or September. More generally, the Director of Athletics is exploring how to make the practice schedule more flexible so athletes may attend certain courses that have often been unavailable to them.

Ongoing support for student-athletes’ academic performance has been strengthened in several ways. The Ivy League-supported tutors will be trained alongside the peer tutors in the academic tutoring unit of the Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning. Moreover, each team now has one or more peer leaders who are intensively trained with Meiklejohn peer advisors. Each team now has a well-trained peer resource for assisting newer students with connecting to advising and support resources early on, in addition to the captains and coaches. Each team also has a faculty or dean’s liaison, who works with each team as a further resource.

All students in serious academic trouble in their first or second year are assigned advising deans specializing in helping students get back on track and with working intensively with academic support services. Student athletes are also part of this approach, which includes asking students to recover credits quickly in the first available summer session, in transfer, or (going forward) in Brown’s new Wintersession. The University is aware that injury, particularly concussions, may affect academic work in a significant way. In 2015-16, 85 of 122 students with concussions were student athletes. Recent work to coordinate support, treatment and academic support to concussed students is described in Standard 5B.
Co-Curricular Programs

Co-curricular learning is a growth area at Brown, largely due to the engaged scholarship efforts of the Howard R. Swearer Center for Public Service, which serves more than 1,000 Brown students. The Swearer Center is committed to using assessment tools across its community-facing and classroom programs, initiatives, and courses to ensure it meets the goals outlined in its 2016 strategic plan, Community Engaged Scholarship and Action: A New Plan for the Swearer Center for Public Service, as well as the broad engaged scholarship goals of Building on Distinction. Under new leadership, the Swearer Center is participating in and creating new mechanisms that will significantly strengthen its existing methods of assessing co-curricular learning, including the development of a set of learning outcomes and associated competencies. The initiatives and assessment efforts of the Swearer Center contribute to Brown’s programs and services for helping students succeed with their educational goals in the spirit of equal opportunity and the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan (see Standard 5).

The Swearer Center is working with OIR to extract all questions relevant to community engagement from routine surveys with the goal of assembling an annual benchmark assessment report. The annual activity report completed by all faculty now includes the category of faculty-directed or sponsored community engagement partnerships. The Center is also working to tag all community engaged courses, which will enable it to survey students about course quality, learning gains, and community impacts. Implementation of BrownEngage, a community-engaged learning management platform, will allow the Center to collect, track, and assess student learning, faculty engagement, and community impact in several ways. Each student will have a BrownEngage profile through which they will be able to collect all engagement hours, deposit and collect all community engagement products, record and track all co-curricular trainings completed, and seek review and verification by faculty and site supervisors. Institutionally the Swearer Center will be able to aggregate all of this data for assessment and use the system to reach all engaged students with new assessment tools.

Externally, the Center will spearhead Brown’s application for the Carnegie Engaged Campus Designation during the next award cycle (2018-19). This will require “evidence-based documentation of institutional practice to be used in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement.” Through the Swearer Center, Brown also participates in the National Assessment of Service and Community Engagement which assesses institutional capacity for mobilizing students in community engagement. Brown submitted baseline data in 2016 and will repeat participation in 2018-19 to assess progress on student engagement goals.

Post-Graduation Outcomes

Assessment of educational effectiveness in the undergraduate program draws in part upon available data on post-graduate outcomes to demonstrate that a Brown education equips students for “lives of usefulness and reputation.” As part of COFHE, Brown has access to comparative data on post-graduate outcomes, which are commensurate with our peer institutions. Information on post-graduation outcomes is made available to students to help them with making academic choices. For each concentration, the Focal Point site provides data on graduates’ careers. CareerLAB also collects post-graduate career data and makes it available to students on its website. Through BrownConnect and other initiatives, CareerLAB frequently invites alumni to campus to discuss the relationship between their education and training at Brown and their respective career paths.
A survey of the Class of 2016 showed 21 percent of respondents heading directly into a variety of graduate programs, with 70 percent going into employment, and 9 percent pursuing other endeavors. A larger number of graduates enter graduate programs in subsequent years.

Preparation to pursue advanced degrees and careers that require them encompasses competencies developed through curricular and co-curricular activities that demonstrate the knowledge, skills, values and personal qualities consonant with learned professions. GRE scores for Brown students rank higher on average than the norm in each category.

Similarly, Brown’s applicants to law and medical schools are notably more successful than the national average. The average composite LSAT score for the admitted applicants was 166, compared to the national average of 153.

With respect to medical school, Brown supports students and alumni through a robust pre-application process including applicant seminars, the completion of a dossier, an interview with a member of Brown’s Health
Careers Advisory Committee, and an institutional letter of evaluation. Typically, between 140 and 150 students and alumni apply to medical school every year. Of the 69 respondents to the Class of 2015 survey who reported applying to medical school, 85 percent were admitted compared with 41 percent of national applicants. The average composite MCAT score for admitted applicants was 34 compared with 31 nationally, and their average Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Math (BCPM) GPAs were 3.7, slightly above the 2014 national average of 3.63. Note that the Brown data include only the students and alumni who have applied using Brown’s support process. They do not include PLME students (who are admitted to the Warren Alpert Medical School as undergraduates), alumni who applied after a post-baccalaureate or master’s program at another institution, or Brown graduate students who completed their undergraduate studies at another institution.

These types of assessment are analyzed by the College and appropriate departments to inform gaps in the curriculum and make changes where needed. For example, the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) embarked on a multiyear project to revise the Medical College Admission Test (MCAT) and to define new criteria to inform medical schools’ application review processes. Based on AAMC information, we have been monitoring the continuity and intersection between these competencies, health professions schools’ expectations, and the Brown course offerings most typical for the pre-health/pre-medical studies. Working with academic departments, we concluded that no substantive changes to our course recommendations are necessary at present. With data from only one applicant cycle so far, we are continually monitoring the changing health professions schools’ expectations.

Projections

- The College Curriculum Council will continue the new round of undergraduate curriculum reviews, leading to changes and improvements.
- The College will continue developing and refining data analytics on academic standing to help identify areas or issues requiring more focused attention.
- The Sheridan Center, including the new Learning Collaborative, will incorporate new methods of assessing gains from liberal learning and growth in core competencies.
- The College will develop techniques to measure the impact of curricular innovations driven by the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan.
- The College’s new efforts for student-athletes will better support the academic transition to college in the early years, and the impact of practice schedules on course choices will be reduced.
- The Swearer Center will implement new methods for evaluating the educational impact of co-curricular activity.

B. Graduate Programs

Description

The Graduate School has placed increasing emphasis on data collection and analysis over the last decade. These efforts have focused primarily on PhD programs, but will be extended to master’s programs going forward. As part of its general reorganization (see Standard 4C), the Graduate School is reviewing its data collection efforts and considering the ways in which data
can be used more effectively to assess program excellence, ensure optimal allocation of resources, and drive improvement.

**Appraisal**

**Collection and Use of Data**

The collection of information to support evaluation of graduate programs is a two-way process in which data collected centrally is shared with programs and programs provide locally collected information to the Graduate School. This information is used to support annual discussions about program performance and needs, external departmental reviews, and periodic program reviews by the Graduate Council.

Every year, the Graduate School provides every PhD program with a dashboard of key admission metrics for the most recent and last five admission cycles (see Workroom). Data include selectivity, yield, standardized test scores, and demographic information. In the past, these dashboards were distributed as PDF files, but as of December 2016, programs are able to access and interact with the dashboard online. Starting with the 2016-17 application cycle, the dashboard will be expanded with additional data in response to *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion*. New data include applicants’ first-generation status; additional information about an applicant’s gender, should they wish to include it; expanded categories for race and ethnicity; and expanded questions about previous and future military service. Based on student concerns about privacy and potential bias, this information is not shared with departments on an individual basis; instead, the Graduate School presents aggregated data to departments while using the information internally to help track students’ needs, allocate resources for support services, and identify opportunities for community-building efforts. The Graduate School is working closely with the Provost’s and Dean of the Faculty’s offices to develop a more robust set of metrics to assess the quality of doctoral programs.

PhD programs submit annual reports to the Graduate School. While the narrative information and data they supply is useful and helps inform program reviews, these reports have not been prepared to a standardized set of requirements, resulting in uneven quality and making it difficult for the Graduate School to aggregate information. Some PhD programs put significant effort into data collection and analysis and share these findings at an annual departmental retreat. The Dean of the Graduate School and his administrative team are in the process of rethinking data collection and quality reporting to provide programs with clear guidance about expectations, and to enable even comparison between programs, where applicable.

In the past, master’s programs have not received the same level of analysis. Some master’s programs submit annual reports, but this was not a universal requirement for all programs. In addition, there has been no regular system of meetings with master’s program directors. The creation of a full-time Associate Dean for Master’s Education is intended, in part, to establish and oversee a set of evaluative processes for these programs.

The reorganization of the Graduate School has also significantly improved data capabilities. In 2016, the Graduate School partnered with Computing and Information Systems (CIS), which has built a strong internal analytical support capability (see Standard 7D), to create two half-time positions: one to address graduate program data needs, and one to address the needs of systems such as admissions and the Graduate Student Information System (GSIM). Both positions are housed in CIS but dedicated to Graduate School needs. This new arrangement is
already demonstrating its capacity for improving the assessment of graduate programs and empowering the Graduate School to make better informed and more nuanced decisions. All student files are being converted to electronic format.

The Graduate School will consider new admission systems with more powerful data collection and reporting systems and better integration with Banner and financial aid. Meanwhile, the current admission system is being adjusted to enable departments to admit PhD applicants to a master’s program instead, while preserving the integrity of the admission data. Historic and current reporting on admitted underrepresented students has been corrected to reflect only the federal categories and to exclude Asian students. Going forward, the Graduate School’s data reports will be reviewed and reconfigured to run automatically on an annual basis, and other frequently needed reports are being configured for the first time to allow Graduate School staff, departmental staff, and faculty to receive this information submitting multiple new data requests. Banner is being leveraged to minimize the manual labor involved in matriculating students and archiving win/loss data.

In the Division of Biology and Medicine (BioMed), the Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (OGPS) oversees the eight biomedical PhD programs as well as the Division’s several master’s programs. OGPS has centralized access to all program student information via GSIM, manages all student appointments and finance, and maintains a database tracking pertinent student and alumni information. All of the data collected by the OGPS are available to the Division’s deans as well as to each BioMed graduate. The data are used to help inform resource allocation and to share best practices among the graduate programs with the goal to improve outcomes for all programs. To provide transparency about program effectiveness, students also have access to the data.

At the central University level, OIR oversees a set of surveys of current and former graduate students, the results of which are publicly available on the OIR website. OIR and the Graduate School conduct an annual survey of doctoral students to better understand the graduate student experience and discover areas for improvement. In 2016, 56 percent of enrolled PhD students responded. The survey asks students about their satisfaction with their program, the advising and mentoring they receive, their academic activities, and their reflections on their decision to pursue graduate education at Brown. A similar survey is administered to master’s students (with 65 percent of those enrolled responding in 2016). As mentioned in Standard 4C, a special planning group was able to use climate survey data to address areas of student concern. The new Dean and administration of the Graduate School plan to act more purposefully on student feedback than has been the case in recent years. As a beginning, and in response to student concerns, they are focusing on improving the graduate academic experience, improving faculty-student relationships and mentoring, revising the Graduate Handbook for accessibility and resources, and providing publicly accessible information about resources for students with concerns about their programs, advising, and teaching responsibilities. In 2016, OIR also administered a student climate survey to provide a baseline for measuring progress under the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan.

The annual Graduate Alumni Survey solicits information from PhD and master’s degree recipients who graduated one, five, and 10 years ago and augments responses with information from individual departments, the Office of Alumni Relations, and other sources (e.g. LinkedIn) to develop a picture of subsequent careers (see Standard 4C). Going forward, we want to incorporate information about career outcomes into graduate program evaluations, engaging with program faculty to define outcomes in relation to program goals. The alumni data have already proved useful in strengthening professional development and networking opportunities
for Brown graduate students. In 2013, for example, the Graduate School, worked with Brown’s CareerLAB to launch GradCON, an annual Graduate Student Career Options Conference in which PhD and master’s alumni from all divisions of the University are invited to share their experience with careers outside of academia. GradCON offers a full day of alumni career panels from fields such as Communications, Government/Policy, Science Research, Education, Non-profits, Data Science, and Business, as well as small-group sessions and networking. The Brown Alumni Association is also working to cultivate stronger ties with graduate alumni, which will help improve their ongoing engagement with the University. The Office of the Vice President for Research tracks data relevant to graduate student research, including conference presentations, University-funded research travel, and significant awards.

Program Purposes and Structures

Brown makes clear public statements about the place of graduate education within the University’s mission and the educational goals for each graduate program. Building on Distinction addresses the importance of graduate education as part of Brown’s strategy for institutional excellence, and Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion as well as each department’s own diversity and inclusion plan also give prominent attention to graduate programs and graduate students. Every PhD and master’s program has both a website and a handbook that provide information about educational goals, the curriculum, requirements, and expectations. Proposals for new doctoral certificate, professional certificate, master’s, and PhD programs are required to address the program’s academic and, if applicable, social and/or civic goals as well as its relevance to a given field or purpose beyond the academia. To be approved, all proposals must be successfully reviewed by the Graduate Council and the Academic Priorities Committee and receive an affirmative vote from the Faculty.

Information about the structure, requirements, and cost of attendance for both PhD and master’s programs is readily available through the University’s website (see Standard 9). Departmental and graduate curriculum reviews (see Standards 4A and C) have led to numerous improvements to PhD programs (see E-Series forms). Creating a full-time Associate Dean for Master’s Education has enabled new focus on and support for master’s programs, including the development of a systematic review process (see Standard 4C).

Master’s programs are important for Brown’s academic strategy as well as for diversifying revenue (see standard 7B), but until recently definitions for full-time enrollment led to program and billing structures that were insufficiently flexible, especially for students who were working part- or full-time while pursuing their degrees. The structures generated a high volume of requests for approval to deviate from the standard structure, students being charged full fees even if they were taking less than a full course load, and significant expenditure of staff time in several offices to manage these issues. International students were particularly affected because they must be enrolled full-time in order to maintain their visa status. In spring 2017, the Graduate Council changed the default full-time program structure from four classes per term over two terms, to two classes per term over four terms. Tuition charges now match the reality of enrollment in each term with the result that students have greater clarity and less stress around billing and requests to deviate from the program structure have been greatly reduced.

Information on the costs of all graduate programs is publicly available (see Standard 9), but as part of its efforts to strengthen quality and competitiveness across master’s programs, the Graduate School is partnering with the Office of Financial Aid to provide all admitted master’s students with a full and transparent breakdown of their costs of attendance and loan eligibility before they matriculate. Currently, this information is only provided to matriculated students. By
making it available to all admitted master’s students (similar to what we do for admitted undergraduates), those students will be able to make a better informed decision about whether to choose Brown and will have an improved experience from the first communication they receive as an accepted student. The new communication effort is projected to launch by spring 2018.

**Assessment of Learning**

All graduate programs are expected to provide a statement of learning goals on their website and in their program handbooks. All new program proposals must include an explanation of what students are expected to gain, demonstrate, achieve, or know upon completion of the program. All new course proposals must include a syllabus that states learning goals for the class. The Graduate Council is the body charged with assessing educational effectiveness of graduate programs. Currently, it relies on an array of methods to assess graduate student learning and outcomes, including departmental and curricular reviews, student academic performance (seminar papers, grades, qualifying exams, dissertations, time-to-degree), student professional preparation (TA evaluations), student disciplinary activity (conference presentations, publications, creative production, results from experiments and projects). The work to build a more robust set of metrics for program assessment described above will further facilitate evaluation of learning outcomes.

Some programs involve practical or co-curricular requirements, and performance in these program components is systematically assessed as part of qualification for graduation. For example, theatrical productions for students in the Department of Theater Arts and Performance Studies, including the Brown/Trinity MFA in Acting and Directing program, are considered a part of professional training and receive critical review within the department. The master’s programs in Public Affairs, Public Humanities, and Urban Education Policy all require internships that are assessed by a supervising teacher, mentor, or on-site supervisor in partnership with the program. These assessments factor into the student’s grade and advancement in the program. ScM programs in Engineering and Computer Science offer a professional track; in Computer Science, the internship counts as a ninth course. These tracks are primarily for the benefit of international students to qualify as Curricular Practical Training under the terms of their F-1 visas. Graduate Teaching Assistants are evaluated by their students every semester, and they have access to these evaluations. The Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning also offers developmental evaluations to help graduate students build their skills as instructors.

**Projections**

- The Graduate School will develop improved metrics for evaluation of all graduate programs, beginning with PhD programs. Improved guidance for programs’ annual reports will produce more consistent and comparable information, and new tools will help capture PhD students’ academic accomplishments.
- The Graduate School will evaluate implementation of a new admission system.
- The Graduate Council will continue the new round of graduate curriculum reviews, leading to changes and improvements.
- The Graduate School will institute more systematic review and reporting protocols appropriate for master’s programs.
Standard Nine: Integrity, Transparency, and Public Disclosure

A. Integrity

Description

Brown has a long-established commitment to the highest standards of ethical conduct and integrity in all areas of its mission. With academic freedom in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge as a core value (see Standards 3 and 6), the University places the highest priority on maintaining those high standards and ensuring that members of the community are aware of their responsibilities in this regard. Various policies and mechanisms in support of integrity and fairness have been described under other Standards, including research integrity (Standard 6), academic and conduct codes for students (Standards 4 and 5), and grievance procedures for students, faculty, and staff (see Standards 5, 6, 7A). Brown’s Ombuds Office, reestablished in 2012 and expanded the following year, provides a secure channel for all community members to explore options for raising integrity issues at the University. Continuous maintenance of accreditation is one index of Brown’s academic and institutional integrity, as well as compliance with NEASC standards. In response to both internal and external developments, the University periodically assesses the effectiveness of processes and structures to ensure integrity, and revises them to take account of new requirements or conditions. This section provides illustrations of some recent and ongoing work to promote integrity in several key areas: discrimination and harassment, faculty conduct, and intellectual property and conflict of interest.

Appraisal

Discrimination and Harassment

Creating an educational and work environment in which all members of the Brown community can participate fully is a central value, strongly underscored by the Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion action plan. The Corporation Statement on Non-Discrimination applies to all members of the University and to all of its activities. Brown also abides by Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action policies. A number of offices and committees are responsible for oversight and enforcement of these policies, including the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity, University Human Resources, Campus Life and Student Services, the Office of College Admission, and the Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity. Over the last few years, there has been significant attention to updating and strengthening Brown’s policies and procedures around discrimination and harassment.

In 2014, at a time of heightened awareness and activity on campuses across the country and increased attention by the government and the media, President Paxson created a Sexual Assault Task Force (SATF) to review the leading research on campus sexual and gender-based violence and harassment, and to gather information through interviews and community forums on how our current policies, practices, and prevention programs could be improved. An interim report issued at the end of 2014 recommended a number of near-term steps to improve prevention of and response to sexual assault and sexual violence on campus. The University immediately moved to implement nearly all of the interim recommendations. A final report, released in 2015, contained further recommendations. For ongoing monitoring and accountability, the President established a Title IX Oversight and Advisory Board to review and make recommendations concerning Brown’s policies, programs, and initiatives designed to
address sexual and gender-based harassment, sexual violence, relationship and interpersonal violence and stalking.

In its first report, the Oversight and Advisory Board found that the majority of the SATF recommendations have been implemented. Significant items include promulgation of a new Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship and Interpersonal Violence and Stalking Policy which applies to all members of the University community; revised policies and processes for students, faculty, and staff that are centralized and unified wherever possible; the creation of a Title IX Program Officer and associated staff, including an internal investigator; additional health promotion staff specializing in sexual harassment and assault; clarified protocols for the administration of medical exams related to sexual violence in collaboration with local hospitals; a new mandated training program for all faculty and staff; the addition or strengthening of Title IX components at all student orientations; designation and announcement of responsible employees to all students, staff, and faculty; and the addition of resources and training on Interpersonal Violence to the Medical School curriculum.

In 2015, Brown joined with 27 universities to collaborate with the American Association of Universities (AAU) to sponsor a student survey designed to establish a more systematic assessment of sexual assault on college campuses and to collect student views on sexual misconduct than had been available from studies of single institutions. The results of the survey show that, since starting college, 25 percent of Brown undergraduate women and 6.8 percent of undergraduate men who participated in the survey experienced either unwanted sexual touching or attempted or completed penetration due to physical force or incapacitation. Among seniors, whose reports encompassed nearly all of their time at Brown, 33 percent of women and 8 percent of men reported unwanted sexual touching or attempted or completed penetration due to physical force or incapacitation since starting college. For attempted or completed penetration since starting college, the figure was 13.4 percent for senior women. Other important findings are that TGQN (trans, genderqueer or questioning or nonconforming) undergraduates reported rates of sexual assault that were similar to those for undergraduate women, and that 8.0 percent of female graduate and medical students reported unwanted sexual touching or attempted or completed penetration since starting at Brown. The majority of students who reported sexual assault by force on the survey did not report the incident to the University (60.5 percent). An estimated 70.5 percent of those who did not report they had been victimized thought the incident was not serious enough to report, and 47.9 percent thought that a report would not be taken seriously.

The data in the AAU report support the conclusions of the SATF that the problem of sexual assault and the lack of trust around issues of reporting are quite serious and demand the full and sustained attention of all members of the Brown community. The report has informed the development of more robust education and prevention efforts, and specific data about the differential levels of risk experienced by some groups on campus have helped with targeting resources. Going forward, the survey establishes a clear baseline against which we can assess ourselves. Brown will repeat this survey at least every four years.

With respect to unlawful discrimination and harassment more broadly, the President charged a group of senior administrators responsible for areas covered by Titles VI and VII to conduct a comprehensive administrative review of Brown’s policies and procedures. Although the working group agreed that the University’s policy on unlawful discrimination and harassment is sound, its report identified a number of areas for improvement. Along with drafting a revised Discrimination and Harassment Policy and general procedures that can apply across the whole University, the group made a number of recommendations to ensure that the policy and
procedures (both general and specific for different population groups involved) are more clearly communicated and consistently and equitably applied; to increase capacity in relevant offices for providing more effective support to individuals who come forward with concerns or wish to engage in the complaint process; to create more robust and systematic tracking of reports, complaint cases, and outcomes; and to provide University-wide education and training on discrimination and harassment policy and procedures and bias incidents.

**Code of Conduct**

In May 2017, Brown announced a [University-wide Code of Conduct](#) to serve as a guide for ethical, legal, and professional standards of behavior that apply to all members of the University community: Corporation members, faculty, undergraduates, graduate and medical students, staff, volunteers, and visiting scholars. Brown had a number of policies and procedures addressing the standards of conduct, but they were dispersed, not easily accessed, and not well understood. In the fall of 2015, a working group began to develop a unified Code of Conduct, examining compelling models at other institutions and creating a centralized set of standards that community members need to be aware of and abide by. The Code reflects the University’s values of integrity, honesty, and fairness, which are integral to our teaching, research, and business activities. On an annual basis, all members of the Brown community will be asked to affirm that they have reviewed the Code.

In parallel, stemming from Brown’s work around policies relating to discrimination and harassment as well as several highly publicized reports in the press about faculty elsewhere whose improper behavior led to disciplinary action or dismissal, the Provost in collaboration with the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) created an ad hoc faculty committee in 2016 to explore mechanisms for mitigating the risk of sexual harassment and other forms of inappropriate behavior by faculty members. Recognizing that Brown is committed to ensuring safety, respect, and fairness for all members of the campus community, the committee considered several possible approaches, including criminal background checks (currently required for all staff hires at Brown) and a requirement for self-disclosure of past disciplinary action. Ultimately, the committee recommended that each year all faculty sign an affirmative declaration that they will uphold a code of conduct that prohibits sexual harassment and other inappropriate behavior. This work led to the FEC to establish a Risk Mitigation Committee with particular focus on faculty hiring. The FEC will continue to work with the Risk Mitigation Committee and the senior academic leadership to address the recommendations that are brought forward.

**Intellectual Property and Conflict of Interest**

The Corporation approved the University’s current Patent and Invention Policy and Copyright Policy in 2005, replacing policies that had been adopted in 1981. The widespread emergence of online education providers prompted consideration of how the University’s intellectual property policies, as well as its Conflict of Interest and Commitment policies, applied to faculty teaching effort and content in this new market. In 2014, following consultation with a wide range of faculty and with particular input from the Research Advisory Board (RAB) and the General Counsel's office, the Provost issued a [Course Materials Ownership FAQ](#) to provide clarifications regarding the rights and responsibilities of faculty members and other paid instructors in relation to online teaching opportunities outside Brown.

With respect to Conflict of Interest and Commitment policies more generally, a 2016 internal audit identified a number of areas requiring attention, including out-of-date or inconsistent policy statements, uneven implementation, insufficient coordination among relevant offices, incomplete
or inadequate coverage of relevant campus groups, and a cumbersome reporting process. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration commissioned a working group to develop recommendations addressing the audit findings. The working group’s proposals focused on creating a single, enterprise-wide COI policy structure and implementing a single electronic system for supporting our COI reporting processes. These proposals and options for implementation are under evaluation.

Projections

- Brown will maintain its multilevel efforts to mitigate sexual and gender-based assault and harassment. Ongoing assessment of the efficacy of new policies, procedures, and practices will include a repeat of the AAU survey.
- The Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity’s website will be redesigned to provide more easily accessible information about Title VI policies and procedures for engaging in the complaint process. The office will develop additional training materials and programs for faculty and staff to understand bias incidents and resources for individuals who experience these incidents.
- The offices of the Provost and the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration will oversee the coordination and reconciliation of Conflict of Interest policies across the University. The new approach will be supported by new tools to facilitate reporting and analyze results.
- The Faculty Executive Committee will examine policies to mitigate risk in faculty hiring.

B. Transparency and Public Disclosure

Description

Brown’s profile is available on the National Center for Education Statistics’ College Navigator, indicating its status as an independent, private, not-for-profit and non-religiously affiliated institution. The University communicates about its mission, programs, and accomplishments in both print and digital media, with digital communications serving as the primary information resource. All of the University’s information about its history, policies, procedures, mission, objectives, and expected educational outcomes appears online. In addition, 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. Numerous pamphlets and booklets also are produced by individual offices to augment the information that Brown publishes on its website and in official printed documents. The creation of the Vice President for Communications role in 2015 and a restructuring of central communications operations have led to improved quality control and consistent management of the University’s websites and print publications, as well as policies to maintain the integrity of Brown’s identity.

Appraisal

Information Resources

Brown’s website serves as the University’s primary means of announcing and sharing information. All major releases of information are posted on this main site. The website is a robust resource for the public and for the Brown community providing information about all aspects of the University: mission, leadership, governance, academic programs, policies,
faculty teaching and research, administrative offices, student life, support services, the physical campus, finances, news, events, and job opportunities. It is also a rich archive of past activity. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) maintains a web-based public Factbook containing rich trove of institutional data on enrollment, degrees and completion, courses, admission and financial aid, tuition and fees, and faculty. The OIR site also contains a wealth of data from a variety of surveys and also Brown’s submissions for the Common Data Set, a standardized set of questions most often asked by parents, students, and other members of the higher education community. Information about the size and characteristics of Brown’s student body is also available on the top-level “About” sections accessible from the homepage of the brown.edu website. Faculty credentials and research and teaching activities are collected in searchable form on the Researchers@Brown site. Information about academic programs, courses, and faculty is collected in the University Bulletin, which is now online (see below). The Facilities Management site provides detailed maps and descriptions of Brown’s campus setting, including information on each building and major capital projects underway as well as accessibility routes.

As technology and media culture develop, the website is regularly evaluated and periodically revamped to improve clarity of information and ease of navigation. In 2015, the homepage design was refreshed to add “I want to…” action links that have succeeded in providing prominent and direct access to the most visited portions of the website, such as sections describing processes and requirements for applying to the undergraduate and graduate programs, and those designed to help students make informed decisions about academic choices. The information categories are self-explanatory and contain links to more specific sources for each category. This is often the first site visited by prospective students and their families considering Brown. The Office of University Communications is currently working with Computing and Information Services to develop a set of web usage analytics that can help inform communications and outreach strategies as well as improved informational content. Until it is possible to undertake a full website redesign, Brown has been implementing new web design templates that reflect current user practices and align with mobile technology.

While many people explore Brown virtually, the University also hosts many visitors on campus. In particular, as 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.

Responsiveness

The Office of University Communications is both proactive and responsive in providing information to news outlets that disseminate key information about admissions and University policies to the general public. The News from Brown and Communications websites give journalists access to direct contact information to respond to requests for information about the University, its policies and procedures. More generally, Brown’s homepage includes a feedback link to provide a space for inquiries. All feedback is answered immediately or forwarded to the appropriate department for immediate response. The Office of University Communications serves as its own news bureau, disseminating information to the general public and key constituencies via news.brown.edu, multiple targeted email newsletters, and social media platforms including Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Snapchat, and Instagram. The University’s financial statements are recorded and available to the public on the Office of the Controller’s website, and the Provost’s website includes materials on accreditation.

Brown communicates regularly with elected and appointed government officials at the federal, state, and local levels. These interactions are coordinated by the Office of Government and
Community Relations and include sharing information and updates through meetings, correspondence, publications and campus visits.

Brown’s compliance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), providing students with specific legal protections regarding the release of their educational records, is stated on the website of the University Registrar along with other information and policies regarding student information rights. Incoming students are notified of FERPA and other rights through an annual disclosure email in advance of each academic year. The University’s policies and procedures related to FERPA may also be obtained from the Office of the Dean of the College.

**University Bulletin and Academic Program Information**

The University Bulletin is a comprehensive official reference document listing Brown’s faculty, senior administrative officers, and Corporation members, and describing academic program curricula, requirements, and other pertinent information for a specific academic year including course offerings. The Bulletin is now a publicly available online resource but may be printed in whole or part from a PDF version. The Bulletin includes the University’s mission statement, policies relating to academic freedom and nondiscrimination, as well as obligations under FERPA. Additionally, the Bulletin incorporates information regarding general academic regulations, degree program requirements, and student billing as well as the offices that can address specific questions and inquiries. It also incorporates links to archival copies of the catalog since 2007.

The Bulletin is not contractually binding, and the information is subject to revision and change at any time. As a dynamic web application, it can be readily updated during the academic year to reflect newly approved academic programs and general policies. In addition, it has become integrated with the University’s online presence and academic-centered user applications geared for prospective and current students as well as advisors, including Focal Point, the College’s concentration portal, and Courses@Brown, a powerful new course search and registration application for degree candidates.

The Course Announcement Bulletin (CAB) is specific to the College but contains information that is part of the larger Bulletin. It is updated twice each year – at the time of publication in mid-March and just prior to the start of classes in late August. The CAB is accessible via the University website and as a PDF. Print copies can be ordered for a fee from Brown Graphic Services. While these booklets were for many years the primary source of information about courses and registration, they have since been supplemented by Banner, a student information system which supports course registration and provides ready access to catalog information.

All major academic units of the University – the College, the Graduate School, the Warren Alpert Medical School, the School of Engineering, the School of Public Health, and the School of Professional Studies – have robust websites that present their programs, degree requirements, faculty members, and admission information, and policies for withdrawal from programs. In addition, information on Brown programs offered at other locations is provided on special websites, including those for the Brown-Rhode Island School of Design Dual Degree Program, the Office of International Programs, and the joint IE-Brown Executive Master of Business Administration. Individual academic departments have their own websites and designated staff who have the training and authorization to manage web content so that each unit has the capacity to ensure that available information is complete and accurate at all times. Athletics maintains a separate website, 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 athletics activities.

The President’s website maintains a publicly accessible archive of statements related to Brown’s academics and excellence, and statements regarding program excellence can be found throughout the various program web pages. Additional information about Brown’s institutional goals for students’ education is provided on the web pages of the major schools and academic divisions. Departmental websites also provide more detailed information about faculty and their undergraduate and graduate programs.

**Student Information**

For prospective students, information regarding the requirements and processes for admission to all parts of the University – the College, the Graduate School, the Warren Alpert Medical School, and the School of Public Health and the School of Professional Studies – is available online along with the actual admission portals. The Factbook maintained by OIR provides extensive information about student applications, acceptances, and matriculation; diversity; and enrollment in academic programs. OIR also provides information from student surveys, as well as data on student outcomes such as employment and post-graduate education. Brown’s career center, CareerLAB, also provides information regarding success in placement.

Collateral printed matter (e.g., viewbooks and program brochures) is also produced for distribution to prospective students. Brown sends a Guide for New Students and Families to all matriculating undergraduate students. It consolidates detailed information (available but dispersed on the website) regarding orientation, course selection, AP test scores, residence hall life, extracurricular activities, rules and regulations regarding student conduct, and community resources. Information regarding processes for grading and transfer of credit can be found through the Registrar’s office (see Standard 4D).

Information on the availability of academic and other support services is readily accessed through websites maintained by the Dean of the College, Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity, the Graduate School, and Campus Life. The website also provides extensive information about institutional learning and physical resources from which a student can reasonably be expected to benefit, including the library, information technology, athletic and recreational facilities, accessibility, and the campus in general. Students and prospective students can also find a wealth of information about Brown’s numerous co-curricular and non-academic opportunities available to students.

Brown has clearly stated rules and regulations for student conduct (see Standard 5B) available on its website, including specific policies covering topics such as sexual harassment, residence halls, study abroad, student activities and events, smoking, drug and alcohol use, and weapons and explosives. These policies also cover student discipline and process for complaints and appeals.

**Student Costs and Financial Aid**

The websites of the Bursar’s Office, the Office of Undergraduate Admission, the Graduate School, the Warren Alpert Medical School, the School of Public Health, and the School of Professional Studies (for each program) include information about student fees, charges, and refund policies.
Discussion of college affordability and accessibility in government and policy circles, the media, and the populace is generating new public information mandates around costs of attendance and aid policies. Brown provides clarity on financial aid to prospective undergraduate applicants and admitted students, and the Office of Financial Aid website includes a Net Price Calculator to enable applicants to estimate the kind of aid that they would be likely to receive. Letters to students awarded University Scholarships specify the amount of aid that each student may expect. To further increase transparency and help undergraduates plan and manage the use of their resources more effectively, the Office of Financial Aid recently created the position of Director of Counseling and Communications. In parallel, the Dean of the College has also created an Assistant Dean of Financial Advising position to assist aided students with issues relating to finances and coordinating requests for emergency funding.

For PhD and master’s students, the Office Financial Aid has been playing an increasing role supplying information related to financing graduate education at Brown. In addition to providing guidance and counseling on responsible borrowing, in-school loan forbearance and repayment options, loan forgiveness programs, and basic tax filing, Financial Aid staff also offer sessions on topics such as successful budgeting techniques and applying for external fellowship funding.

Improving Information Accessibility

In a complex and rapidly evolving communications environment, ensuring optimal access to information presents many challenges – particularly as the information itself is also evolving. This is an ongoing concern, and universities must think about information access across many dimensions. Recently, for example, a committee of students, faculty, and staff at Brown has been examining the possibilities for improving information accessibility for families who are not native English speakers through translation of key communications (e.g., admission, financial aid, and academic standing letters) and interpreter services for significant University events (e.g., orientation) and emergencies.

Another challenge is that, notwithstanding work across the University to make information more easily accessible, it remains the case that a great deal of important information is dispersed. Moreover, our web and digital environment lags behind the experience and expectations of our students. In response, Brown has recently embarked on a multiyear Digital Transformation Initiative to develop a unified digital ecosystem to better serve and engage both on-campus and off-campus communities (see Standard 7C). Launched in fall 2016 following several months of assessment and exploratory work, the project seeks to increase ease of use and utility of Brown’s online services across a range of platforms and applications while also creating more personalized information-sharing and communications capabilities through integrating data, news and campus information, and relationships and networks within our communities.

Projections

- Through projects now underway, Brown will achieve a more streamlined, transparent, and accessible information environment that addresses the needs of internal and external constituencies and helps to advance the University’s strategic goals.
Conclusion

The self-study process has provided Brown with an excellent opportunity to draw together the many ways in which we have worked over the last several years to set a course for the institution and further strengthen our academic excellence, campus community, and financial sustainability. As we make progress toward our goals, we continue to raise our sights. There is a great deal that remains to be done to achieve our ambitions and, in a virtuous cycle, everything that we accomplish leads us to set the bar even higher. The visiting team’s review comes at around the halfway mark of Building on Distinction’s initial 10-year horizon. Thus, the timing could not be better for helping to evaluate what we have managed to achieve so far and providing guidance on how Brown continues to move forward as an outstanding and distinctive community advancing discovery, creativity, and learning at the highest levels.
Appendices

- Affirmation of Compliance with Federal Regulations Relating to Title IV
- E-Series Forms
- Financial Statements, June 30, 2017 and 2016 including Independent Auditor’s Report by KPMG LLP
- List of Workroom Documents