

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting**

February 10, 2009

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Corporation Room, University Hall

Minutes

Present: James Dreier, Chair; Gerald Diebold, Vice-chair; Ruth Colwill, Past Chair; Cynthia Garcia Coll, William Rakowski, Gabriel Taubin, Nicolas Wey-Gomez

Guests: Katherine Bergeron, Courtney Colton, Dana Eldridge, Reiko Koyama, James Padbury, Kathleen Shannon, Patrick Vivier, Jerry Wolf

Professor James Dreier called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. Minutes of the January 27, 2009 meeting were approved.

Professor Dreier gave a chair's report. He met with Dean Vohra yesterday who said he would be happy to work with the FEC on strategies for improving faculty's participation in faculty governance. Professors Simmons and Hu-Dehart, Nominations Committee chair and vice-chair respectively, will be invited to a future FEC meeting to discuss their issues with the FEC and Deans Vohra and Wing. Professor Gatsonis, last year's Nominations Committee chair, will be invited to participate in the discussion. They talked about faculty expansion in the future which is already included in the departments' staffing plans. When the FEC officers spoke with Provost Kertzer about this, he mentioned that not all staffing plans are approved by the departments. This raises the question of how many vacancies will actually be filled.

Target hiring has not been frozen and can still include senior faculty, which the FEC worries might be too costly in light of the current recession. Perhaps Brown should be focusing target hiring on junior faculty instead of senior faculty. Should investment for diversity lie with the hiring of graduate TA's? It was suggested Dean Bonde be invited to an FEC meeting to talk about the logistics of graduate admissions. Perhaps the FEC should convey a sense of the Faculty to the Administration about target hiring. They cannot make the decisions but maybe they can have some influence on them. Different departments have different needs where faculty is concerned, so it would be hard to make a unified judgment on this.

A replacement will be needed for Professor Stephen Foley as Secretary of the Faculty while he is out on medical leave for the remainder of this semester. The FEC will ask if the former Secretary, Professor Barrett Hazeltine, would be willing to fill in for him. Other faculty were discussed as backup should Barrett not be available. Professor Foley is also a member of the Brown University Community Council (BUCC). The FEC will

leave the decision up to the Nominations Committee whether or not he should be replaced on the BUCC.

Professor Dreier and Dean Doherty discussed the FEC's question regarding the appearance of deadline dates in her proposal to amend Faculty Rules and Regulations (FRR) regarding tenure procedures. There is no particular reason for the February 1 deadline to remain in the text. The purpose of including the October 1 deadline is to protect the junior faculty member. There appears to be no reason to delete either date as they both seem to be firm for the foreseeable future.

Vice-President Clyde Briant agreed to post the Research Advisory Board's IRB report on his office's web site which will be posted soon. Professor Dreier asked the vice-president if he could provide him with a copy of the draft Conflict of Interest Policy for advanced screening by the FEC. He would be happy to do so.

President Simmons invited Professor Dreier to dine with her and members of NEASC on April 5th but he is unable to attend. He called for a volunteer to represent the FEC at this dinner. Professor Coll will do it if no one else can attend.

The FEC reviewed two draft amendments to the Grievance Procedures proposed by Russell Carey: (1) Procedures governing dismissal of a faculty member, and (2) procedures governing appeal of a finding by the Provost of sexual harassment. Procedures governing dismissal of a member of the faculty would be a new addition to the FRR that would parallel the levels for achieving tenure. An ad hoc committee will be formed to investigate allegations which may lead to dismissal of a faculty member and the procedure for handling such cases is specified. The ad hoc committee would be elected by the FEC for confidentiality reasons. There are no provisions in the proposal on procedures for addressing issues with a faculty member prior to notifying the Dean of the Faculty of an allegation. How will one know when a formal complaint should be filed? In some cases, wouldn't a sufficient number of written warnings to the faculty member be required prior to the formal allegation? Perhaps it should be stated somewhere that this procedure should only be followed at a certain point in time. Do we need formal safeguards? Not if action would require these procedures.

The sexual harassment grievance procedures were amended by removing the Committee on Grievance in its entirety. The Committee would like to have some input into the procedures governing the appeal of the Provost's finding of sexual harassment. The FEC will need their input soon because they must move forward with this proposal. A question was raised about the timing of when the faculty member is notified of the details of the allegations against him/her. The faculty member is "informed in writing of the allegation" and asked to meet with the Provost. It is at the meeting with the Provost that the faculty member "receives a written copy of the complaint and the name of the person filing the complaint". How does one prepare for a discussion with the Provost if they are not aware of the charges filed against them? Professor Dreier will inquire if this was Russell's intent when he wrote the proposal. The FEC also suggests that the title of the proposal be reworded.

Students Reiko Koyama, Jerry Wolf, and Dana Eldridge presented a motion to remove Columbus Day on the University Calendar and rename it Fall Weekend, which would fall on the second Monday in October beginning in the fall of 2009. The FEC approved of the motion but felt that too much emphasis was placed on the rationale which could be shortened considerably. Professor Dreier reminded the student guests that faculty will be voting on the substance of the motion and not on the rationale. A formal statement outlining the University's stance on the holiday in light of the provisions of the Slavery and Justice Steering Committee, recognition of the Indigenous community, and the University's commitment as an institution of higher education will need to be done separately. The statement should go to the Brown University Community Council. Professor Wey-Gomez suggested the energy of the holiday be re-directed, perhaps by naming the holiday Heritage Day and having a forum. The students had thought about that and considered renaming the holiday Tomato Day. The FEC's consensus was to move forward with the motion to rename the holiday on the University's calendar and to re-direct its energy. The students will send Professor Dreier a revised version by February 20 for the March 3 faculty meeting.

Dean Bergeron spoke with the FEC about removing Modes of Thought Courses from the FRR as they have not existed as a separate program for 20 years. The FEC agreed that the section of the FRR be removed and any references to it. In its place, the Dean would like to add language about Departmental Independent Studies Programs (DISP's). It's an important part of the undergraduate program and the FRR contains language only about Independent Study Programs (ISP's) and Group Independent Study Programs (GISP's) but nothing about the DISP's. This omission is confusing to faculty members because distinction between Brown's ISP's and GISP's and the DISP's is not clear, Brown's program having distinct rules and set deadlines while the departmental programs have practically nothing. Adding information about the DISP's will make it much clearer. Dean Bergeron will present these motions at the March 3 faculty meeting and will be invited to the 2/24 FEC meeting to give a second annual report on the College Curriculum Council's (CCC) activities in the current academic year. The CCC's annual report will also be presented on March 3.

Drs. James Padbury and Patrick Vivier were invited to present a proposal of a Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences (CCTS) which has been endorsed by the Academic Priorities Committee. Brown has been the recipient of the NIH's CTSA Planning Grant which led to the development of this proposal. The CCTS will foster new collaborative, interdisciplinary research programs across Brown and its affiliated hospitals and institutions and is already drawing linkages from across the University. Social sciences at Brown will be brought into this as well as the State where pilot projects will include the University of RI, for example. "Translational" has been really taken to heart. The Center is still in the planning process, but we already have the parts to be competitive for CTSA awards, the infrastructure grant that will bring this all together. Brown will apply for the NIH award in October, 2009. The FEC asked what will happen if they do not get the award money in 2009. They are looking at two years of sustained support, the main sources being Lifespan and the hospitals. The NIH does not fund anything on the first

submission. Brown will provide space for the Center either in the 4th floor of Arnold Lab or in Davol Square. The motion to recommend the establishment of the Center will be presented at the March 3 faculty meeting.

Professor Diebold proposed adding language to the section of the FRR pertaining to the Faculty and Students stating that any document describing a directive or policy that requires mandatory faculty signature be voted on by the Faculty prior to its implementation. Procedures for introduction of new documents or amendments to existing documents should first come to all Faculty including the Research Advisory Board (RAB) who will hold a faculty forum for input. The FEC will then review the documents for additional amendments followed by a faculty vote. The principle of this is understandable. After some discussion, the FEC's consensus was that the language be included in the RAB's charge making it more visible to the Faculty. Appeals could come to the FEC. We would need to think about what would happen should the RAB cease to exist at some point in the future which happened with the College Advisory Board (CAB). It's not clear at this time if Dean Bergeron will revive it. The FEC should ask about this when she visits with them at the 2/24 FEC meeting. The FEC will ask the RAB to review all existing forms that require faculty's signature. It was suggested there be a resolution at a faculty meeting so that Faculty's voice is heard on this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary