

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting**

**April 22, 2008
3:00-5:00 p.m.**

Corporation Room, University Hall

Minutes

Present: Ruth Colwill, Chair; James Dreier, Vice-chair; Ann Dill, Past Chair; Albert Dahlberg, James Campbell, Svetlana Evdokimova, Chad Jenkins, Geoffrey Russom, Gabriel Taubin

Guests: Brenda Allen, Clyde Briant, Linda Cook, John Davenport, John Donoghue, Carolyn Dean, Elizabeth Love, David Lowe, Steve Lubar

Professor Colwill opened the meeting at 3:03 p.m.

Vice President Clyde Briant was invited to discuss the annual report from the Research Advisory Board (RAB) previously distributed with the agenda. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) report is still pending from the RAB subcommittee doing the study and will not be ready in time for report at the May 6 faculty meeting. The FEC expressed concern about the low priority this issue had received. Faculty are frustrated by the top-down implementation of the new IRB policy and by the fact that a year later they are still waiting for the Administration to address the IRB changes which have had a direct impact on undergraduate and social science research projects. Vice President Briant explained that he must wait until the report is ready for his review so that he can fully understand the issues before addressing them. As we approach this, we must be clear on the solutions. The FEC had also asked the RAB to look at the effectiveness of seed grants and Salomon awards. The RAB will get the figures for the FEC. The RAB discussed ways in which compliance procedures can be communicated to departments, also part of the IRB situation. All department administrators will be required to take a course on compliance rules and regulations. Ms. Regina White will be running these programs for all department administrators. If Brown is audited by the federal government, we will be prepared. Reducing risk and ensuring compliance are key priorities of the OVPR. There was some discussion about consulting rules and regulations. Vice President Briant or Professor Robert Hurt will present the RAB annual report at the May 6 faculty meeting.

Professor Linda Cook, Chair of the Committee on the Status of Women (CSW), was invited to discuss the CSW's comments regarding the creation of a Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED). They proposed amendments they feel will preserve more of the charge and function of the CSW in the new CFED. Their biggest concern was the risk of women issues being marginalized or forgotten by the new CFED. We should encourage action on status of women rather than just identifying problems. The CSW proposed that language for a subcommittee of the CFED be formed to focus on the status

of women that would meet once a semester and report back to the CFED. The subcommittee would suggest changes for improving the status of women where inequalities currently exist rather than just monitoring or reviewing the issues. They also propose that there be a mechanism to address issues involving women and minorities that reach beyond faculty to students and staff so that the problems can be addressed in a consistent manner. The CSW did look at issues beyond their realm. Professor Cook raised a concern of her own that the current charge of the CSW states that the committee encourage changes in University policy and procedure that will improve the status of women faculty at Brown. Language should be added to the CFED's charge to preserve this intent. The FEC's consensus was that there should be a separate report on the status of women from the CFED. Language will be added to address the CSW's concerns and the revised CFED charge will be forwarded to the CSW for review prior to the May 6 faculty meeting.

Professor Steven Lubar presented a proposal to change the name of the John Nicholas Brown Center for the Study of American Civilization to the John Nicholas Brown Center for Public Humanities and Cultural Heritage. The new name is being proposed to catch up with a change made to the Center three years ago. There was concern by some faculty that the term "cultural heritage" had negative connotations and that the proposal had not been circulated broadly enough to departments prior to Academic Priorities Committee's (APC) consideration of it. Both of these issues have been addressed by Professor Lubar to the APC's satisfaction. He prepared an addendum addressing the use of "cultural heritage" describing in detail the history and use of the term. The FEC encouraged Professor Lubar to conduct additional follow up with those individuals who had raised concerns about the new name to ensure that their objections have actually been addressed prior to the faculty meeting on May 6.

Brenda Allen, Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Diversity and Carolyn Dean, Associate Dean of the Faculty, were invited to discuss NEASC's draft reports on hiring and recruitment and organization and governance. Brenda highlighted the reports in a power point presentation. She described the reaccreditation process, a written self-study required every 10 years with an interim report every 5 years. Brenda is bringing the governance and faculty chapters of the report to the FEC for its input while other chapters will be reviewed by other groups. The Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) is the framework for the strategic initiatives being studied in the reaccreditation. All plans are written in the context of the goals of the PAE identifying strengths and weaknesses. The appraisal part of the accreditation is the most challenging. They are reviewing 11 standards, all of which are related to the Plan, some of the reviews sparked by the accreditation report of 1998. The goal is to identify the most important initiatives to focus on over the next 10 years and to act on them.

Discussion ensued with regard to statements in the draft report about tenure rates and standards, and the relatively weak record of faculty research productivity. The NEASC process can be used to bring to the surface how change of culture at Brown can be addressed. Suggestions of how to better clarify the issues are welcome from the FEC. There was strong objection to the wording of the tenure section of the Hiring and

Recruitment report. It was viewed as premature given the upcoming forum and other FEC initiated discussions. The FEC suggested that the section should be suspended and not just reworded or rethought. Concern was also expressed that the Administration must be more careful about how it reports on the lack of faculty research productivity prior to the PAE; at times, they seem to blame the small size of the faculty and at other times they seem to place blame on the quality of the faculty. The addition of 100 FTEs has boosted faculty research productivity but has it had an impact on the curriculum and advising. Brenda reminded the FEC that this is a draft report reflecting where we are today and that it is subject to change in several drafts to come. Discussions are currently underway to improve department statements of criteria and to make sure those statements are communicated to junior faculty.

The NEASC reports will be edited again after all groups have been consulted. In the fall, the reports will be open to more public discussion and input and then Brenda will come back to the FEC with the edited versions. Professor Dill reiterated that consensus and mandates should not be implicated in the report because this is not where we are at this time. She cautioned that the administration must be candid about their approach so as not to undermine faculty's integrity. The FEC will be sponsoring a faculty forum on tenure standards on April 29th. Brenda thanked the FEC for their input.

Professor Colwill gave a chair's report. Approximately 60 associate professors have responded to the survey. She has not found anyone willing to serve on the Faculty Committee for the Campaign and needs more names from the FEC. Professor Colwill distributed a draft letter from the FEC to the Provost regarding the FAC's report on scholarly leaves for (Research) faculty. . The FEC's consensus is that this is a financial issue that should be taken on by the administration and not to be undertaken by another committee. They approved the draft letter. Professor Colwill asked the FEC if they could reach a unanimous recommendation on the issue of enhanced leaves for senior lecturers. Discussion of the current policy, exceptions to the policy and who should grant exceptions, and the impact on the curriculum of more frequent leaves ensued. It was suggested the FEC obtain a current leave application from the Dean's office and find out how the application process works.

Professor John Donoghue, Director of the Brain Science Program and John Davenport, Associate Director, were invited to discuss the proposal to transform and rename the Brain Science Program into the Brown Institute for Brain Science endorsed by the APC. Designation as an institute seems appropriate for an entity such as the Brain Science Program which oversees many research and other academic programs. The FEC thought that the question of tenure lines might come up at the faculty meeting because of the Watson Institute's request to have its own tenure lines. The APC also mentioned this. Their goal is not to have tenured faculty in the Institute. They would like to see term appointments that are not tenurable. This proposal will be presented by Professor Donoghue to the faculty in the form of a motion on May 6.

Professor David Lowe, Vice-chair of the Computing Advisory Board (CAB), was invited to discuss the CAB's annual report with the FEC. The Board met twice a month with

new Vice President Pickett. They have spent a lot of time discussing the IT Strategic Plan and its relation to the PAE discussing policy structures that will affect certain areas over time. Professor Lowe would like to see more work being done on basic email quotas for mail boxes. There are 109 projects on file with CIS; the first 60 are structural. Are CIS people interested in what the faculty needs are? Research computing has been discussed at length by the CAB. The FEC suggested Professor Lowe mention the portion of the budget that is dedicated to faculty needs when he reports to the faculty on May 6. He could give a projection of when some of the goals should be met.

Professor Colwill informed the FEC that the proposal for a University College Advisory Committee has been tabled after discussing it with Deans Bergeron and Bonde but that some of the issues to be considered by this committee might be addressed by an ad hoc committee set up by the FEC. A charge for such a committee will be discussed this summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Moreau
Secretary