

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting**

**May 13, 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, Geoffrey Russom, Gabriel Taubin

Guests: Beth Bauer, Russell Carey, Linda Cook, Steve Hamburg, David Kertzer, Maud Mandel, Martin Maxey, Michael White

Professor Ruth Colwill opened the meeting at 3:05 p.m. Minutes of the 4/8 and 4/22 meetings were approved.

Professor Colwill began her Chair's report by announcing that Brown was ranked 5th among all national universities in Forbes Magazine this month. A heavy emphasis is placed on student evaluations and achievement in the methodology used.

An issue has come up with the Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee (TPAC) ballot. The Nominations Committee reported that there are no social science candidates who want to serve on the TPAC as much as Professor Alan Zuckerman. He has insisted that he would like to step down as vice-chair of Grievance to run for the TPAC. The FEC discussed the request with some expressing concern about the specific impact on the Grievance Committee as well as general concerns regarding the effects on governance of committee hopping and hidden agendas; another did not want to discourage faculty enthusiasm for a heavy service assignment. After some discussion, the FEC decided to ask Professor Zuckerman to submit a resignation letter to Professor Colwill stating that he is stepping down from the Grievance Committee and his agreement to serve as Chair next year so he can run for the TPAC. Professor Colwill will inform the Nominations Committee of their decision.

Professor Linda Cook, Chair of the Committee on the Status of Women (CSW), was invited to discuss the Committee's annual report distributed with the agenda. Discussion focused on two issues: the gender distribution of Seed, Salomon, and Advance Grants, and gender disparities in promotion from tenured associate to full professor. In reviewing data prepared by the Office of Institutional Diversity on the gender distribution of internal awards, the CSW noted that the gender distribution varied and that the data showed no clear pattern. The CSW voiced concern that women may be trading Advance Grants for Seed Grants. The CSW recommends that it be made clear to women in advertising of Advance grants that they are an additional resource to Seed Grants, not an alternative. Women should be encouraged to apply for both. With regard to promotion for associate to full, the CSW proposes the Dean of Faculty's office study how the process is handled in various departments. The CSW found that there was no consensus about the impact of delayed promotion of women to full professor status. Some felt that the delay spared women a burden of additional responsibility whereas others felt that it hampered ability to obtain external funding and had a negative effect on professional status. There seem to be discipline specific effects. In response to a question, the CSW stressed the importance of three types of data for further study: (1) lab usage by gender, (2) external review of salaries, and (3)

implementation of the new leave policy. They had not considered access to graduate students as a function of gender which could impact research productivity in the sciences. The CSW hopes that the new Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED) will continue to track, monitor and encourage action on the status of women at Brown.

Professor Steve Hamburg was invited to discuss the Campus Planning Advisory Board (CPAB) annual report also distributed with the agenda. Pamela O'Neil, Associate Provost, now chairs the Board replacing Richard Spies, Executive VP for Planning, who still attends all the meetings. Professor Hamburg does not feel that this arrangement is consistent with the mandate that boards are chaired by the senior administrator responsible for making the decisions. Unless the Provost chairs this board, the CPAB cannot fulfill its charge. Other concerns about the operation of the CPAB included inadequate consultation. Although they do have some voice on campus planning issues, they are not consulted on planning priorities. There is no faculty input from the Board in the early stages of the planning process for major capital projects. The CPAB has had no say in the changes on the physical campus—buildings have been shuffled with no faculty input and they were not consulted on the timing of the Walkway project on the campus green, which resulted in disruption of classes this semester. Discussion ensued whereby Professor Hamburg and the FEC agreed that a liaison from the CPAB to Design and Planning Committee would resolve some of these issues.

VP Russell Carey and Professor Beth Bauer joined the FEC for discussion of the Campus Life Advisory Board's (CLAB) annual report circulated with the agenda. Items discussed by the CLAB in the past year centered on three goals of the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE): Enhancing excellence through diversity, building a shared sense of Community, and enhancing the quality of our facilities, infrastructure and administrative support. The Board discussed the NEASC Accreditation Self-Study on Students as well as the Gender Neutral Housing Working Group Report. In the spring, the CLAB focused on the residential experience at Brown. The Board provided input to the Faculty Fellows Advisory Program and the Task Force on Undergraduate Education. The CLAB was consulted early in the planning process about structural plans for the dorms. Integration of athletics and student life was discussed. The Subcommittee on Athletics and the CLAB will continue to consider how to more closely integrate student life with athletics. Efforts have been made this past year to involve coaches in more non-traditional settings on campus.

Professor Martin Maxey, Chair of TPAC, provided the FEC with a preliminary report from the Committee's activities to date. TPAC is still meeting and the Provost has yet to respond on a few cases, some of which may need to go to the Committee on Diversity in Hiring (CDH). Several departments waited too long to schedule their tenure or promotion cases with TPAC resulting in a last-minute crunch in May. Because of this, some recommendations for promotion to full professor had to be postponed until the fall. Clear deadlines need to be established and communicated to the departments for when specific cases must be presented to TPAC. Professor Maxey provided a summary on the number of cases reviewed by TPAC—21 recommendations for reappointment of faculty at the rank of assistant professor, 19 departmental recommendations of promotion to associate professor with tenure (3 of which the departments recommended against awarding tenure), and 12 recommendations of associate professors to be promoted to full. TPAC studied very carefully the 3 cases for which tenure was not recommended by the departments after which TPAC concurred with the departments in all 3 cases. There was some discussion about TPAC's operating procedures and issues of how the departments present the cases. Associate professors are sometimes appointed without tenure for a number of reasons. It is important that appointment letters to these candidates be worded very carefully so that faculty will know when they are expected to be up for tenure. Departments need better guidance on how

to prepare and conduct their tenure and promotion reviews. According to the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, Chapters 14 and 16 of the Handbook for Academic Administration have been updated although Professor Maxey has not yet seen the revisions. The FEC asked if it is plausible to educate departments on how to present their cases to the TPAC. Professor Maxey replied “yes”. Departments could also benefit from professional training in how to craft an effective letter for the annual reviews. There also needs to be more oversight to ensure that all departments conduct careful annual reviews of assistant professors. Professor Kim Boekelheide will chair TPAC next year. Professor Maxey will send a final version of the report to Ms. Moreau in Faculty Governance once TPAC has completed its work and all reports are in.

Professor Maud Mandel presented the annual report from the Committee on Diversity in Hiring (CDH). The Committee did a self-study of procedures for reviewing negative tenure and promotion cases. After the CDH worked with the FEC to develop a set of procedures for reviewing negative tenure and promotion cases, they were informed by the Office of Institutional Diversity that there were existing procedures already in place but which had not been carried over with last year’s CDH. The CDH participated in the FEC’s review of faculty governance and proposal for CFED in addition to reviewing monthly reports of searches and negative recommendations on tenure review. After discussing the negative decisions regarding tenure review, the CDH concluded that there were cases of fairness that should be brought to the President’s attention. The CDH feels that some of the problems they face now will be remedied by the new CFED. Professor Mandel voiced concern about the possibility of TPAC bringing cases to them for review in the next two weeks. The CDH may not get through them before they disband on July 1. Professor Colwill noted there will be carryover of some of the existing CDH members to the new CFED. The FEC inquired as to the number of shortlists for faculty searches that lacked diversity. Most searches have good representation of women or minorities, but usually not both in one search. The old Affirmative Action Monitoring Committee model vs. the new CDH model was discussed. Is the new model working? Professor Mandel feels that it is. Enforcement of affirmative action procedures in the departments and training for AARs on diversity was discussed. Departments must be on board with commitment to recruiting women and minorities in order for the AARs to be effective. Do we have departments that have not added women or minorities to their ranks? The difficulty of imposing diversity on departments from the outside was discussed. Brenda Allen has offered to have an external review of her office conducted so that we can see how diversity at Brown has progressed.

Michael White was invited to report on last year’s activities of the Library Advisory Board (LAB). The Board met 3 times last year discussing the challenges of matching library development with new priorities of the PAE. The LAB feels that some of the PAE’s initiatives do not fully account for resource demands of the Library. The LAB reviewed recent upgrades to physical facilities and digital resources and met with Marisa Quinn and Richard Spies on the status of the PAE review. They also reviewed the NEASC re-accreditation process. Due to lack of a quorum at their last meeting in April, the LAB could not elect their new faculty vice-chair for next year and will do so in the fall. Discussion ensued with regard to the technology of the library and its resources. The library always manages to wind up at the bottom of the priority list for fund-raising. The FEC suggested the LAB brainstorm about more effective ways for the University to raise money for the library. Discussion ensued about the different needs of the departments across disciplines. Professor White encouraged the FEC to send their comments directly to the Librarian instead of funneling them through the LAB.

Provost Kertzer was invited to discuss tenure and promotion standards with the FEC. This continues a series of discussions that the FEC has had with various groups and follows a faculty forum on the subject that was held on 4/29. Provost Kertzer was puzzled by faculty concern

about tenure standards. Does it stem entirely from a recent tenure denial in the Humanities? The FEC Chair suggested that the concern goes back to Provost Zimmer who said that it was too easy to get tenure at Brown and who urged the TPAC to be tougher and to set higher standards for tenure. The FEC also mentioned the draft NEASC report on the faculty that included a bullet to address the 67% tenure rate. There was discussion of how the process seemed tougher, that TPAC grilled departments, and that there had been no actual change in the overall rate of tenure. There were 4 negative cases that went to him for review this year. At least one denial of tenure was based on teaching. The FEC raised the question of whether the priorities that have been placed on research may be affecting the amount of attention junior faculty pay to teaching. What is the process that we should use to change standards for tenure? What can we do to make the process transparent so that the whole University is on the same page? Brown has a reputation for getting tenure right – not too difficult and not too easy. This gives us an edge over peer institutions with more resources. Administration should find better ways of rewarding and appreciating their faculty especially those who have been here for so many years and worked hard in many areas of the University. There was extended discussion of how Brown can be a stronger research institution with a stronger Graduate School without jeopardizing its culture of valuing undergraduate teaching, interdisciplinary collaborations, and being supportive of junior faculty colleagues. The FEC thanked Provost Kertzer for coming and will invite him back again next academic year.

Professor Colwill then thanked all the FEC members who complete their terms June 30th: Professors Campbell, Dahlberg, Dill, and Evdokimova who were present; Professors Jenkins and Smith who were not able to come today. Professor Dill was then presented with a special gift of appreciation for her work as FEC Chair in 2006-07. The annual FEC end-of-year luncheon is Thursday, May 15 at the Faculty Club.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary