

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting**

**November 9, 2010
3:00-5:00 p.m.
Corporation Room, University Hall**

Minutes

Present: Susan Allen, Cynthia Garcia Coll (Chair), Reid Cooper, Evelyn Hu-Dehart, Ben Raphael, Harold Roth, Philip Rosen, Peter Shank (Vice Chair), Chung-I Tan (Past Chair)

Guests: Peter Richardson, Peter Scharf

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The October 12, 2010 minutes were approved as submitted. With regard to the October 26 minutes, it was recommended there be record of Prof. Roth's comments about the Grievance committee having overturned a ruling by TPAC, the Provost and President to deny tenure in the past. After some discussion, the 10/26 minutes were approved as amended.

Since there are provisions in the Faculty Rules for the Grievance Committee to have some oversight into the Provost's procedures where tenure denials are concerned, their Committee charge should be compared with that of CFED's. Prof. Shank will follow up on this.

Prof. Garcia Coll recently spoke with someone in the Dean of the College's office about Faculty who have raised concerns about the on-line teaching evaluation form and was advised that some FEC members meet with Dean Bergeron to discuss it. Profs. Tan and Reid volunteered to accompany her to a meeting with the Dean.

Peter Scharf of Classics joined the FEC for discussion about concerns he has regarding inequities for lecturers/senior lecturers at Brown. It is not the first time he has raised these issues. In March 2007, Faculty adopted a new Faculty leave policy that does not include lecturers. However, there is a provision for lecturers to take a leave outside of the regular leave policy for Faculty. Most lecturers are language teachers or spouses of distinguished faculty. Some are artists. Many lecturers teach 4-6 courses a year, some teach graduate students and conduct research. Many of them do the same work as a professorship. The designation of senior lecturer is not a principled categorization, and Peter feels that Brown should consider re-categorizing lecturer/senior lectureships. He noted that Bill Crossgrove, a retired associate dean of the Faculty, produced a report on lecturers several years ago. It would be beneficial to have a copy of that report. Peter voiced some personal concerns about his own life as a senior lecturer. After hearing them, the FEC advised him to contact the Grievance Committee. They will take the general lecturer issues under consideration and let him know their decision as soon as possible. In the meantime, Ms. Moreau will see about getting a copy of Bill Crossgrove's report. After Peter Scharf's departure and some careful consideration, the FEC decided that the general inequity issues Peter brought to the table should go to CFED. He is asking for an evolution from senior lecturer to professor. It's possible that the vagueness of the lecturer/senior lecturer categories is intentional to allow the University some flexibility in recruiting distinguished faculty.

The President would like the FEC to suggest several faculty names for consideration to serve on the Search Committee for the new Provost. The FEC discussed several names ensuring that the

final list includes Faculty members who are knowledgeable in Faculty Governance. The FEC decided on a diverse list of sixteen Faculty, four from each of the four areas of the University that will be submitted to President Simmons after their meeting adjourns.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussing the FEC's motions on tenure and tenure procedures for presentation at the December 7 faculty meeting. Prof. Reid proposed that the FEC present a generic motion for Faculty to approve a statement of principles and postpone presenting motions to change the Faculty Rules until second semester. Maybe this will help to avoid the Faculty from getting "bogged down" with discussion about substantive revisions to the text of the Faculty Rules. A question was immediately raised as to whether or not the FEC could legally do this. Prof. Garcia Coll phoned Prof. Richardson, Parliamentarian, who dropped by to review the proposal and advise the FEC. He mentioned that some Faculty may say they do not have an understanding of what the changes are because the text is not in front of them, and what would happen if some Faculty approved some concepts and not others? Such a motion must be phrased in a way in which the FEC does not control the debate, which would be against Robert's Rules. Discussion ensued with regard to the pragmatics of debate. Prof. Rosen asked the Parliamentarian if someone could question parliamentary procedure if the FEC introduced a statement of principles. Yes, they could and depending on the nature of the objection, Prof. Richardson may have to rule against the FEC's proposal. The FEC could simply be postponing the inevitable by presenting such a statement prior to presenting motions to change the Faculty Rules. The FEC was grateful for the Parliamentarian's input and thanked him for coming on such short notice. Is this the most efficient way to get something passed at the December Faculty Meeting? Prof. Reid would like to revise his proposal and bring it back to the FEC at the next meeting. The FEC will continue to work on dividing Motion Two, a challenge since the actual division of the Motion was not spoken to at the October Faculty meeting.

Prof. Garcia Coll suggested they meet next Tuesday, Nov. 16, in lieu of the 23rd due to Thanksgiving. The FEC will check their calendars and Ms. Moreau will confirm with them asap.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary of the FEC