



BROWN

Brown University Faculty Bulletin

Volume X/Number 1
Current Issue: December 2009

FACULTY BULLETIN TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECEMBER 2009

	PAGE
Editorial Introduction.....	2
Peter Wegner and Peter Richardson, Editors	
A New Look at Brown’s Tenure System and Junior Faculty Development.....	4
David I. Kertzer, Provost	
Thoughts on Tenure.....	6
Maurice Glicksman, Provost Emeritus	
On Tenure and Institutional Ethics.....	9
Geoffrey Russom, Professor Emeritus of English	
The OVPR Research Advisory Board	11
Clyde L. Briant, Vice President for Research	
Serving as FEC Chair	14
Chung-I Tan, Chair of the Faculty/FEC	
Brown University Library at the Heart of Brown’s Academic Mission	17
Evelyn Lincoln, Vice Chair, Library Advisory Board James N. Green, Co-Chair, Library Organizational Review Team	
Horace’s Legacy: Remembering Ted Sizer.....	20
Eileen Landay, Adjunct Senior Lecturer of Education	
What is the Case? To the Memory of Valerie Ayer Hayden.....	22
Philip J. Davis, Professor Emeritus of Applied Mathematics	
Ayer’s Philosophical Dreams.....	24
Peter Wegner, Professor Emeritus of Computer Science	
Armistice Day—Veterans Day.....	26
Peter D. Richardson, Professor of Engineering and Physiology	
Next Issue.....	29

Editorial Introduction

Peter Wegner and Peter Richardson
Editors

This issue includes articles by the Provost David Kertzer and former Provost Maurice Glicksman about Brown's tenure policy, and comments from Geoffrey Russom on his experience in going from an Assistant Professor to Department Chair under it; also articles about the Brown Research Advisory Board, the FEC, and the Library. These are followed by a series of articles with a broad theme of commemoration - about Ted Sizer, the philosopher Ayer, and Armistice Day - Veterans Day on campus.

David Kertzer discusses the role of the ad hoc tenure committee in reviewing and evaluating Brown's tenure standards. This follows The New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) reported in a recent re-accreditation review that Brown historically promotes faculty to tenure at a higher rate than comparable institutions, and the standards for quality in promotions should be reviewed in this light. Historically we have given emphasis to teaching: we did not keep Lars Onsager of Chemistry, who later won a Nobel Prize for work done here, because his teaching abilities were not good enough.

Maurice Glicksman reviews tenure-granting practice while he was Provost and asserts that tenure review was generally adequate, though a few irregularities were brought to light by him and resolved.

Geoffrey Russom suggests that his own evolution from hiring to tenure in the 1970s and to Professor and head of the English Department was well done and that that current criteria for tenure are good and should be preserved.

We look forward to hearing more about the analysis of our tenure policy and implementation from the Ad Hoc advisory committee.

Clyde Briant, Vice President for Research, describes the activities of the Research Advisory Board (RAB) that assist faculty on grant preparation, conflict of interest issues, and other research matters.

Chung-I Tan, Chair of the FEC, provides a glimpse into the current work of the FEC and their interaction with the President, the Provost, the Deans, and the Board of Fellows in addressing the needs and concerns of the Faculty.

Evelyn Lincoln, Vice Chair, Library Advisory Board and James Green, co-chair of the Library Organizational Review Team, explore how the Library serves the Brown teaching and research community. The recently redesigned 21st century web page offers an array of research tools and links with twenty-four hour global access.

Eileen Landay, Education, describes Ted Sizer's contribution to education through his 1984 book "Horace's Compromise" and later publications. As head of Brown's Education Department he developed an undergraduate teacher education program (UTEP) that has contributed nationally and is widely appreciated. He died on October 21, 2009.

In a cluster of short items about the philosopher Ayer, who visited Brown several times because his daughter Valerie was married to Brown's Professor Hayden, we have first Phil Davis, Applied Mathematics Emeritus, with a reprint of Ayer's letter of the 1970s on his philosophical dreams about the status of philosophy. Secondly, Peter Wegner, Computer Science Emeritus, responds to the letter by relating Ayer's dreams to those of Bertand Russell in "Principia Mathematica" and "The History of Western Philosophy", whose dreams are widely discussed in the philosophical literature. Ayer wrote a biography on Russell shortly after Russell's death in 1971.

Finally, Peter Richardson recalls the participation of President Simmons and Provost Kertzer in observing Veterans' Day, 11 November 2009, with others on campus, and - with some personal recollections of WW II - hopes that observations of this going forward can be facilitated by cancelling classes in the middle of the day to permit more to participate in the remembrance ceremonies, which this year included reading of stirring letters of alumni when on active duty.

Many may remember the historian David Underdown, who was at Brown as the Munro-Wilkinson Professor of European History from 1968-1986. He spent his last 10 years before retirement at Yale, and so was not commemorated with a Memorial Minute. He died this Fall, and an obituary is at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/oct/26/david-underdown-obituary>.

A New Look at Brown's Tenure System and Junior Faculty Development

David I. Kertzer
Provost

No institutional practice is more central to an academic institution's values and aspirations than the methods and standards through which it awards life tenure to members of the faculty. The appointment this fall of an ad hoc faculty committee to review issues related to faculty development, promotion, and tenure represents an important opportunity for the Brown faculty, and for the University as a whole, to reflect on the meaning of academic tenure, the method by which untenured colleagues are considered for tenure, and the standards that we apply. It is also an occasion to evaluate whether we are effectively advancing Brown's standing as a major research university whose faculty are at the forefront of their fields, excellent teachers and mentors, and contributors to the university community.

Such reviews do not occur often, but they are not unprecedented at Brown. In the mid-1990s, Provost Jim Pomerantz appointed a strategic planning task force on "The University/College" aimed at identifying what would be required to advance our graduate programs to the first ranks. Its report, issued in 1997, concluded that "In the long run, it is by the recruitment and cultivation of the best young scholars that the university can most effectively ensure excellence in its faculty. In general, the university does a good job in locating and attracting excellent recent PhDs to join its assistant professor ranks, and in providing a supportive environment for their career development; however, at the crucial point of tenure, Brown falls far short of its aspirations of ensuring that its faculty consists of the best it could." The task force made a series of recommendations to address this situation, but no action was taken and the report has been largely forgotten.

A dozen years later, in language that recalled the 1997 report, Brown's decennial reaccreditation review, conducted under the auspices of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), raised questions and concerns about our tenure policies and practices. In particular the NEASC report called attention to the fact that "Brown has historically promoted faculty into the tenured ranks at exceptionally high rates when compared to its peer institutions, and especially when compared to the rates at those institutions of the stature to which it aspires."

In short, the NEASC outside review team, chaired by President Amy Gutmann of the University of Pennsylvania and including a number of distinguished colleagues from several of our peer institutions, identified a serious issue about which the Brown faculty had itself earlier expressed concern. But between the time of the 1997 task force report and the NEASC report of 2009, much had happened at Brown. Sizeable investments had been made in the faculty, not only in increasing its size significantly—primarily by hiring assistant professors-- but also by increasing faculty salaries to be more competitive and creating a much more generous sabbatical policy to support faculty research. In addition, major investments were made in providing facilities to support advanced research. All of these measures were enthusiastically endorsed by the Corporation with the understanding

that they were essential to ensuring that Brown could effectively attract and retain the very best scholars and teachers. It is not surprising in this context that, on reflecting on the recent NEASC report, the Academic Affairs committee of the Corporation asked the administration to engage the faculty in a thorough review of our tenure practices and standards.

We should take the report of the NEASC review team, and the Corporation's response to it, as an opportunity to consider -- on our own terms and with Brown's own institutional mores and aspirations in mind -- whether our tenure practices and policies reflect our ambitions as a university. Do they reflect our aim to ensure that Brown is a leading international university whose faculty exert a major influence in their field nationally and internationally? Are students and faculty at other universities throughout the world looking to the research and artistic production of Brown faculty in their own education and research? Do our faculty appointment policies and practices ensure a continuing flow of new ideas and approaches in all of our academic departments, or do they lead too often to departments that are overwhelmingly composed of tenured faculty?

Whether Brown thirty years from now will be one of the world's great universities or something quite different will depend in part on tenure decisions made in the next years. To award tenure to a junior faculty member means to commit one of the university's precious few faculty slots in any area of the curriculum to that person for three decades or more. If the faculty member is not destined to be among those who will significantly influence their scholarly or artistic fields, and not in a position to attract the best graduate students in their fields, Brown will have but a modest place among the country's and the world's universities.

I am chairing the Ad Hoc Committee which is reviewing these matters. In selecting the nine faculty members who, along with the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Biology and Medicine, constitute the committee, I sought those who embodied our aspirations for faculty who are major scholarly figures nationally and internationally while also being excellent and devoted teachers and university citizens. The committee has been meeting since early October and is meeting frequently throughout the fall semester to get broad faculty input, including meetings with various faculty committees (FEC, TPAC, CFED) and the holding of a general Faculty Forum. The ad hoc committee has also been gathering information both about Brown's own tenure decision-making processes and rate of tenuring, and about the way that the tenure system works at our peer universities. Ultimately, what is important is not what percentage of junior faculty receive tenure, but that we have in place a system that ensures that our tenure process is leading us to have as strong a faculty—and as strong a university--as we can.

It is my hope that after gathering all of this internal and external input during the fall semester, the ad hoc committee will be able to bring to the full Faculty some time next semester both a critique of our current tenure system and a set of recommendations for strengthening it. I can think of nothing more consequential for ensuring Brown's future.

Thoughts on Tenure

**Maurice Glicksman
Provost Emeritus, Brown University**

Apparently Brown University is promoting junior faculty to tenure in numbers sufficiently large to raise questions with the outside accrediting agency. The fraction achieving tenure has risen measurably in the past fifteen years. This could be a sign of excellent choices made in appointing junior faculty. Or it could signal a lack of rigor in the system, which should be investigated. The Provost has appointed a committee to look into the matter and report to him and to the faculty.

My views on tenure (the right to hold the position as long as the holder is able to perform competently) are simple: It should exist to protect the holder's right to teach, research and speak and write whatever the holder wishes, without fear of termination of his or her position. Limits to those freedoms can be imposed if there are flagrant violations of the laws of the state. Clearly the institution has to assure itself of the value brought to it by the faculty member granted tenure, and takes some time (typically six or seven years) to gain sufficient knowledge of the competence of the person before making the long-term commitment.

Unfortunately, the process often has participating groups with different goals. At Brown University the groups are: (1) the junior faculty; (2) the department's tenured faculty; (3) the tenure review committee; (4) the deans of the faculty, provost and president, and (5) the Board of Fellows. The University will benefit if these goals can be aligned. [The Schools – Medicine and Public Health – also play a role.]

Most junior faculty members are acutely aware of the tenure decision to come, and make their decisions about what they do accordingly. In a system geared to the goal of ever-improving the quality of the University, the ideal is to have each tenure decision lead to an improvement in that quality, i.e., put in crass terms, each newly-tenured person should perform better than his or her peer in the department. The junior member works hard to teach well, to excel in research, and to carry a fair share of the load in service, by advising students and participating in committees of the department and the University. Because the University also gives weight to the judgments of outside referees, junior faculty members have to demonstrate the quality of their efforts to peers outside the University, through publications and presentations in the appropriate disciplinary forums. All of this presents that junior member of the department with major challenges.

In my years of service to Brown, I found no evidence that junior faculty acted improperly in the tenure process, although some who were not awarded tenure felt that the decision made by the University was in error.

The key to an outstanding university is a strong faculty. The important role in achieving this is played by the faculty making the recommendations for appointments and promotions to tenure. Hence the departmental role in the process is vital to its success

and to the success of the university. The institution tries to emphasize this and assure the departmental faculty of its support of the goal of improving the quality of the departmental faculty. One such step, taken for this purpose among others, is the use of “staffing plans” to assure the department that rejection of a junior person for tenure would not remove a faculty position. Another is the willingness to take exceptional steps to attract outstanding new faculty.

However, departments are often conflicted in making their decisions. Working along side a bright young peer, who has become a member of your small team, makes the decision on your colleague’s continuing presence difficult. In very few cases is the junior faculty member not helpful to the other members of the department. Rejecting her or him can be traumatic to the tenured faculty in the department.

I recall two instances of improper behavior of a department in tenure recommendations. In one case, the department had a difficult decision, because the case did not appear overwhelmingly strong. In fact, the vote of the tenured faculty was apparently a close majority for tenure. However, the department attempted to hide this split within its faculty, by asking for and getting the faculty to agree to a second vote of unanimity, so as to impress the tenure committee. Knowledge of the actual voting actions was not available to the tenure committee or the senior administration until after the tenure committee had supported the department’s “unanimous” recommendation.

The second case involved a departmental tenure review committee withholding an outside letter from their colleagues – and from the review bodies as well – because it contained criticism of some of the work of the tenure candidate. They feared that such comments could not be successfully countered, and that their judgment that the candidate should be tenured would not be supported. The junior faculty member did receive tenure, although the deception was discovered late in the process, because the writer of the critical letter called me to ask if his letter was in the file, and sent me a copy of it.

Such misbehavior is ethically unacceptable and does neither the university nor the department any good. It undermines the relationship of trust that is important in an academic institution, and leads to an aura of skepticism about the departmental commitment to increasing excellence, which is not healthy for the institution. I hope that the two examples I note were aberrations, which were not repeated---but I suspect not.

Not all departmental recommendations are approved, but rejections at the dean, provost or presidential level are rare. One of those may be worth noting. A department came to the tenure committee with a case very weak on paper, although with very good letters of recommendation. The president accepted my recommendation to deny tenure. The senior faculty came *en masse* to a meeting with the president and me, to press their case. I pointed out the weakness of the faculty member’s record, and then asked why a scholar prominent in the field was not among the outside referees. The response was that they expected him to be critical, because he was known to be critical of his senior colleague, who had been the Brown candidate’s mentor. I told the Brown faculty I would like to hear his opinion, and they agreed to call him. I did the calling. He gave us very

interesting advice: “If you give him tenure now, your department will be roundly criticized for awarding tenure to a person with a weak case. But he is a very good scholar; his trouble is that he has not published the very fine work he has done. Find a way to keep him!” We did, and tenure came somewhat later, on a strong case.

The provost and president share the goal of improved faculty quality. But they are also concerned if the fraction of faculty tenured becomes very high (80% or more), because the university’s ability to enter new fields and change the disciplinary foci is then restricted, and the cost of instruction is increased. These are considerations which should not affect the tenure review process, but do influence the staffing plans for the university.

The integrity of the tenure system depends on the good judgment of the faculty and their commitment to the goal of continually strengthening the faculty. Sometimes the deans, provost and president need to remind the department of its responsibilities, and even to disagree with its judgment when there are obvious reasons to do so, but the institution’s improvement in quality must come from the faculty’s taking that goal as its own. It is the deans’, provost’s and president’s responsibility to make the system work properly, catch the aberrant cases, and help the faculty make the difficult decisions which lead to continuing improvement in the quality of the Brown University faculty. With all working together, we can see a bright future.

The measure of a faculty’s quality is not the fraction of junior faculty granted tenure, but the results of the faculty’s teaching and research: the quality of performance after graduation of its college and graduate school alumni/ae, and the contributions made by its faculty to our understanding of the world in which we live. I trust that we understand this, and I hope that the evaluating bodies do likewise as they go about their business.

On Tenure and Institutional Ethics

Geoffrey Russom
Professor Emeritus of English

I would like to bring together two concerns raised in recent years by friends of Brown. Some observe that junior faculty usually achieve tenure here and wonder if our tenure rate is too high. Others, reflecting on recent economic calamities, argue that the fate of an institution may depend crucially on its ethical climate.

I have not seen a focused argument showing that Brown's tenure rate is high relative to institutions with comparable resources. If the rate is in fact high, could that be because Brown attracts more than its share of junior faculty who deserve promotion? Based on my experience with our humanities and social sciences departments during thirty-six years as a faculty member, I suspect that we do attract especially talented applicants in these fields, and in significant part because of our ethical climate.

When I chaired the English department, we routinely mailed back publications submitted at our request by applicants on our short list of finalists for faculty openings. One rejected applicant thanked us earnestly for returning his publications as "things of worth" and informed me, to my surprise, that we were the only institution to have done so among several to which he had applied. To my mind, our procedures amounted to nothing more than common decency. If this value is in fact somewhat uncommon, it might well help us recruit talented academics.

When I came to Brown myself as a junior faculty member in 1972, I was delighted by several characteristics of my new environment. The quality of the students seemed very high. My chair wanted to see what I could do with my subject and left me to it. The senior colleague nearest my field was welcoming, helpful, and never obstructive. Colleagues in other departments, whom I met in part through interdisciplinary programs, helped me imagine the kind of teaching and research I wanted to do. I gambled on doing exactly what I wanted and received tenure for a body of work that was evaluated as innovative and substantial by the referees. The quantity of these publications may not have met today's standards, though. I became more conspicuously productive after receiving tenure and continued to work systematically on my courses, helped of course by the six years' experience on campus as a junior faculty member. I was promoted to Full Professor on schedule. I took pride in attracting students to subjects that interested me greatly but were distressingly unpopular in many universities. I viewed directing Ph.D. dissertations as a valuable privilege and learned much from my graduate students. My experience here has been deeply fulfilling and I say so without hesitation to anyone who asks about Brown.

The well-known literary critic Wayne Booth thought it was almost impossible to do teaching and research simultaneously. He worked at the University of Chicago, where the graduate school is separate from the college. With limited resources and great ambitions, Brown needs professors who can do both, and has evolved in a way that supports the

scholar-teacher. Our moderate "University-College" size facilitates a kind of interdisciplinary cooperation that produces interesting courses as well as innovative research. Emphasis on the importance of teaching attracts students who are stimulating rather than oppressive to teach, and they in turn attract junior faculty who are dedicated teachers, along with some senior faculty who could find a position anywhere. During my career I have seen this cycle yield steady advances in the quality of students and faculty.

I find it particularly worrisome when Brown is compared to institutions that seldom promote from within and have endowments that are greater than ours by an order of magnitude, even after our superb fund-raising campaign. These institutions can afford to hire academic superstars and as many junior faculty as the workload may require. Having known several graduate students with spouses or friends at such institutions, I gather that the superstars may not always be interested in teaching and may find it more profitable to cultivate long-established academic gardens than to keep abreast of new work in the field. A department consisting largely of senior faculty hired from outside may have serious problems of leadership and a rate of retirement that makes continuity problematic. I find it difficult to imagine that this approach to faculty development could produce the quality of undergraduate education for which Brown is recognized. Even in our relatively small graduate programs, students may be better served by a somewhat less conspicuous but reputable and well-informed professor who devotes appropriate effort to their training, making it possible for them to secure a position on their own merits. I am one of those who believe that we need to increase support for graduate education at Brown, but not just any superstar will be helpful. We need superstars who are accomplished program leaders and appreciate the value of teaching at all levels. We also need an age distribution in our faculty that will help ensure continuity and avoid the cost of sudden rebuilding efforts.

When I first came to Brown, economic challenges to the University were very severe indeed. If faculty wanted something new to happen, there was little money available, and the mantra was "be creative." Now, even in a difficult economy, we are in better financial shape and can replace some improvisations with more durable structures. But as we do so, can we afford to fix what isn't broken? The creativity we used instead of funding must surely have yielded some ideas of lasting value that are suited to Brown's particular circumstances.

These thoughts are based on unsystematic observations by a faculty member preoccupied with the usual duties. I offer them as food for thought and would be honored to see them criticized. Ideally, our institutional research would meet standards of rigor like those that apply in our academic work, and no one person could hope to achieve that. As I begin my retirement, I have confidence that those who come after me will deal effectively with new challenges and wish them all the best in their endeavors.

The OVPR Research Advisory Board

Clyde L. Briant
Vice President for Research

In its work of advancing the research enterprise at Brown University, the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) works closely with the Research Advisory Board (RAB). The Board is composed of faculty who represent different parts of the University. In addition, several key administrators also sit on the Board as ad-hoc members. The RAB is charged with providing recommendations on, for example, research policies, procedures, and initiatives. However, the Board does not make policy. Instead, it serves as a sounding board. The aim of this article is to discuss the important role that RAB plays for the Vice President for Research and to highlight some of its recent activities.

The RAB is chaired by the Vice President for Research, and this year Professor of Education Kenneth Wong serves as vice chair. Board members include Associate Professor of Medical Science Diane Hoffman-Kim, Professor of Medical Science Joseph Hogan, Professor of Geological Sciences Carle Pieters, Associate Professor of Engineering Thomas Powers, Professor of Sociology Mark Suchman, and joining us in the spring, Professor of History of Art and Architecture Dietrich Neumann and Professor of Africana Studies Anthony Bogues. All members have three year appointments. Ex-officio members who also participate in the Council include Professor of Medical Science and Associate Dean for Biology Edward Hawrot, University Librarian Harriette Hemmasi, Director of Government Relations & Community Affairs Timothy Leshan, and Vice President for Computing & Information Services/CIO Michael Pickett. In addition, members of the OVPR staff regularly attend the meetings and participate in the activities of the RAB.

In AY 2008-2009, we took a new approach in RAB meetings. Whereas the Board had previously met monthly, as a single unit, we decided to break into smaller working groups to investigate complex issues in a more directed manner. We selected several major themes at the start of the year and formed subcommittees to consider and report on them. The RAB as a whole oversaw the entire process. The Board met in September to agree on working group topics and composition, in January to assess progress and offer suggestions to each group, and in May to hear the outcome of group deliberations. Each group then submitted a written report on their activities and conclusions, and these reports were circulated within the OVPR and to other relevant University bodies. Once completed, the reports were posted on the OVPR website. This new approach allowed members to work on topics that particularly interested or concerned them or for which they possessed special expertise. Multiple conversations allowed for the exploration of problems in greater detail with the goal of achieving consensus and evolving final recommendations. Overall, we found the new organization gave the Board's work more focus and traction and made it a more productive and helpful asset to OVPR.

As one of the topics last year, we looked at Information Technology Support and Infrastructure, for which the working group was charged with describing a strategic approach to the technology support needed by faculty in advanced data acquisition, data storage, data management, data integration, data mining, data visualization and other computing and information processing services over the network (a.k.a. cyberinfrastructure). The resulting report described the strategic issues of creating cyberinfrastructure at Brown. Proposed next steps included the formalization of a cyberinfrastructure service center and identification of a lead faculty member for the development of support services, the creation of a research technology steering committee, and greater coordination among that steering committee, the Library, CIS, and other relevant groups. Many of the recommendations of this group have been realized with the new commitment to high performance computing, which is now available to Brown faculty.

The Board also considered faculty incentives for research. The need to push incentives beyond matters of “mere funding,” (for example, providing release time for grant preparation), was particularly highlighted. The RAB continues to work on this issue in the 2009-2010 academic year.

Another working group focused on Research Funding Streams and the University mission. This group considered how to foster public, thoughtful dialogue in a variety of fora about the ethical relationship of research and research funding to the University’s stated mission. As part of this activity, the OVPR co-sponsored an event with the American Anthropological Association and the Watson Institute to consider military and defense funding, and its intersection with scholarship, in a time of war. The Office of the Vice President for Research is interested in establishing Brown as a place where these often difficult, but necessary, conversations, can take place, and we are considering how best to organize this effort.

Another RAB subcommittee looked at IRB (Institutional Review Board) issues and produced a report on the relationship between Brown’s IRB and undergraduate research at Brown. The group reviewed current policies and practices, conducted faculty interviews, and collected information from peer institutions. They also outlined specific policy options and recommended a course of action, with an emphasis on more explicit communication of information and greater contact between faculty advisors, students, and the Research Protections Office (RPO). Useful clarifying changes have already been made to the RPO website, and other suggestions were made about how to effect further positive changes.

The Board also examined the University’s Conflict of Interest Policy last year, as part of the University-wide effort to revise this policy. At its May 2008 meeting, the Corporation Audit Committee directed OVPR to commence a revision of the “Conflict of Interest Policy for Officers of Instruction and Research.” This policy concerns the outside financial interests of faculty and the establishment of appropriate reporting, management, and disclosure of such interests to preserve the objectivity and integrity of the University’s research and teaching environment. The advice and input of the RAB over

the course of the 2008-2009 academic year was critical in leading to the revised policy that was approved by the Corporation on April 24, 2009.

In AY 2009-2010, the RAB continues to work by having subcommittees address critical issues. New issues include research faculty and concerns that post-doctoral research associates have raised. The RAB welcomes suggestions for future topics for review. We try to select interests appropriate to a large group, representing the entire research community. Faculty members who wish to submit items for possible future investigation can bring a concern to any of the members of the RAB or anyone in my office.

Serving as FEC Chair¹

Chung-I Tan
Chair of the Faculty/FEC
Professor of Physics

In this short note, I will provide a glimpse into the work of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Chair, based on my experience during my first month on the job. I wish to first express my appreciation for the faculty's confidence in me. I am excited by this opportunity to serve the faculty, the University at large and the Brown community. I look forward to working with a team of dedicated FEC members to address the challenges confronting us in the coming year.

One of the duties of the FEC Chair is to organize the monthly faculty meetings. It has been stressed by a former chair that the primary purpose of these meetings is to conduct faculty business. This business includes informing faculty members about ongoing and upcoming FEC matters, discussing and debating issues of faculty concern, garnering recommendations for FEC attention, and communicating the faculty's academic priorities and values to the administration. To achieve these goals, I invite your suggestions of worthy projects, which the FEC should address on behalf of the faculty.

FEC officers meet monthly with the President and the Provost. These meetings are valuable opportunities to provide input from a faculty perspective on critical issues confronting the University. Recent subjects discussed have included the Ad Hoc Tenure Review Committee and the Organizational Review Committee (ORC). The FEC expressed the belief that any meaningful review of the tenure process at Brown must be faculty-driven. The Provost will chair the Ad Hoc Committee, and the FEC plans to organize a faculty forum in November to solicit broader faculty input. Other venues for discussion of the tenure issue will be organized, including meetings with junior faculty. Regarding the ORC, the FEC will work closely with the groups charged to examine academic unit support, student support, and library support. Separate meetings with these groups as well as meetings with the faculty members on the ORC are being arranged.

The FEC chair also meets monthly with the Dean of the Faculty. Our initial meeting addressed faculty governance, and several questions emerged from the discussion. Is incentive or reward necessary for faculty service? If incentives and rewards are not offered, what can be done to encourage faculty participation? How might we develop a culture of faculty engagement? One specific suggestion is to engage department chairs and center directors in an effort to create a more participatory culture. A meeting has been organized to discuss various approaches.

At the beginning of each academic year, the FEC chair meets with the Tenure, Promotion

¹ *These are based on the FEC Chair's reports at the first two Faculty Meetings and on notes prepared for the meeting of the FEC Officers with the Board of Fellows on Oct. 16th.*

and Appointments Committee (TPAC). This year's meeting allowed us to listen to new concerns and extend our thanks to the members of TPAC for their time-consuming service to the faculty and Brown.

The FEC has held three meetings since September 15. One of our productive discussions was with Vice President Clyde Briant on the role of the Research Advisory Board. Several issues involving the Office of the Vice President of Research were examined, including the adoption of a more "customer-based" approach by the Office of Sponsored Projects when dealing with faculty. Many other vital issues facing the University have also been discussed, and some of these are mentioned in the minutes for the October 6 faculty meeting.

On October 16, the FEC Officers held their annual fall meeting with the Fellows of Brown University. We assured the Corporation that we stand ready to assist Brown in confronting the current difficult challenges and to collaborate with the administration to expand Brown's status as a stellar institution. We made a commitment to address any issues in the NEASC Report that require attention. In particular, we presented a faculty perspective on the issues of the next phase of the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE), tenure at Brown, faculty assessment and governance. We also discussed how the FEC could help in shaping the ORC process, emphasizing that academic priorities should be the primary concern when making other decisions.

A specific goal of the PAE is the hiring of 100 new faculty to enhance Brown's status as a leading research institution. As we have learned, perhaps 100 are not enough. Additional targeted future hires should be carried out. With the current fiscal constraints, this growth must be slowed but not stopped. We will monitor and assist in moving this effort forward so we will be prepared when better financial times arrive. Hiring of new faculty, particularly at the senior level, could lead to unanticipated problems if certain issues are not addressed in advance. Every effort should be made to ensure that new faculty members participate actively in faculty governance. Perhaps more engagement in undergraduate teaching is necessary if we are to hold true to Brown's mission of being a leading research institution with a global presence while maintaining our distinctive character as a university-college.

Allow me to conclude with a baseball analogy. Our beloved Red Sox have been around for a long time. For many years, they did not have much success in winning the World Series. Recent successes can be attributed in part to the use of free agency and the ability to bid for established talents. However, it is important to remember that the Red Sox have a well-established farm system, which provides a constant supply of young talent. The "homegrown" talent forms the basis that allows the Red Sox to compete regularly for the playoffs. For every star one touts, there are many other equally strong players delegated to a supporting role. It is the combination of these talents, both homegrown and newcomers, that keeps the October Dream alive.²

² *Note added: perhaps next October.*

We believe that Brown's current system of tenure review is part of our strength. Our ability to attract outstanding young faculty by promising a nurturing environment for each to grow in his or her intellectual pursuit is essential. This is analogous to Red Sox's solid farm system, and we should value this strength. Perhaps the approach by the Yankees, which relies heavily on acquiring established senior players, is really not for us. It works for the Yankees with their deep pockets but it may not be appropriate for Brown. I trust the Ad Hoc Committee will examine these issues wisely and carefully. The tenure system can definitely be improved. However, Brown's tenure rate is not necessarily the real issue. Can we expect a "one-size fits all" policy to work at Brown? The real challenge is how to effectively move Brown steadily forward while maintaining our distinctive character as a university-college. Let's not "throw the baby out with the bath water."

My experience as the FEC chair so far has been that of "on the job training", and I expect that many more issues will unfold as the year progresses. In the meantime, I look forward to working with faculty and administration alike to address the concerns that face us in these challenging and interesting times.

Brown University Library at the Heart of Brown's Academic Mission

Evelyn Lincoln, Vice Chair, Library Advisory Board

James N. Green, Co-Chair, Library Organizational Review Team

What would Brown faculty and students do if we didn't have an outstanding University Library that we could count on? Without reliable access to all of the books, journals, and electronic databases we need, could students successfully complete assignments? Could faculty members efficiently balance their teaching and research agendas? Would we continue to attract and retain top-tier faculty and graduate students? The Library is central to the fulfillment of Brown's Plan for Academic Enrichment. As members of the Library Advisory Board, we want to remind the community about how the Library serves us.

Many people know the Library only as a local repository for information to meet the academic and scholarly needs of students and faculty. Yet it is also Brown's gateway to a wider world of materials. As such, the Library is simultaneously collection, connection, and classroom for current and future students and faculty, while also serving others in the University community and our regional, national, and global communities of learning and scholarship.

As the University's primary provider of educational and scholarly resources, the Library is deeply engaged in developing and stewarding collections in all formats that support teaching, learning, and research. Librarians in the Scholarly Resources Department are charged to collaborate with faculty to acquire materials that meet the campus's needs and to integrate Library services and collections into the University's teaching and learning environment. While the Brown University Library has many outstanding print and online collections of extraordinary depth, it is difficult to keep pace with the new hires and new academic directions resulting from the Plan for Academic Enrichment, especially in interdisciplinary fields and new areas of teaching and research. The Library has been aggressive in taking advantage of cooperative borrowing arrangements to maximize the breadth and scope of materials available to Brown users, but it will always need to expand its core collections to support Brown's distinctive programs. Preserving the Library's ability to purchase scholarly resources (in analog and digital formats, as well as special collections) in support of on-going and emerging areas of curricular and research emphasis is critical to the academic life of faculty and students and is a crucial factor in attracting and retaining top-rated faculty and graduate students.

The Library provides a variety of support services to enhance students' learning and assist faculty in teaching their courses. Librarian subject specialists regularly assist faculty with content for course web pages, make classroom presentations about finding and using library resources, and provide research consultations for students to assist with research papers. Brown faculty and instructors are able to place electronic materials (text, audio, video, and still images) on reserve for their courses using the Library's online course reserve system (OCRA) system, as well as reserves for printed materials. Recent

new services bring the Library directly to faculty and students where they are and when they need information or assistance; these include desktop article delivery services, paging services for physical books, online course reserves for all media (text, image, audio, video, etc.), online chat reference and text messaging services, and a custom-built search engine called *easyBorrow* that works behind the scenes to query different online catalogs and automatically place the user's request with the most appropriate service. To facilitate access to the Library's extensive online content, librarians at Brown have created nearly 100 resource guides -- web pages that direct users to selected Library resources that pertain to a particular topic of interest. The Library's web page, recently redesigned after an extensive usability study, offers an array of search tools and links to provide members of the Brown community with twenty-four hour global access to all of Brown's licensed databases and web-based services.

The Library's Digital Technologies Department is responsible for the core information systems and digital technology that enable the Library to serve Brown faculty, students, and staff, and researchers worldwide. A cornerstone of the department is the newly formed Center for Digital Scholarship, incorporating the former Center for Digital Initiatives, the Scholarly Technology Group, and the Women Writers Project. The CDS focuses its efforts on partnering with faculty to produce digital materials for use in scholarship and teaching at Brown; digitizing the "signature collections" from the Library's famous special collections and building specialized tools around the digitized content; developing databases, programs, and applications to make it possible to access and use these materials; and providing consulting services for library and academic units undertaking digital projects. In addition, the Digital Technologies unit is responsible for maintaining the Library's website and supporting staff equipment and computing needs. The foresight of building a strong technology team within the Library cannot be overemphasized. Every aspect of the twenty-first century library is affected by changes in technology and relies on technological expertise. Today's Library is more than a warehouse of books, a place for study and socializing, or a holder of electronic licenses, although it will and must still be all those things. The Library must support changing patterns of teaching, learning and research by combining traditional and new knowledge resources with emerging information technology. Libraries are essential for managing and mining information, and the University Library's development of the Brown Digital Repository is a good example of this new role. The Library must be encouraged and supported in these fundamental yet essential endeavors as it responds to and keeps pace with changes in scholarly practices and publications.

In this era of the virtual library, the needs for brick-and-mortar library spaces have changed, but not declined. Faculty and students at all levels in their academic pursuit require a well-stocked, up-to-date library now more than ever. During this past year more than 900,000 people used one or more of Brown's Libraries. As a crossroads for all academic disciplines, the Library plays a significant role in promoting interaction among students, faculty, and staff. With the noticeable progress in the last few years that the Library has made in improving its facilities, the Rock, the SciLi and the John Hay Library have become places where students engage in collaborative learning and develop their critical thinking skills. To meet today's academic needs as well as those of the

future, the physical library must reflect the values, mission, and goals of the institution while also anticipating new directions in technology and information use. On a campus where study space is at a premium, the Library serves multiple functions by providing state-of-the-art facilities that welcome student and faculty use. The Library needs the sustained support and commitment of the entire University in order to continue to expand, maintain and make available the collections and services that we rely on so heavily for our teaching and research.

Horace's Legacy: Remembering Ted Sizer

Eileen Landay
Adjunct Senior Lecturer of Education

In 1984, Theodore Sizer became chair of Brown University's Education Department. In Horace's Compromise, published that same year, he told the story of Horace Smith, a composite of the many high school teachers he had met while visiting schools across the country. In this book and a half-dozen others published over the next twenty-plus years, Sizer introduced and elaborated a set of principles that he proposed would greatly improve the American high school.

In Sizer's view, the *compromise* Horace and his students were required to make resulted from institutional structures that included fragmented curriculum, presented in many short periods throughout the school day, in which teachers were responsible for "covering" vast expanses of factual material that student were then held accountable for knowing.

Instead, Sizer wanted high schools to be environments that focused more specifically on teaching young people to use their minds well. Such environments required students to be active learners, whose "habits of mind" included questioning, inquiring, interpreting, analyzing and ultimately demonstrating mastery of their learning through many types of "exhibitions of understanding." High school students are not empty vessels, Sizer argued. While it is true that they are relatively inexperienced, they have much to contribute. They are capable of grappling with ideas, seeking out and gathering evidence, probing topics from a range of perspectives, making connections among bodies of material, and producing results that they and others find important and interesting.

Sizer saw teacher-leaders at the center of such environments and believed they needed to experience these principles in their own professional preparation. On his arrival at Brown, Sizer made the teacher education program the central curricular vehicle for accomplishing his vision of school design and restructuring. He redesigned Brown's Master of Arts in Teaching Program and created the Undergraduate Teacher Education Program (UTEP) to serve undergraduate students. The programs offer certification in secondary English, history/social studies, biology/science and elementary education.

Intentionally small in size and led primarily by clinical faculty, Brown's Teacher Education Program was designed to be rigorous and personalized. Working from the example of medical education, Sizer introduced the role of clinical professor, experienced practitioner/scholars who served students as model, mentor and coach. Clinical faculty are proficient in both content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge—the kind of knowledge that enables a teacher to make ideas accessible to others. With substantial classroom teaching experience in their background, clinical professors provide guidance to their students by observing their work in classrooms and providing extensive and ongoing feedback. They lead university seminars in which students study the content of their discipline in the context of their own developing practice.

Under Sizer's guidance, the program established standards to measure candidates' knowledge of content and pedagogy. The "Practice-based standards" address student knowledge and achievement in seven major areas including: Roles and Relationships, Student as Learner, Planning, Classroom Practice, Assessment, Professional Knowledge and Growth and Knowledge of Content. Teacher candidate achievement is assessed through a portfolio that provides examples of proficiency in each of the seven standards, and a public presentation of a specific inquiry project.

In 1993, Sizer stepped down as department chair though he continued to teach in the Education Department until 1996. In the intervening years, he founded and directed the school reform organization, the Coalition of Essential Schools, and with President Vartan Gregorian established the Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Later, with his wife Nancy Faust Sizer, he founded and served as co-principal of the Francis W. Parker School in Devens, Mass. At the 1996 Commencement, he was awarded the President's Medal, the highest honor Brown bestows. At Commencement in 1998 he received an honorary doctorate of humane letters.

In subsequent years, he continued to visit and remain influential in Brown's Education Department and in the university at large. Sizer believed that educating teachers should be a central task of the nation's best universities. His contribution to Brown is perhaps most fully and tangibly realized in the exemplary program he built in the Education Department, a program viewed as a national model for preparing excellent teachers. Since the start of his tenure, approximately a thousand students have graduated from Brown's Master of Arts and Undergraduate Teacher Education programs. Many more have been students in his courses and seminars. At least 75 Teacher Education graduates are currently teachers, administrators, mentors, artists and community leaders in Providence-area public and independent schools and teach with his principles in mind. Forty others are currently enrolled and serving as interns and student teachers.

Ted Sizer believed that to be excellent, teaching must be a highly reflective practice, and that this characteristic must explicitly be built into the curriculum of teacher preparation. He challenged his colleagues and students to question and to reject Horace's compromises. Instead, he taught that teaching is creative and intellectually serious work, a historically celebrated calling that—like all great crafts—should deeply enrich both its recipients and those who practice it.

Ted Sizer died of cancer on October 21.

**What is the Case?
To the Memory of Valerie Ayer Hayden**

**Philip J. Davis
Professor Emeritus of Applied Mathematics**

Some years ago I had a brief correspondence with Oxford philosopher, wit, and media personality Alfred Ayer (1910 -1989). My connection to Ayer came about through knowing his daughter Valerie Hayden, a stunning personality who was married to Professor Brian Hayden. To the great sorrow of all who knew her, Valerie died young.

Alfred Ayer had achieved great *éclat* as a young man with his *Language, Truth and Logic* (1936) a definitive statement of logical positivism. My correspondence with Ayer was related to a project I had conceived of asking a variety of professionals what were the dreams of their professions; i.e., what were their goals; what were they trying to achieve? Here is Ayer's reply to my question.

New College, Oxford
9 June 1978

Dear Professor Davis:

Thank you for your letter. As you probably know, Valerie and Brian Hayden are at present in this country and I will tell them that I have heard from you.

You ask me for a list of philosophical dreams. A different philosopher would give you different answers but I would suggest the following:

1. To find a secure foundation for our claims to knowledge.
2. To agree upon a criterion for deciding what there is.
3. To draw a concrete distinction between necessary and contingent truths. (The truths of mathematics have commonly been taken to be necessary but this has been disputed.)
4. To reconcile the scientific account of the physical world with the evidence of the senses.
5. To achieve an analysis of judgments of value.
6. To develop an adequate theory of signs.

Yours sincerely,

(signed: AJA)

Sir Alfred Ayer
Wykeham Professor of Logic

I myself, over the three decades that have passed, have thought long about Nos. 1 and 2.
I usually rephrase them in this way: *What is the case and how do we know it?*

I leave my readers to judge the extent to which any of Ayer's six "dreams" have now been realized.

Ayer's Philosophical Dreams

Peter Wegner

Professor Emeritus of Computer Science

Phil Davis declined to comment specifically on "Ayer's Dreams" but suggested that I add my own reflections. I will relate Ayer's views to those of Bertrand Russell, especially since Ayer wrote a book on Russell soon after the latter's death in 1970, and will suggest some philosophical views of my own.

Russell (1872-1970) was deeply involved with the philosophy of mathematics in the book *Principia Mathematica* that he co-authored with Whitehead in 1910-13, and explored general philosophy in *A History of Western Philosophy* published in 1945 at the age of 73. Russell's goal of supporting Hilbert's assertion that all mathematical proofs could be specified by logic was discredited by Godel in 1931 and also by Turing, who showed in 1936 that computers, though useful in problem solving, cannot solve all general or even all mathematical problems. I agree with Godel and Turing that the role of mathematics or logic in specifying knowledge or solving problems has been overemphasized, and that non-mathematical methods of philosophical reasoning and computational proof are incompletely understood.

Russell's *History of Western Philosophy*, published late in his life, has become a central, widely-read exposition of the views of the Greeks, the Christians, and modern philosophers since Descartes. Modern philosophy focuses on scientific models, and especially on the distinction between the rationalist view that science is a form of human thought and the empiricist view that philosophy as a description of behavior must be based on experience. Rationalism, the central model of Cartesian and Kantian philosophy, is still the primary model of political thought in Europe and the United States. Empiricism was a central model for Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and distinguished British from European philosophy, a fact that was partially responsible for the success of the British Empire and the growth of the early United States, which adopted Locke's separation of Church and State. These views differ from the five dreams proposed by Ayer and from Russell's principles, and merit the reader's analysis as an alternative dream about the desired goals of philosophy.

Ayer's six philosophical dreams include: a foundation for knowledge, deciding what exists, necessary versus contingent truth, evidence of the senses, judgment of values, and theory of signs. It neglected better understanding among political adversaries. Russell likewise focuses on understanding but neglects good behavior. The U.S. administration under Bush focused on wars as distinct from ideas as the primary mechanism for eliminating destructive groups from controlling their countries.

Philosophy provides a foundation for both scientific understanding of the world and political principles of government. Unfortunately governments have not improved in recent centuries, and there have been many conflicts, like the French Revolution, the two European world wars, the Korean and Vietnam wars, and current conflicts in Africa and

Asia. We hope that governments can become more stable by eliminating political conflict, and that philosophy can encourage better interaction among conflicting societies. However, I believe stability can be improved by moving away from rationalist modes of thought to empiricist tests of political goals for making the world a better place.

Armistice Day– Veterans Day

Peter D. Richardson
Professor of Engineering and Physiology

President Simmons, Provost Kertzer and other senior Administration representatives attended the observation on November 11th 2009 of Veterans Day on campus. In the US this was first called Armistice Day, starting from the first official observation in 1919 after the end of World War I, to reflect upon the significance of the sacrifices made to achieve peace. In 1938 it became a US Federal Holiday under that name. This was just before WW II began in Europe. In the early 1950s there was an informal drift in the US in the name given to the observation of November 11th towards Veterans Day, perhaps because Veterans of Foreign Wars (first organized in 1899) were organized locally and widely respected. Also, unlike so many other countries in Europe and around the world, the US civilians had not been placed at direct personal risk and suffered widespread injuries and deaths during the conduct of wars, and the Veterans themselves had taken the brunt. In 1954 President Eisenhower, formerly a General in WW II, signed a bill that proclaimed November 11th as Veterans Day. Although there was a subsequent shift in 1968 in its recognition to the fourth Monday in October, ten years later there was return of its official observation to November 11th.

I experienced WW II as a child living on the hills south of London about five miles south of Croydon Aerodrome, one of the frequent local targets for German bombing raids. Typically for the area we were bombed quite heavily, predominantly at night. In the daytime life proceeded relatively normally; I walked back and forth by myself to kindergarten, passing through a tank trap as invasion was a risk, meeting my roughly 20 schoolmates at the house which was our school. I had been instructed that if we were invaded I might become separated from my family, in which case I should head north, I was told to memorize my code number, and not to give it or my name to anyone unless I trusted them. I remember a girl who was one of my classmates, especially from her enjoyment of class breaks in the garden of the school-house, skipping around so that her hair in dark ringlets tossed with her dancing movements over her yellow summer dress bordered with white lace. She was one of the first fatalities I knew, killed with her parents at home by a direct hit by a bomb one night. I remember her better than most other children in that kindergarten.

While my father had been taken into the Ministry of Aircraft Production, my uncles joined the armed forces and the one whose marriage to my mother's younger sister I had attended became missing in action near El Alamein in the North African campaign, early in the War. That aunt of mine worked as dispenser for Dr. Lawson, an excellent diagnostician, whose patients were mostly people in the entertainment industry, I went to the Christmas parties he organized for many years and thereby met many nationally-known actors and musicians; war led to interesting opportunities that likely otherwise would not have occurred. My father understood my desire to know how things worked, as something that might enhance my chance of survival, and the first book he gave me for learning to read was a manual on how to fly a single-engine, low-wing plane. When

children on my road played together it was sometimes as King Arthur's Knights of the Round Table, we eagerly included a girl on the street as one because she had regular horse-riding experience, and also in other games where we were Admirals and Air Force Marshals planning war – if Lew Lipsitt had been around then with his professional studies in child development it is likely we would have been interesting to him, we were displaying in play a desire for more control of what was going on around us. We were well aware of some of the trauma of the war, a nearby large country house had been taken over for treating wounded Air Force air crew, some took walks in our area.

As WW II proceeded I pondered how to cope with civilian injuries and deaths as well as those in the military forces, and on both sides, if indeed I should be a survivor myself, and I concluded that I should join with others in observing 11th November each year – which is still called Armistice Day in the UK, for example – and try as a more extended remembrance and thanksgiving to do some things to help make up for the loss of what good might otherwise have been done by those lost in the war of both sides had they survived. The annual observation on November 11th would remind me to review whether I had recalled that intended dedication well enough each year.

With concerned others, I would like to invite the Faculty to agree to suspend classes for the 11 AM period through 1 PM on November 11th to allow the campus community members who wish to freely join the observation together to do so henceforth, and that while representatives of the Military should have a prominent role in the observation we should seek representation of civilian populations who have suffered in such conflicts as well, and reflecting our international role.

When I joined Brown I met a number of other faculty, also fortunate survivors, with their tales of the War to recall. Peter Wegner came to the UK via kindertransport just before WW II, and he gives frequent lectures to groups about the Holocaust. (A cousin of my father, Lilian Rolfe, served in SOE F-Section, and after capture was subsequently executed in Ravensbruck concentration camp early in 1945.) Joseph Kestin, a professor in Engineering and a co-author with me of some research here, as well as a mentor, had his own story, which he preferred not to dwell on. Having graduated at the University of Warsaw and started graduate study in London, he made the small mistake of going to see family and friends in Warsaw late in August 1939. He said life was amazingly normal there, people were still buying and selling houses and so forth. Then there was the German invasion, and he quickly decided he'd go towards the Russians, then somewhat allied to Germany, rather than in the other direction. His period in Russia involved doing heavy labor (cutting trees in forests, I think) but after Russia was driven to be one of the Allies he started a period on passenger ships going back and forth across the Atlantic, serving as the ship-board announcer with his multi-lingual capabilities. This was a hazardous situation, as German U-boats were very active attacking such boats. Joseph succeeded in returning to graduate study in London, still at risk due to continued bombing. After the War ended Joseph helped establish a Polish Engineering College in London to allow the studies of Poles whose education had been interrupted by the War to be completed; by 1952 that mission was largely accomplished and he visited the US, and soon returned permanently. Other faculty had extraordinary tales of their escapes in

Europe, including swimming across cold rivers at night knowing they risked being spotted by nearby German soldiers.

My personal experiences of the War were as a child; it was over before I was 10. Besides my school-mate already mentioned, I knew a number of contemporaries who were killed. Neighbors, a childless couple, who'd had an underground shelter built in their garden, larger than the well-known Andersons, shared it freely with us, and one night a bomb landed very close while we were in it, after which we found we could not open the door. Luckily my father, often away overnight, had anticipated this possibility and had stocked enough tools inside for us to be able to get ourselves out of it. Later in the War a flying bomb landed in the woodland opposite our house and the blast blew out all 36 windows. Luckily no one was in the house at the time. In daytimes I was allowed to roam the nearby lands and hills, and regularly returned home with collections of fragments of anti-aircraft artillery shells, and more occasionally with shot-off parts of aircraft, but there was a metals recycling effort and so I could not keep my collections. I did not take home the even more occasional discovery of an aircrew body-part, but these were very sobering reminders of how horrific air warfare could be.

A sabbatical I took at the Medical School in Aachen in the mid 1970s allowed me to see how long it was taking there to recover. My academic host had similar memories of lucky personal survival as a child during Allied bombing raids.

My WW II experiences continue unusually. There is an Exhibition at the Imperial War Museum in London called The Children's War, opened a few years ago and now scheduled to be open to 29 February 2012. The largest component is the full-scale replica of the house in West Wickham which is recorded as the family home on my birth certificate, and which remained in the family until 1999 when my father died. The original house was used in a TV series called The 1940s House, where it was occupied by a selected five-member family experiencing an accelerated version of living through WW II, used in the UK as informative entertainment and in part to teach modern history in schools (it was also shown on PBS in the US). The Museum told me it immediately increased Museum attendance by 60 per cent. The exhibit is meticulously curated, and I contributed a number of personal items for the Exhibition, including family photos, kindergarten school report, and a drawing I made (when 7) of a plane that had crashed nose-first into the ground behind a nearby house, with the fuselage leaning against the back of the house.

FACULTY BULLETIN
INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING ARTICLES:

A second issue of the *Faculty Bulletin* will be published in the spring.
Articles should be submitted by mid March for publication in April.

Please submit text electronically in Word format to:

Cheryl_Moreau@Brown.edu

Articles should be approximately 1,000 words (two to three pages). If space
permits, longer papers will be considered.

Articles and/or questions should be directed to:

Cheryl A. Moreau, Manager
Office of Faculty Governance
402 University Hall
Box 1830
Phone: (401) 863-9440