

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Faculty Meeting—December 6, 2005

President Simmons called the meeting to order at about 4:01 PM. The customary motion to limit these proceedings to 6:00 PM was made, seconded, and approved. The minutes of the November 1, 2005 were approved—some minor changes will be made.

President Simmons presented her report. She started by commenting on two recent campus events that offer us some serious challenges in the areas of safety, security, and public relations. One was a disturbance after an alcohol free social event in Sayles Hall, involving individuals not affiliated with Brown. Fights broke out and gunshots were fired in the vicinity of Brown and Benevolent Streets—no one was injured. The second event was on the following evening at a dance, also alcohol free and in Sayles Hall. A number of Brown students and guests required emergency medical attention due to excessive alcohol drinking. A reporter videotaped the event and aired a film segment on national television. The President has received much correspondence about these events. A particular concern, the President feels, is the potential danger to students both from excessive alcohol use and violence.

Some steps being taken include a review by our non-academic disciplinary process of whether the organizers and participants observed University rules and guidelines. An ad hoc committee will be formed to review our social events policy and procedures. The intention is that the committee will move swiftly so changes can be implemented this spring. Campus Life is reviewing its scheduling policy about the appropriate use of various sites, such as Sayles Hall. Prof. Nancy Barnett from the Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies and chair of the Campus Life Advisory Board Sub-Committee on Alcohol and Other Drugs will lead a thorough review of our alcohol policy. Faculty will be involved in all of the review committees. A particular issue is that some students drink heavily before attending alcohol free events.

President Simmons emphasized that Brown students typically act maturely and responsibly; we should not overreact to these events but establish sensible measures to protect members of the University community. The President welcomes the views of faculty members on what else we might do.

The President described the status of a proposal that the University divest itself of stock held in companies doing business in the Sudan. Last month the Brown University Community Council took up the issue and made it clear they favor divestment. The topic is tentatively on the Corporation agenda for February. The President reported that several faculty members have spoken at two events in California in connection with the Boldly Brown Campaign—350 people attended. Other faculty will be involved in the campaign. She urged departments and faculty members to work on their web sites; potential donors are often impatient to learn what is happening at Brown. We should not miss opportunities. Todd Andrews '83 was introduced as the new Vice President for Alumni Relations. Todd most recently was director of corporate communications for CVS and previously had worked with Senator Jack Reed and Senator Claiborne Pell.

Total Campaign giving to date is \$582 million and is expected to exceed \$600 million by the end of December. This is primarily pledges, not cash. We are grappling with much higher than expected utility costs—exceeding the budgeted amount by about \$3 million. Health costs and property insurance is rising also and we are seeing cost overruns for the Life Science Building due to Hurricane Katrina. Adjustments will be made to the budget.

The ensuing discussion centered on the two events described. Dean Klawunn assisted in answering questions. Our regulations are not specific about types of behavior and dress required. Precedents exist for much of the behavior sensationalized—President Simmons noted the Nude Olympics when she was at Princeton. President Simmons is very concerned about the 20 students taken to the hospital for alcohol poisoning. Prof. Barnett said it appears alcohol use on campuses is greater this year than last. Prof. Banchoff noted that these things go in cycles—is drug use down? Dean Klawunn said it was hard to tell; alcohol creates the behavioral problems. The gunshots probably came from a person refused admission to the Sayles Hall event. Notices about most campus events appear on the Web and are known to people off campus.

Provost Zimmer spoke next. He noted the room was chilly and was pleased that energy was being conserved. He talked about the science cohort program, noting that it came from an effort to improve contemporary science education and a concern about the sparse pipeline of students studying science. The question is whether Brown has a particular capacity to contribute. He has met with the chairs of the physical science departments and will meet with the chairs of the biological science departments shortly. A proposal is emerging—the academic program is settling although administrative issues are not yet clear.

Last year was the first year of open application to the Medical School. This year applications are up 66%; the admit rate last year was 3%. The Provost urged departments, programs, and individual faculty members to do their Web pages—important for NRC and for the Campaign. The search committee for the Vice President for Research has been formed. He encouraged faculty members to send nominations. The URC is well along in their process, having heard from every senior officer overseeing a large budget. It is committed to the goals of Academic Enrichment, particularly a growth in the faculty and continued access to Brown for all students. The budget process is difficult; all the proposals received were thoughtful; the amount of funds is limited.

The URC needs to explore all options and one option is the possibility of raising graduate tuition 40%. The faculty received an email about this possibility and much response was generated. One argument for the raise is putting more money in the hands of the departments. Extensive discussion followed. The Provost commented that the points raised were similar to those he had received already. Some were that the proposal would encourage faculty members to hire post-docs rather than graduate students, that NIH has a cap on graduate tuition, the affect would be to reduce the number of graduate students that a faculty member could support, comparisons with other universities are misleading because they do not account for all that these universities do for their students, research and research funds might increase if graduate tuition—a tax on research funds—were reduced to zero, an affect of the increase would be less opportunity for undergraduates to do research, junior faculty—who cannot attract post-docs—would be especially hurt. Prof. Clifton reviewed the conclusions of a committee he had chaired 2.5 years ago addressing the same issue. He pointed out the increase is not consistent with a strong effort

to improve graduate education and should be thought about very carefully. Provost Zimmer noted that much further work needed to be done to understand the implications of the proposal. The issue is what we can do to improve our competitive position. The President assured the Faculty that no surprises will be forthcoming.

Prof. Savage commented on the proposed science cohort program. He is concerned about a proposal that had its impetus in the Provost's Office and he is concerned about identifying a particular group of students—such seems inconsistent with the Brown undergraduate culture. The Provost stated that the people working on the proposal have thought about the latter issue. He agreed that no program could survive without the full embrace of the faculty: his role has been to ask the important question.

Prof. Pelcovits, Chair of the FEC, began his remarks by noting that the search for the Faculty Ombudsperson is underway. He noted two documents distributed at the meeting about that search. He announced that a Faculty Forum would be held in February (on Valentine's Day) to discuss a competitive leave policy. He gave an update on the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Campaign. Many opportunities will exist for faculty to be involved. He reported on his recent attendance at the Brown University Community Council meeting. One item discussed was brought to the Council by a student group working to require the University to deal only with apparel made in sweatshop free factories. The Council supported the proposal. The second matter was divestment of university funds from corporations doing business in the Sudan. The Council also supported divestment. The matter is now being studied by the pertinent faculty committee and is expected to be on the February Corporation agenda. Prof. Pelcovits commented that he was impressed by the calm, informed manner of the students and encouraged faculty members to pay attention to the Council's deliberations. He will ask faculty members on the Council to report about Council meetings to the Faculty. He closed by introducing Prof. Harvey, who reminded the Faculty of the approaching deadline for the charity drive. No questions were asked of Prof. Pelcovits.

He then moved the first motion on the Agenda: The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Center for Genomics and Proteomics. The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Center for Genomics and Proteomics. The motion passed by a voice vote.

He then moved the second motion: The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Master's Program in Innovation Management and Entrepreneurship Engineering (PRIME) in the Division of Engineering. Prof. Beeman asked if a one-year Masters program is standard in Engineering—it is. Dean Briant explained the year-long project each student will do. The Graduate Council has approved the program. The motion passed by a voice vote.

Prof. Pelcovits moved and Dean Armstrong spoke to the third motion clarifying the conditions under which a student may request a Course Performance Report. This motion involves a change in the Faculty Rules. The motion follows.

SUMMARY: To amend the Faculty Rules and Regulations, effective July 1, 2006, for the purpose of clarifying the conditions under which a student may request a CPR (Course

Performance Report) from their instructor and when the instructor may decline to write a CPR. The amendment makes it clear that any student in any course to request a CPR for the course, a practice already common at Brown. It also clarifies the conditions under which faculty are obligated to honor such a request.

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 3, Sections 9.II.A. and B. of the *Faculty Rules & Regulations* delete the existing language as struck-through below and replace it with the proposed new language underlined and in bold below, effective July 1, 2006.

Faculty Rules & Regulations

Part 3. Rules Governing Academic Programs

Section 9. Grading System and Examinations

II. Undergraduate Students:

A. Grades:

~~3. All Modes of Thought courses will be graded on a "Satisfactory/No Credit" basis only. Instructors of MT courses shall be responsible for providing Course Performance Report forms to all students who request them.~~

~~4. Other e~~Courses may be designated to be graded on a **mandatory** "Satisfactory/No Credit" basis for all students enrolled, on the initiative of the instructor. The designation of a course by an instructor to be graded **mandatory S/NC only** must be announced no later than the first day of classes and entails the responsibility for **writing providing** Course Performance Report (CPR) forms to all students who request them. An asterisk shall accompany the listing on the transcript of any course that has been designated by the instructor to be graded on the basis of **mandatory S/NC only**, with an appropriate explanation of the symbol provided.

~~4. Any student regularly enrolled in a course, no matter whether for A,B,C/No Credit or for Satisfactory/No Credit may request a CPR, and, at the instructor's discretion, receive one. Normally this request will be made during the semester in which the course is taken.~~

B. Course Performance Reports:

1. Students ~~who elect to take a course on a Satisfactory/No Credit basis~~ may request the instructor of any course they take to complete a Course Performance Report form. Normally this request has to will be made prior during the semester in which the course is taken to mid-semester. Instructors of mandatory S/NC courses are obliged to honor the request. For all other courses, the instructor, at his or her discretion, may decline to submit such a form if it is believed there is inadequate information to do so report. Particular consideration should be given to requests from students for whom the course is part of their concentration program. Copies of Course Performance Reports will be made available to:

- a. the student,

- b. the Dean's Office, and
- c. the student's concentration advisor

RATIONALE: The College Curriculum Committee recognizes that the CPR (Course Performance Report) is a valuable, source of feedback and evaluation for students. This short, dual statement by student and faculty member about the student's performance in the course not only informs the student but can, if the student desires, be sent out with their official Brown transcript.

Historically, the CPR has been restricted by Faculty Rules to use in two contexts. First, instructors of mandatory S/NC courses must provide a CPR to any student in the course who requests one. Second, students taking any course S/NC may request a CPR for the course. In this case, the instructor has an option of not writing the CPR ("The instructor may decline to submit such a form if it is believed there is inadequate information to do so.").

However, the CCC recognizes that many faculty already agree to write CPRs for students in their courses no matter what grade option the student has chosen. Indeed, the Course Announcement Bulletin lists this as an option. We move to clarify the policy already in practice by amending the Faculty Rules to note that students in any course be able to request, in a timely manner, a CPR and that the faculty member in charge of the course shall provide one (for mandatory S/NC courses) and seriously consider providing one for all other courses.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

Prof. Spoehr reported for the Committee on Nominations. The list of nominations follows.

Nominations Recommended to the Faculty for Committee appointments effective immediately:

Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee

Jerome Sanes (Neuroscience) replacing Christine Janis (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology), on leave, to June 30, 2006.

Antal Jevicki (Physics) replacing Karen Fischer (Geology), on leave, to June 30, 2006.

Faculty Resumed Undergraduate Education Policy and Admissions Committee

Evelyn Lincoln (History of Art and Architecture) to an existing vacancy to June 30, 2008.

Secretary of the Faculty Forum

Lewis Seifert (French Studies) to an existing vacancy to June 30, 2006.

Chair of the Faculty Forum

Leonard Tennenhouse (English) replacing Thomas Banchoff (Mathematics), on leave, from January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006.

Faculty Executive Committee

Marida Hollos (Anthropology) replacing Nancy Jacobs (Africana Studies/History), on leave, to June 30, 2006.

No other nominations were made and the slate was elected by voice vote.

Prof. Reginster presented the report of the College Advisory Board. The report had been distributed with the Agenda. The Board has addressed three main issues: the effectiveness of student advising, the relations of the Board with the CCC, and the somewhat ad hoc structure of the Board's agenda. Suggestions about the latter issue are desired.

Dean Armstrong presented the report of the College Curriculum Council; that report had also been distributed with the Agenda. He explained the CAB had a broader mandate than the CCC. Some overlap exists and is being sorted out. The CCC has dealt with two broad issues: fostering the goals of Academic Enrichment—including wider availability of an undergraduate research experience—and coordination with other committees and offices. In response to a question about the report, Dean Armstrong explained that the Teagle Foundation had supported a conference, and will support a study, by schools offering an "open" curriculum—a curriculum featuring student choice and student independence. The study will involve the entire CCC. Prof. Suuberg asked why the Corporation had not approved the Late Course Registration Fee proposal. Once the new Banner registration system has been implemented, the matter will be considered again.

Due to the lateness of the hour, the report of the Honorary Degrees Committee was not considered.

No Old Business existed. No New Business was brought up.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barrett Hazeltine
Secretary of the Faculty