

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Faculty Meeting

March 6, 2007

President Simmons called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. The faculty agreed unanimously to a suspension of the rules to allow the presence of Provost Jay Coogan and Interim Associate Provost Roseanne Somerson of the Rhode Island School of Design. The customary motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. was approved with one dissenting vote. The minutes of the meeting of February 6 were approved without dissent.

The faculty with a standing vote of respect approved a memorial minute delivered by Professor Alexander Levitsky for Victor Terras, Henry Ledyard Goddard University Professor and Professor Emeritus of Slavic Languages and Literatures. The minute is attached and will be entered into the permanent records of the Faculty and copies sent to members of the immediate family.

Professor Dill reporting for the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) reiterated that this body is open to ongoing concerns and questions. Recent issues raised include the preservation of photographs of departed faculty members and an array of questions about the implications of the proposed five-year funding guarantee for graduate students as well as questions such as how committee structure and faculty governance might be affected by the proposed revision in faculty leaves. The FEC continues to consider many of these issues and reports are expected.

In the absence of Professor Wharton, Professor Robert Self, vice-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) presented item four on the agenda, a motion: That the Brown Faculty endorses the Enhanced Leave Policy dated February 13, 2007 proposed to the Administration by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Dean Vohra replied to a question whether replacement funding would apply equally to regular sabbatic leave and to the enhanced six semester leave at 75 % salary. He stated that the proposed \$10,000 replacement funding would apply only to sabbatical leaves at 75% salary.

Noting that many senior lecturers are evaluated upon research as well as upon teaching and service, Peter Scharf moved that the motion (final paragraph, first bullet, page 12) be amended to read: "The change applies to tenured faculty and senior lecturers." The motion was duly seconded and went to the floor.

Professor Dill noted that the concerns of senior lecturers were being considered seriously but separately, and that they were not part of the initial research conducted.

Mr. Scharf asked why the research could not be conducted before the motion was made. Dean Vohra noted the structural problem that senior lecturers are not covered in the current sabbatical leave policy approved by the Corporation but have been granted “scholarly” leave in individual cases.

Professor Emigh, noting that he has written to the FEC, expressed his disappointment that these concerns could not be easily taken into consideration, given the small number of senior lecturers, and also voiced his fear that this proposed motion if it were to exclude senior lecturers would be destructive of morale for a group of hardworking teachers and active members of the community who also were expected to conduct research. Hiring was made, Emigh stated, upon such an understanding. His amendment to the motion to amend was accepted as friendly. The motion thus called for the following amendment: “The change applies to senior faculty and senior lecturers with an approved research proposal.”

Professor Doane speaking as a member of the FAC noted that the committee had considered these serious concerns throughout the process, but they recommended that since the current policy does not include senior lecturers, and because some senior lecturers conduct research and some do not, it was advisable to separate the issues. The FAC continues to take equity across ranks seriously, but it must proceed expeditiously.

Professor Dill stated that the current proposal is working within the limits of the current policy approved by the Corporation for faculty leaves and that the many issues about the status of lecturers are of continuing concern of the FEC and its committees.

Professor Mor proposed a second amendment to the motion so that the same section amended by the previous motion to amend would thus read if the first motion to amend carried: “This policy applies to tenured faculty, senior lecturers, and senior faculty (research)” or, should the first amendment not carry, it would read “This policy applies to tenured faculty and to senior faculty (research).”

Professor Valente asked why such employees who pay into the sabbatic fund should not be included.

Professor Dill noted that senior faculty (research) concerns were being taken up and that a committee was being convened. More research is needed on the issues of senior lecturers and senior faculty (research), but the proposal to amend the current policy for faculty should proceed.

In response to a question about what relief from teaching in order to conduct research means if an appointment is defined as limited to research, Professor Fausto-Sterling replied that many research faculty are committed to teaching large and important courses without appropriate relief.

Other members suggested that the proposal would represent a change in direction in Brown’s recent support for growth; that faculty leaves represent relief not only from

teaching but from other administrative, advising, and governance responsibilities; and that enlarging a policy by such large numbers should not be entered into unadvisedly.

The second amendment was voted down unanimously, and discussion continued on the first proposed amendment.

Professor Emigh expressed dismay that such a large community concern should be decided merely on an economic basis. Dean Vohra said that the issues were not merely financial and that to consider such a change the Corporation would need to consider all aspects. Professor Self said that all these matters continue to be dealt with and must be thought through thoroughly.

Professor Emigh and others recalled a report on similar issues concerning lecturers that was completed by Associate Dean of the Faculty Crossgrove but that was never brought forward. Professor Doane said further study was needed to bring an effective case to the Corporation.

The motion failed on a voice vote, and discussion followed on the main motion.

Professor Wegner asked how our sabbatic leave policy stood in relation to those of other universities. Professor Self characterized our policy as in between New York University at one semester at 75% after six semesters and Harvard at the same interval at 100%.

Professor Valente, thanking the FEC and the FAC, expressed regret that the proposal now under consideration was virtually the same as the draft submitted last fall and received with considerable disfavor. He expressed the belief that this proposed change will create two categories of faculty—those who can afford to take the enhanced leave and those who cannot. He suggested that as new contracts are written for incoming faculty there will be three or more categories as more favorable deals are made, and he argued that such important matters should not be made on the sole basis of what one can afford. He questioned why the FAC did not pursue the option of one semester of leave at full pay after nine semesters. He found it puzzling and regrettable that after discarding the old Brown mentality of not being able to do what we cannot afford, we are returning to it under the guise of do what you can do now and fix it later.

The motion was approved by a show of hands: 51 ayes, 11 nays.

A motion to suspend the rules to make item 8 next in the order of business was approved without dissent.

Professor Fishman presented the motion from item 8. The full text reads:

MOTION: The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Brown University/Rhode Island School of Design BA/BFA or BSc/BFA Dual Degree Program. The Faculty recommends to the

President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Brown University/Rhode Island School of Design BA/BFA or BSc/BFA Dual Degree Program.

Professor Fishman noted that programs already in place demonstrate the viability of the proposed program; that there would be twenty students per year with no net increase; that the program would be duly monitored and reviewed in five years; the dual application and Brown Orientation would be mandatory; the forty courses are required over five years with twenty at each institution.

Michael Pesta, Registrar, noted that the names of the degrees in the motion and proposal are not consistent with the degrees offered at Brown. A friendly amendment was accepted to change the listing of degrees to conform to those awarded by Brown.

Mr. Pesta clarified that the program is capped at no more than twenty students in the combined programs. Professor Silverman asked why no faculty from the sciences were included in the oversight. Professor Fishman said that inclusion of the science was initially an oversight. The engineering connection came into their planning process late.

After questions about revenue, transfers, and whether students could join the program from within the institutions while staying inside the cap of no more than twenty, the motion carried unanimously.

Professor Hurt presented the following motion:

MOTION: The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of a Center for Nanoscience and Soft Matter. The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of a Center for Nanoscience and Soft Matter.

After being questioned by Professor Waage on what “track” meant in relation to concentration, Professor Hurt responded that track meant a recommended series of courses and not a concentration. The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Hurt presented an additional motion:

MOTION: The Faculty acknowledges receipt of the report from the Academic Priorities Committee supporting the establishment of an Institute for Molecular and Nanoscale Innovation. The Faculty recommends to the President and Board of Fellows the establishment of an Institute for Molecular and Nanoscale Innovation.

The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Ward presented the following motion:

SUMMARY: Motion by the Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies (ACCRIP) to revise the Faculty Rules, effective immediately, for the

purpose of amending the charge of the ACCRIP to reconcile it with a role that is more appropriate and feasible given the Committees composition and resources.

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part 1, Section 2.VI. A. of the Faculty Rules & Regulations, Committees Reporting to the President, Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies, delete the existing language (as struck through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below) effective immediately.

Faculty Rules & Regulations Part 1. Membership, Meetings and Committees

Section 2. Committees: Faculty Members Elected by the Faculty

VI. Committees Reporting to the President

A. Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies

1. Charge

The Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies (hereafter “Committee”) shall:

- ~~a. To develop and present for faculty approval, a permanent mechanism for regularly communicating to the Corporation the views and recommendations of the Brown community regarding corporate responsibility in investment policies;~~
- ~~b. to develop investment policies and to consider procedures for making decisions about University investments;~~
- ~~a. e. to consider ethical issues and issues of moral responsibility in the investment policies of Brown University. **The Committee shall evaluate information on such questions that are submitted to the Committee from individuals, groups, and organizations within and outside the University community;**~~
 - ~~d. to consult with and to make recommendations to the Proxy Committee of the Corporation, which in its considered judgment, would best serve the interests of the University; and~~
- ~~e. to observe nine guidelines in making its recommendations:~~
 - ~~i. Examine all proxy resolutions that are presented to the University as a shareholder in any company and decide which proxy actions represent significant questions of an ethical nature where “social harm” (as defined in Part I) may be a factor. Social harm in these guidelines shall be defined as the harmful or inhumane impact which the activities of a company or corporation have on consumers, employees, or other persons, particularly including, but not restricted to, deprivations of life, health, safety, or basic freedoms.~~
- b. examine all proxy resolutions that are presented to the University as a shareholder in any company and that raise issues of social responsibility. The Committee shall develop guidelines for voting on**

proxy resolutions and from time to time, as appropriate, amend these guidelines. The

guidelines and any amendments shall be submitted to the Advisory and Executive (A&E) Committee for their review and approval. After A&E approval of such guidelines, each proxy resolution shall be reviewed and, if the resolution clearly is covered by the guidelines, that resolution shall be voted in accord with the guidelines. If a particular proposal is not covered by the guidelines, that proposal shall be considered by the Committee. If the Committee recommends voting against the proposal, that vote will be cast. If the Committee recommends voting in favor of a proposal or abstaining from a vote, that recommendation will be sent to the Proxy Committee of the Corporation, for its review and action;

- ~~c. ii.~~ c. ii. Consider requests by all any members of the Committee to examine issues of alleged “social harm” with respect to the activities of corporations in which the University is an investor. Social harm is defined for the purpose of this charge as the harmful impact that the activities of a company or corporation have on consumers, employees, or other persons, or on the human or natural environment;
- ~~iii.~~ Analyze and investigate proxy and other issues deemed to involve important questions of an ethical nature. The Committee should seek and evaluate information from individuals, groups, and organizations within and outside the University community.
- ~~d. iv.~~ d. iv. Carefully balance (in making its judgment on any specific questions of social harm) the gravity of the social harm, the potential effectiveness of various means of influencing corporate policy, the University’s need to maintain a sound financial policy, and the consistency of various proposed courses of action with the maintenance of an environment at Brown conducive to teaching and scholarly inquiry. ~~However, I~~ In no event will a recommendation be made that an endowment security be selected or retained solely for the purpose of thereby encouraging or expressing approval of a company’s activities or, alternatively, for the purpose of placing or leaving the University in a position to contest a company’s activities
- ~~e. v.~~ e. v. ~~N~~ not recommend action on any proxy resolution or other aspect of investment that advances a position on social or political questions unrelated to the conduct of the company’s business or the disposition of its assets
- ~~f. vi.~~ f. vi. ~~H~~ have the power to recommend one or more of the following actions if it deems a proxy or other issue to raise a significant question of “social harm” (as defined above):
that the University vote its proxies in the manner best calculated to correct or alleviate that social harm;

- that letters of inquiry and/or protest be directed to the corporation(s) involved expressing the University's concerns and requesting further information, and that (in appropriate cases) such letters establish specific terms and deadlines for the correction of the social harm involved and suggest that the University might divest itself of its shares in that corporation if these terms are not met;

- that the University make its views on these issues known to the public;

that a representative of the University appear at the shareholders' meeting where the proxy is to be voted and present on behalf of the University its views on the issue;

- that the University cooperate with other interested groups and institutions to exert additional pressure upon the company (or companies) involved to correct the social harm;

- that the University divest itself of all the shares in the company (or companies) involved;

- that the University pursue any other measures the Committee deems likely to be constructive.

~~g. vii.~~ recommend divestiture (keeping in mind the fundamental principle of sound financial policy, the legal responsibilities of the Corporation to sustain fiscal soundness and stability of the endowment fund, and the kinds of balanced judgment called for in ~~number four~~ above) when: divestiture will likely have a positive impact toward correcting the specified social harm and no other effective means of achieving a positive impact within a reasonable time appears to exist, or when: the company in question contributes to social harm so grave that it would be inconsistent with the goals and principles of the University to accept funds from that source.

~~h. viii.~~ conduct open meetings except when the Committee specifically votes that they should be closed; **and**

~~i. ix.~~ report annually to the University community on its actions **by posting this report on the Committee's website.**

2. Membership

There shall be three faculty members **to be elected by the faculty**; three students, two to be elected by the undergraduates and one by the graduate students, for terms to be decided by their councils; ~~and three alumni (to be chosen by the President, in consultation with the Board of Directors of the Associated Alumni, for such terms as they may recommend)-, and two~~ **University staff members, serving staggered two-year terms, recommended by the Staff Advisory Council and approved by the President. Staff of the Investment Office shall not serve as voting members of the Committee. Faculty members shall serve for three-year terms, and can be elected for successive terms.**

3. Organization

The Committee shall establish its own by-laws for election of officers, and for conducting its business. **Committee members may participate in decisions by their presence at meetings, by participation via telephone conferencing or by e-mail voting.**

4. Assistance to the Committee

In order that the ~~Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment~~ may carry out its charge with efficiency and dispatch, ~~the Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies~~ it is recommended:

- a. ~~That~~ the President make available to the ~~Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment~~ the reports of **a reputable proxy issue research service** ~~the Investor Responsibility Research Center (IRRC)~~ **but and** that additional material for information and evaluation also be sought;
- b. ~~That~~ the University join in any consortium with sister institutions of higher learning ~~which~~ **that** would be mutually beneficial to the fulfillment of its corporate responsibilities in investment; **and**
- c. ~~That~~ the President arrange for the appointment of a research assistant to help the Committee in its investigations and ~~analysis~~ **analyses**.

RATIONALE: The ACCRIP, since it was resuscitated in 1997, has not been operating in accordance with its Charge. This is in part because some tasks with which the Committee was charged lay beyond the authority of the Committee (e.g. 1.b.); and in part because expectations in the Charge would have required resources well beyond the Committee's reach (e.g. 1.a.). Further, as the number of proxy proposals raising social issues that the Committee must consider has grown (more than 85 in the current proxy season), the Committee has developed procedures to improve the efficiency and continuity of its process for crafting recommendations that were not described in the original Charge. Finally, the Administration has requested that two members of the University staff be added to the Committee, to keep it in line with other Presidential advisory committees.

Professor Ward explained that the charge of the committee had grown after its formal inception in 1997 and its predecessors concerned largely with South Africa. After being assured that language on page 27, apparently calling for a particular vote from the Corporation, was in accordance with the operation of the Corporation, Professor Savage withdrew his opposition. The motion carried without dissent.

President Simmons agreed to defer her report to a subsequent meeting, and she agreed to take questions on the unuttered report following the report of the Provost.

Provost Kertzer, noting the linked health of Brown as a whole and of its Graduate School, noted progress evident in the increase in applications and selectivity in admissions, stated that the recent guarantee of five year support is an outgrowth of these efforts, also visible in the 50% increase in stipends over the past few years and the enhanced program in summer stipends.

Kertzer corrected two misperceptions that may have led to a belief that support for the Graduate School had declined. 1) the number of TAs and RAs offered next year will not decline, and the size of fellowships will continue to rise, reaching up to \$18,500 for the nine-month academic year; and 2) students will not be ineligible for support after their fifth year. He stated that to his knowledge no other university makes guarantees beyond the fifth year, and that there was no planned decrease from this year in the number of fellowships expected to be offered to students beyond the fifth year. The Provost explained that the anticipated reduction by fewer than a dozen in the entering graduate school class was intended to deal with the consequences of the five-year guarantee. He announced that Dean Bonde and he, taking into account rapid changes in the Graduate School in the context of university change, have announced a working group to examine graduate education and help plan for the future, examining such issues as appropriate size and support, standing among our peers, and more generally, what opportunities may be taken up to strengthen the school further. The committee will be chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School and will include the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the College, the Vice-president for Research, and the Associate Dean of the Graduate School for Academic Affairs, as well as one faculty member each from physical sciences, biological sciences, humanities, and social sciences.

President Simmons noted that there are difficulties in timing a full report on admissions with the URC deadline for budget submissions in April. Questions were raised about how students moving between external funding and university fellowships, and vice versa, about students coming with prestigious external fellowships, and about selectivity. Professor Dill noted that such issues had been raised to the FEC, and Provost Kertzer urged the faculty to bring their concerns to the new working group.

In lieu of her report, President Simmons commented that the Corporation, in addition to continuing consideration of the Medical School, is looking at strategies for revising the financial plan in light of emerging needs in the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Looking for aggressive action in such areas as facilities, they are also thinking hard about a fair degree of risk. So now is the time to carefully consider that direction of the Graduate School and its emerging needs. She stated her firm belief that this is the time to get it right—before increasing payout begins to pinch.

Professor Colwill asked if under the umbrella of improving research the Dean of the College budget could be increased to allow for such faculty/student collaborations as UTRA. President

Simmons advised that this is a timely moment for considering such issues. The Provost and his staff and the appropriate committees are looking at a table of needs passing \$1,000,000.

Professor Waage asked if increasing graduate and faculty research opportunities threatens undergraduate research. Professor Banchoff asked about the relation between faculty leaves and graduate support.

Dean Vohra noted that the relation of one item to another in a large budget must be examined carefully, and that leaves had already been factored into the budget.

President Simmons stated that our faculty size is too small and that size for issues like leave policy makes this a tight fit in comparison to places three times larger. We must find funding for replacement faculty.

Professor Banchoff asked if this policy would mean more and more adjuncts or graduate student instructors. President Simmons replied that standards for replacement appointments need to be put in place as policy, and that obstacles like using replacements for the short term should not stand in the way of pushing forward and testing limits.

Professor Lusk presented the results of the ballot election for the University Resources Committee: James Green (History/Portuguese & Brazilian Studies) and Melissa Clark (Community Health) will be the new members effective March 1, 2007 until February 28, 2010. Jane Sokolosky (German Studies) and Christopher Seto (Chemistry) will serve as alternates effective March 1, 2007 until February 28, 2010.

Vice President Carey briefly addressed the annual report of the Campus Life Advisory Board, speaking on behalf of vice chair Professor Zimmt, who could not be present, and noting especially that the investigations and reports initiated by the Council, such as the report of the Subcommittee on Alcohol, were having a direct and timely effect upon policy and planning.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merrim Foley
Secretary of the Faculty

A Memorial Minute for
Professor Victor Terras
(21. I. 1921 —17. XII. 2006)

Victor Terras, the Henry Ledyard Goddard University Professor and Professor Emeritus of Slavic Languages and Comparative Literature at Brown, certainly belonged to that special group of scholars "whose abilities and talents were of the highest order," as the description of his named chair suggests. He was indeed our profession's foremost cross-disciplinary specialist in the history of aesthetics and literary criticism, poetic theory, nineteenth- and twentieth-century Russian and Western literatures, and his many students are today's leading scholars in the profession worldwide.

Professor Terras' long and distinguished career began in his native Estonia, where he specialized in Romance and Classical Languages at Tartu University, and continued with a Ph.D. in Slavic Languages & Literatures from the University of Chicago. His academic interests ranged from the Classics through historical linguistics to the study of Germanic and Slavic cultures and Comparative Literature. Unlike many scholars, he did not abandon any of these fields as he developed new interests. He kept up with his many specialties, thanks to his ability to read with great speed and fluency. He was completely at home in Estonian, German, Russian, English, Polish, highly competent in Classical Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit, could speak what he modestly chose to term "halting" French and Czech. In 1970 Roman Jakobson wrote on behalf of Victor Terras, just before he came to Brown: "Terras is a man of wide erudition, both in Russian and comparative literature; his studies on the greatest modern poets belong to the deepest and most refined essays which were written on Russian poetry in world criticism. I think he would be a magnificent addition to your department." And he was. By the time Professor Terras left Brown, he had authored dozens of monographs and over 400 influential publications on such writers as Vissarion Belinsky, Fyodor Dostoevsky, E. T. A. Hoffmann, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Osip Mandelstam, Vladimir Mayakovsky, Vladimir Nabokov, Boris Pasternak, Alexis Rannit, and many others. He also became the world's leading expert on the nineteenth-century school of Organic Criticism; he was editor-in-chief of the heretofore unsurpassed and monumental *Handbook of Russian Literature*; the author of the magisterial *A History of Russian Literature*; and the seminal *Poetry of the Silver Age*.

A keynote speaker at a number of distinguished academic forums, he held high office in many national and international professional societies. He served as President of the *American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages*, and the *International Dostoevsky Society*, as bibliographer of the *MLA International Bibliography*, and as a member of the *Academic Council of the Kennan Institute*. He rendered distinguished service to Brown University on a number of important committees, in addition to chairing the Department of Slavic Languages between 1972-76. He regularly taught two or three courses a year beyond a professor's normal course load and was a much loved and highly respected teacher and colleague in our department. Having been forced to retire for reasons of health, Professor Terras nonetheless continued his active engagement with the profession and provided our department invaluable help as reader on a number of our dissertations. When he came—in spite of a debilitating physical condition—to help us in celebrating our 50th anniversary in 1997 with another profound lecture on "Russian Modernism" and selflessly agreed to serve on yet two more

dissertations, we clearly understood that there were at least two more ways in which his persona reflected his named professorship: supreme generosity and supreme collegiality.

Victor Terras passed away last December in Washington, D.C. after complications from Parkinson's. His colleagues and former students remember him as a soft-spoken, modest man, an inexhaustible source of knowledge and support, and a reliable friend. He is survived by his wife, Professor Rita Terras, his son, Dr. Alex Terras, and his granddaughter, Mara.

Respectfully submitted to the Office of Faculty Governance
at the March 6, 2007 Faculty Meeting, Brown University,

by Alexander Levitsky