

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting May 4, 2010

President Simmons called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m., asking those entering to wait to take their seats until the conclusion of the memorial minute. The minutes of April 6 were approved, and the customary motion to adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. was adopted without dissent.

Professor Weber (Chemistry) delivered a memorial minute for Joseph Steim, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry. The minute was approved by the Faculty with a standing vote of respect; a copy is attached and will be entered into the permanent records of the Faculty, with copies to be sent to members of the immediate family.

Professor Tan, Chair of the FEC, introduced a motion to suspend the Faculty Rules to allow the attendance of students whose names were submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty as required but after the deadline of the beginning of the first semester of the academic year; this motion was approved without dissent. In his final report of the year, Professor Tan looked back at events and accomplishments, anticipated upcoming needs, and paid tribute to those who made possible those accomplishments. Given the shape of the year, in which this final meeting addresses many important issues, he made this verbal report short. He commended the role of the FEC as a conduit of faculty concerns and advice, recalling such purportedly “major issues” of the year as campus preparedness for potential acts of violence or the H1N1 virus and addressing low faculty interest in faculty governance. He commented that the H1N1 scare has been abated and that the faculty participation was a problem for which FEC actions would appear by attendance today to have succeeded. The FEC has worked with the Organizational Review Committee and on response to the NEASC accreditation report, on clinical tenure in the Medical School, on the formation of the School of Engineering, and on assisting the work of the ad hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Faculty Development Policies. He expressed warm thanks to outgoing members of the FEC and to the chairs of faculty committees, anticipating a later event in which to celebrate their work, and to the President and the Provost for their monthly meetings. He requested that as of July 1 emails on faculty affairs keep coming but should be directed to Cynthia Garcia Coll. He also expressed special thanks to Cheryl Moreau of the Office of Faculty Governance. Since the last faculty meeting on April 6, the FEC has focused on the report of the ad hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Faculty Development Policies. Since the release of the report of the ad hoc Committee, the FEC met with the Provost and the Committee; held a special meeting on the issue; sponsored a Faculty Forum; held a joint meeting with the committee and CFED and TPAC; and facilitated organization of an information session hosted by the ad hoc Committee. He expressed thanks to ad hoc Committee members for spending time to listen and to accept input from the faculty and to all faculty members who have written or talked to him directly or through other FEC members. The FEC has brought specific concerns of the faculty to the Dean of the Faculty, the Provost, and the President, and these conversations have helped in shaping the set of current motions. He expressed the belief that tenure decisions are central to the ability of a university to meet its mission; that there is a need for an on-going examination of whether the tenure process and standards that exist are achieving the needed results; and that to be among the world’s best institutions requires the aspiration to tenure faculty not just of good quality but of the highest quality. Professor Tan commented that Brown as an exceptional institution with unique academic strengths seeks in the review of tenure and faculty

development policy not to change the character of the University but to continue to ensure strength in an increasingly global arena through constant re-examination of how we can do all things better. He stated that this process should involve us all, from the perspective of departments, the faculty, and the academic administration, and that the key to a rigorous and fair tenure process is to have a proper balance, the issue shaping the debate today. Professor Tan expressed the hope that while it is natural for passions to run high when faced with such a critical issue we should all work together to ensure an outcome that is best for the future of Brown.

Professor Dreier recalled that when, one year ago, the Vice-Chair of the FEC resigned unexpectedly, Professor Tan had agreed to run for the chairmanship, where his leadership has been consistently level-headed. If Professor Tan is known for such temperate rhetoric as “of course...in some sense...the question is... but... despite...it appears,” he is also characteristically direct: “Ruth, that is not right.” Professor Dreier acknowledged that as chair Professor Tan has agonized with pain and suffering over university affairs, suggesting to all that conscience makes life so much more difficult, and expressed thanks to him on behalf of the FEC and the faculty.

Professor Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience) presented the report of the Nominations Committee, calling the attention of the faculty to the forthcoming ballot elections. She explained the procedures the Nominations Committee followed in composing these ballots. Besides the long-standing reliance upon volunteers identified through preference sheets on the Faculty Governance website, the Committee recruited additional volunteers through general email (forty-four responses) and targeted email for specific openings. Some department chairs were also consulted for recommendations and recruitment. The upcoming ballot will now include links to candidates' CVs and research pages, so that voters can make more informed choices. Over the last 3 years, faculty participation in elections has averaged 43%. She expressed the sincere hope that our participation in the elections will rise to the level of electorates for the European Parliament. Professor Simmons presented the following slates:

NOMINATIONS RECOMMENDED TO THE FACULTY FOR FACULTY OFFICER APPOINTMENTS TO BE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010:

Parliamentarian

Peter Richardson (Engineering and Physiology) to 6/30/11

Secretary of the Faculty

Stephen Foley (English) to 6/30/11

Chair of the Faculty Forum

Dietrich Neumann (History of Art & Architecture) to 6/30/11

Secretary of the Faculty Forum

Lynne DeBenedette (Slavic Languages) replacing Elizabeth Bryan (English) to 6/30/11

NOMINATIONS RECOMMENDED TO THE FACULTY FOR COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO BE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010:

Committee on Academic Standing (CAS)

Elizabeth Taylor (English) replacing Melinda Rabb (English) to 6/30/13

College Curriculum Council (CCC)

Thomas Doepner (Computer Science) replacing Roderic Beresford (Engineering) to 6/30/13

Caroline Karp (Environmental Studies) replacing Jin Li (Education) to 6/30/13

Committee on Commencement Speakers

Richard Meckel (American Civilization) replacing Elizabeth Taylor (English) to 6/30/13

Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policies

J. Vernon Henderson (Economics) replacing Louis Putterman (Economics) to 6/30/13

Committee on Faculty Retirement

Robert Patrick (Neuroscience) replacing Lewis Lipsitt (Psychology) to 6/30/13

Graduate Council

Gianpaolo Baiocchi (Sociology) continuing to 6/30/13

Committee on Medical Faculty Appointments (CMFA)

Sean Ling (Physics) replacing Pascal Van Hentenryck (Computer Science) to 6/30/13

Standing Committee on the Academic Code

Ruth Colwill (Psychology) replacing Tom Doepner (Computer Science) to 6/30/13

Michael McKeown (MCB) replacing Robert Patrick (Neuroscience) to 6/30/13

The slates presented by Professor Simmons on behalf of the Nominations Committee were approved without dissent.

President Simmons noted the presence of students at the meeting and also that the camera in the room was being used for video projection to the overflow room, not for recording. She stated that since the meeting today set aside regular business to allow full discussion of the motions stemming from the report of the ad hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Faculty Development Policies, upon which many will wish to speak, she was proposing some principles for an orderly process and maximum participation: the chair be seen to act impartially in consultation with the parliamentarian for his knowledge of procedure to ensure the fair conduct of the meeting; members will be recognized before they speak, stating their names and projecting clearly and using the microphone provided when possible; members will confine their remarks to the item on the floor; no member may speak again until all have been given a chance to speak and no one may speak more than twice; members will be asked to speak when possible alternately for and against the motion; a courteous tone will be maintained with no attempt to rival the Ukrainian Parliament. She deemed laudable the presence of so many faculty members for this important discussion. Professor Schiller (Political Science and Public Policy) asked how voting would proceed, and , the parliamentarian referred to a voice vote supplemented if needed by the

counting hands or standing members, and if so moved, seconded, and approved, to a vote by paper ballot.

Provost Kertzer introduced the motions by reviewing their context. The ad hoc Committee has worked with him and the deans to examine Brown procedures and those of other institutions in order to strengthen the tenure process and ensure fairness for junior faculty. They propose a variety of measures for more thoroughness and confidence in results, including more feedback for candidates. He stated that these are proposals for modest changes to the current system, not to replace it but to work with it towards a system aimed to make us as good as we can be, ensuring that all involved in the process have the best resources. The faculty, the departments, and TPAC each play, Kertzer stated, a critical part towards adjudicating a recommendation that will ultimately be reviewed by the Provost. Provost Kertzer reported that since the report of the committee was issued there has been a marathon of meetings including the faculty forum and the forum sponsored by the committee. Taking these meetings into consideration, the committee has revised its original recommendations, resulting in the motions now on the agenda. In the interest of timeliness, the Committee withdraws the fifth recommendation, which can be separated for discussion next year. He added as a final note that while it is tempting to examine the proposals in light of one's own departmental experiences, there are differences in scale and composition among departments, so that the provision, for example, of additional letters supplied by the Dean of the Faculty, might be appropriate for a small department or for a department with a history of troubled relations with junior members.

The Provost then yielded to Professor Alcock to speak to the first motion for the committee, listed as Item 4 on the cover page of the Agenda as “4. **MOTION:** By the *Ad hoc* Committee to Review Tenure and Faculty Development Policies to amend the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, Part 1, Section 2.VI.B.3, Tenure, Promotion and Appointments Committee (TPAC), effective July 1, 2010.”

The motion on Agenda p. 13 reads:

MOTION: That the Faculty, in Part I, Section 2.VI.B.3 of the Faculty Rules & Regulations on the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC), delete the existing language (as struck-through below) and replace it with the proposed new language (underlined and in bold below) effective July 1, 2010.

Faculty Rules and Regulations

Part 1: Membership, Meetings, and Committees

Section 2.VI.B.3

~~3. Method of Election~~

~~On about March 15, the Office of Faculty Governance shall send an electronic ballot to all voting members of the Faculty.~~

- ~~a. The ballot shall be prepared by the Committee on Nominations to ensure representation of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Life Sciences. Candidates will be grouped into as many categories as there are vacancies.~~

After time was allowed to ensure the seating of all members, Professor Alcock read text of the revised language proposed in the motion on Agenda p. 13:

Each year a ballot will be prepared with two faculty members per vacant position. Candidates for each slate are to be chosen by the Committee on Nominations in consultation with the Provost after seeking nominations from the voting faculty. Candidates should be representative of the division of knowledge in the University and diversity in the Faculty.

Professor Alcock stated that TPAC is the most important committee at Brown, determining the future of the University for the long term as a diverse, informed, strong community of teachers, scholars, and artists; that the motion calls for names to be sought by the Nominations Committee as now; to be chosen in consultation with the Provost, and then to be elected as now by faculty ballot, disciplinary representation being included in the selection of nominees; that the Committee unanimously recommended the inclusion of the Provost in the process as the chief academic officer, responsible for department chairs, the APC, the URC, the daily management of the University, and as chief officer to whom all major officers report, possessing a global perspective greater than would be possible for any individual member of the faculty. The unique qualification of the position of Provost would seem to make a failure to consult him unusual, and a spectrum of practices involving those in similar positions at other institutions would by any informed study show that such involvement is the norm. Formalizing this role does not diminish faculty participation but makes the process as strong as it can be and needs to be.

President Simmons invited faculty to speak, suggesting that the presenters reserve answers as the comments and questions indicate recurring concerns. Professor Ahearn (Comparative Literature and French Studies) rose to speak against the motion. Recalling Professor Tan's reference to "balance," he stated that TPAC is a committee of great importance to administration and to the faculty and that there should be a balance reflected structurally in the process; the Provost has the final review of TPAC recommendations at the end; the motion would involve his intervention at the start of the process, ensuring his influence from start to finish, and thus disrupting the balance. The motion would diminish the influence of the faculty in the tenure process. Professor Ahearn strongly urged the importance of the faculty voting down the motion.

The President next recognized Professor Hogan (Sociology), a former chair of the TPAC, who asked to speak in favor of the motion. He stated that it is extremely difficult to know how people will act as committee members; some are unreliable; some don't show up; some breach confidentiality. The motion does not give more power to the Provost but seeks his consultation on important issues of nomination; the Nominations Committee will still compose the list of nominees and can ignore the Provost's advice if it wishes, and the Faculty will vote. He suggested that the inclusion of the Provost would simply provide more input.

Professor Zimmerman (Molecular Pharmacology, Physiology and Biotechnology) spoke against the motion, stating that the Provost, often coming to Brown from outside and usually holding office for only four or five years, does not necessarily have superior knowledge for the recruitment of TPAC nominees, since many faculty members, and faculty collectively, have the knowledge of decades. While it may be appropriate for the Provost to have the right of final

review, it is not appropriate for him to participate in the selection of TPAC nominees. Professor Zimmerman stated that it was delusional to think that a Provost, who exercises power over each member of the Faculty, would not exercise undue influence on the Nominations Committee, and that for the Provost to exercise power at the beginning and the end of the process was out of balance. She concluded that TPAC needed to be chosen independently of the provost, and that it should function as a faculty committee that is completely independent of the administration.

Professor Landy (Molecular Biology) asked if an amendment intended to allay the possibility of undue influence would be accepted as friendly: that the chair of the Nominations Committee be a tenured full professor. The motion was not accepted as friendly. Having been seconded, the motion failed on a voice vote.

Professor Malle (Psychology) spoke against the motion. He suggested the asymmetry in faculty/administration power in the structures proposed in the motion might be addressed through allowing the Provost the power of adding names but not of rejecting them, stating that he found such veto power objectionable.

Professor Fennell (Sociology) spoke in favor of the motion, suggesting that the key word is consultation, which is how the motion defines the input of the Provost, reserving control of the nominations to the Nominations Committee and ensuring shared governance.

Professor Logan (Sociology), a new member of the Nominations Committee, spoke against the motion, questioning what consultation means in the proposal. He stated that in practice this year for APC nominations the Provost's list of those who could be asked to serve was helpful in recruiting some members to run, but not in all cases, and that it was not possible to fill the slate with names suggested by the Provost. In the original wording of the proposal by the ad hoc Committee, the Provost would determine TPAC members. In the wording of the current motion, it is not clear what "to be chosen by the Committee on Nominations in consultation with the Provost after seeking nominations" means. He asked if a friendly amendment might be accepted for the motion to read "to be chosen independently by the Committee," if the intention of the motion is for the role of the Provost to be consultative. If the intention of the motion were otherwise, he concluded that the motion would be treated as unfriendly.

The Provost responded that he has upon request suggested nominees for APC and URC, and that the wording in the motion parallels the existing language in the nominations process for those committees. President Simmons concluded that the amendment was not accepted as friendly and asked Professor Logan if he wished to make a motion.

Professor Logan then moved an amendment to add the following to the existing motion:

It is the sense of the Faculty that after seeking nominations from the Faculty and advice from the Provost, the Committee on Nominations will exercise its independent judgment in establishing the candidate slates for TPAC, URC, and APC.

The motion was seconded, and the Parliamentarian indicated in response to a question that debate on the motion to amend should proceed.

Professor Logan added that the amendment may remove ambiguity about questions of consultation/independence, but that he may or may not vote for such an amended motion.

Professor Colwill (Psychology) spoke against the amendment. She stated that the role of the Provost on URC and APC differs from his role on TPAC. For URC and APC the Provost chairs the committees, sets the agenda and seeks faculty appointments to help him move that agenda forward. In contrast TPAC is a faculty committee and requires independent judgment on how well departments have made their case for the hiring, tenure and promotion of candidates. The nominations process already makes provision for the Provost and other faculty-administrators to suggest names to TPAC in the same way that any member of the faculty may suggest names. The TPAC ballot does not and should not require any further review by him.

Professor Allen (Egyptology) stated that he believed the words “Candidates for each slate are to be chosen by the Committee on Nominations” to be sufficiently clear without amendment.

Professor Dill (Sociology) proposed an amendment to the amendment to strike the words APC and URC from the amendment. She stressed the importance of the amendment in differentiating the TPAC nomination process from the process of APC and URC. This amendment to the amendment was accepted as friendly by Professor Logan. The motion to amend thus reads:

It is the sense of the Faculty that after seeking nominations from the Faculty and advice from the Provost, the Committee on Nominations will exercise its independent judgment in establishing the candidate slates for TPAC.

Professor Doane (MCM) stated that the intent of the motion to make the nomination the clear and independent choice of the Nominations Committee would be clear only as amended.

Professor Roth (Religious Studies), recalled serving as Vice Chair and Chair of TPAC, which he found to be a diverse and collegial body, and stated that he believed the amendment allowed a consultative role for the Provost while maintaining the clear independence of the committee. He recalled that the last major revision of the Faculty Rules and committee structures brought along with the election of twelve faculty members from the different divisions the increased ex officio role of four deans on the TPAC. He believes that the amendment provides for the role of the Provost as Professor Alcock defined it while also clarifying the independence of the committee.

A motion to close debate on the motion to amend having been moved and seconded carried by a majority, and the President asked the Secretary to read the motion. The Secretary asked if it was appropriate to read first the original motion, and Professor Elliott raised a point of order to clarify the question moved. As instructed by the President, the Secretary read the motion to amend made by Professor Logan, and the President called for a voice vote.

Professor Valente (Portuguese and Brazilian Studies) requested a vote by written ballot. The motion was seconded, and Professor Dill (Sociology) stressed that, in addition to the memo sent by the Provost asking department chairs to vote in favor of the motions, it had come to her attention that chairs and others in administratively superior positions had sent similar memos to

their subordinates as well as urging the latter to vote for the motions during meetings and through other means. This raised important concerns about the right of faculty members, particularly those without tenure, to exercise their independent vote without fear unless the voting was made confidential. While Professor Dill was confident that the chair of her own department has treated the memo of the Provost with appropriate silence, she stated that the protection of the written ballot was important to allow faculty members to vote confidentially. Professor Rodriguez (American Civilization) spoke in concurrence with Professor Dill. The President called for a voice vote on the motion to vote by written ballot on the motion to amend. After an inconclusive voice vote, it was agreed to proceed by a standing vote on the motion of Professor Valente, that is, the motion to vote by written ballot. The motion carried: 162 ayes; 133 nays.

The vote by written ballot (ballot #1) on the motion to amend proceeded, and the motion carried: 222 ayes, 79 nays.

Discussion returned to the main motion as amended. Professor Morgan (Cognitive and Linguistic Science) asked about the exact form of the ballots prepared by the Nominations Committee; what information would the ballots contain? After an admonition from the President for the meeting to continue to move forward judiciously as it had been, Professor Andrea Simmons (Psychology), chair of the Nominations Committee, stated that ballot would include name, department, and title with a short statement about the candidate and, through a new measure to be instituted next week, a link to the candidate's page of the Directory of Researchers at Brown. Provost Kertzer stated that if questions about the undue influence of the Provost in the nominations process have been answered by the amendment, the faculty can focus on the results of a deliberate and expeditious process of looking at norms and procedures. He thanked the faculty members on the ad hoc Committee for model service, and he stated that the committee worked very hard and they represent model faculty members. President Simmons suggested that the questions raised about the motion were not directed at the Provost personally but towards defining the sense of the faculty in maintaining the integrity of the process. She asked if the faculty were ready for the question. The motion to close debate was made by Professor Larmore (Philosophy) and seconded; it carried on a voice vote. Professor James Simmons (Neuroscience) asked to take the floor in order to affirm that while nothing personal was to be read in questions raised about the nominations process, he was concerned about the divisions in the faculty that arose from the committee report and the differences between the positions articulated by many of the voting faculty and the recommendations of the ad hoc committee, since the committee did not acknowledge the voices of a large number of faculty. He questioned whether there was influence from the administration on the committee. President Simmons stated that debate was closed, and a motion to vote on the main motion (as amended and called) by written ballot was seconded and then passed by voice vote. The results of the ballot (ballot #2) on the main motion as amended were: 174 ayes; 115 nays.

President Simmons commented on the importance of the roles many exercised in the meeting; the importance of the great number of faculty members taking ownership of faculty governance; of the importance of the Provost's stewardship of the motions; of the importance of the service of faculty members on the ad hoc Committee, who gathered information and did their best to assess it and to come forward with proposals. She expressed thanks to all. She stated that at the heart

of ideas exchanged and actions taken today is the shared process of shaping the University, what it is and what it will be, hard and worthwhile work that will continue to strive for the best. There being no time for unfinished business before the appointed hour of adjournment, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Merriam Foley
Secretary of the Faculty

Joseph M. Steim
Memorial Minute at Faculty Meeting
May 4, 2010

Our good friend and colleague, Joseph M. Steim, passed away on Monday, February 15, 2010.

Born on April 5, 1932, in Pennsylvania, Joe received both a baccalaureate and a doctorate degree at Penn State University. His PhD, in 1962, was entitled “Neutron Activation Analysis of Biological Materials.” As the title suggests, this work embodied Joe’s approach to science: it combined Chemistry with neutron physics, biology and material science. As such, almost 50 years ago, Joe displayed a highly interdisciplinary approach to science that was far ahead of his time.

Following post doctoral research at Pennsylvania State University, Joe joined Brown University as an Assistant Professor in 1966. He rapidly rose through the ranks, with promotions to associate professor after only 3 years in 1969, and to full professor after 5 years in 1971.

As a biophysical chemist, Joe published in a wide range of fields including chemistry, physics, biology and medicine. Among his outstanding investigations are studies on premature infants suffering from Respiratory Disease Syndrome and the analysis and synthesis of anti – AIDS drugs in the late 1980’s. With his interdisciplinary training and research, Joe was an ingenious scientist and a great fountain of knowledge.

Joe was a most accomplished educator and remained active until very recently. He designed a highly acclaimed laboratory manual for introductory general chemistry courses.

Reaching out across disciplines, he also developed several chemistry courses for humanities majors, such as History of Chemistry, the History of the American Technology, and numerous independent study courses with topics ranging from the development of the telegraph to the chemistry of art conservation. Through his excellent courses and tireless advising, Joe touched the hearts of many generations of students at Brown.

Madam President, I move that the Faculty adopt this Minute by standing vote of respect, and that the Secretary of the Faculty be instructed to enter the Minute into the permanent records of the Faculty and to send copies of it to members of the immediate family.