

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting**

March 20, 2007

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Corporation Room, University Hall

Minutes

Present: Ruth Colwill, Vice-chair; Bob Pelcovits, Past Chair; Albert Dahlberg, Svetlana Evdokimova, Nancy Jacobs, Chad Jenkins, William Rakowski, and Jody Rich.

Guests: Katherine Bergeron, Beppie Huidekoper, Bernard Reginster, Bill Patterson, Kathy Spoehr

Professor Dill opened the meeting at 3:06 p.m. Minutes of the 3/13/07 meeting were approved with one minor change.

Professor Dill gave a Chair's report. The FEC officers' meetings with the President and Provost focused mainly on issues raised by the faculty regarding the Graduate School funding policy. Most departments are concerned about the cuts mandated by the Graduate School to the incoming class. There is a general sense that the incoming class will be smaller than last year's class by an amount greater than the 12 students claimed by the Graduate School. It is unclear as to the number of people supported under the 6-year window, and the question was raised again at the Faculty Agenda Committee meeting this morning. Provost Kertzer is reluctant to announce specific numbers right now because the figures are still shifting, but feels he will be prepared to do so in May by division rather than department. At that time, he will be prepared to tell the FEC how the working group came up with the figures. President Simmons encouraged the FEC officers to send the Provost precise questions to address at the future meeting.

A leave policy for senior lecturers was discussed. Both the President and the Provost have advised the FEC officers to be careful not to set up unrealistic expectations. The President has noted that Sr. lecturers can be broken down into three separate categories: those whose appointments are not intended to be long-term and are solely to teach specific courses; those with longer-term appointments who also conduct research related to their fields and pedagogy; and those who might have been appointed to a Senior Lecturer position because a tenure-track line was unavailable. Of these, we should consider promoting the last into tenured lines. A leave policy would only apply to those with long-term appointments that require research or additional pedagogic training. It might be possible to grant a leave to such people at the time of their promotion to Sr. Lecturer, as is done at Princeton. Beyond that, we need to ask whether we should change the practice currently in place for senior lecturers to accord with the timeline now in the enhanced leave policy for tenured professors. It would be helpful to get statistics from other universities. Professor Dill will ask Dean Doherty to research peer institutions.

Once the FEC receives the information from her, they can decide what to do with it from there.

Professor Dill discussed how the new leave policy would fit into the overall budget picture. This cannot be decided before the University Resources Committee (URC) starts their work for next year's budget.

The Science Education Committee has been looking at developing new science education programs and expects to complete its preliminary report to the Academic Priorities Committee (APC) by mid April. The final report to the Dean of the College and Provost should be ready by the end of the month. Professor Fischer, chair of the Committee, suggested a faculty forum be held for additional input from the science department chairs. After some discussion, the FEC decided to move forward with scheduling a faculty forum in the next few weeks.

The FEC discussed the candidates for the Nominations Committee ballot suggesting several faculty members from the physical sciences and the humanities. They must consider filling the "hole" that will be left in the humanities when Professor Rován takes over as next year's chair.

Professor Kathryn Spoehr was invited to discuss the annual report from the Computing Advisory Board (CAB). The report was distributed with the agenda and included the Board's response to faculty governance questions outlined in the FEC's committee questionnaire. The CAB did not work well in the past year, the attendance at meetings spotty, which Professor Spoehr attributed to lack of interest in the agenda items. The Board was chaired by the interim vice president for CIS who has not been able to consult with them on a regular basis. It is expected that once the new vice president is hired the CAB's activities will increase.

Professor Spoehr discussed several recommendations for FEC action including expanding the CAB's student membership and amending "Appointment of Members" in the Faculty Rules. It was suggested that terms of office be extended from 2 to 3 years for faculty and to stagger two-year terms of student members to improve continuity. She noted the Board has been particularly frustrated with CIS budget priorities because the CAB does not meet before the URC hears CIS's proposal, so their voice is not heard. The FEC invited Professor Spoehr to bring the report to the April 10 faculty meeting for discussion.

Beppie Huidekoper, VP for Finance, visited the FEC to discuss the Education and General Financial and Capital Plans (E & G Budget). The key elements for the E & G Plan as outlined in the Plan for Academic Enrichment are to increase the faculty by 100, improve faculty salaries and startup support, provide need blind financial aid for domestic undergraduates, improve stipends and health benefits for graduate students, and improve the facilities and infrastructure. There has been approximately 50-60 million dollars in new endowment to support academic enrichment. VP Huidekoper described the major sources of growth noting that the goal of hiring 100 new faculty should be met by AY 2008-09.

In May 2006, the Administration presented a revised set of financial and capital plans to the Corporation to take into consideration some unanticipated changes since 2004. The Corporation asked that the Administration do more in the next few years, to be more aggressive, because there will be more debt, more renewal, and more international programs. The Budget is expected to be lean. VP Huidekoper reviewed the revised Capital Plan for projects currently in progress. It is expected that more endowment money will be used for increased operating expenses. She provided figures for projected costs, funding and incremental annual expenses noting they are still subject to change. "What if" scenarios have been discussed with the URC. For example, "what if" in 2009, Brown stopped hiring faculty and saved that money for something else. What could that money be used for--undergraduate and graduate financial aid, athletics, sabbaticals, carbon neutrality?

Discussion ensued with the FEC regarding the sabbatical program, the components of the faculty fringe rate and the different options of how to cover incremental costs. Some budgets are being cut to meet requirements elsewhere. VP Huidekoper will be making a presentation to the Faculty at the April 3 faculty meeting under the President's report. It is important for her to present the scenarios to the faculty. She would like to hear some responses to the "What ifs" from the faculty.

Professor Bernard Reginster, faculty vice-chair of the Academic Priorities Committee (APC), was invited to discuss the APC annual report distributed with the agenda. In general, the APC answered the committee survey questionnaire positively, noting that the Committee's time is used efficiently. The Committee Charge determines the "regular" scheduling of the agenda such as external reviews and departmental reviews which must be done periodically throughout the academic year. New initiatives come to their attention while others are brought up by APC members as well as the Provost and associate Provost.

The Task Force on Undergraduate Education will be reporting to the APC in a couple of weeks. The APC is starting to look at existing entities and how they are organized hoping to be able to determine if the descriptions of departments, programs, centers and institutes need to be revised. Professor Jacobs asked how the APC envisions its role in departmental reviews. The external committee will submit a report and the department will submit an internal report. The APC will make recommendations based on these reports. They will be looking very carefully at the specific issues that are of concern to them. Professor Reginster is invited to present the APC annual report at the April 3 faculty meeting.

Dean Bergeron and Dr. Bill Patterson joined the FEC for discussion about the College Curriculum Council (CCC) annual report previously distributed to the FEC. There were no questions about the written report, so Dean Bergeron spoke about new initiatives the CCC is currently working on. There is a new Barcelona International Program which is very exciting. The CCC Screening Committee appointed two specific subcommittees to study course evaluations and teaching as part of the promotion process. Luther Spoehr is

the chair and students are very involved. Concentration forms are being reviewed and revised to make them more consistent throughout departments. A concentration database is being created which will be useful to the Task Force on Education.

Discussion ensued with regard to the Teagle Grant being used to explore the values of an open curriculum and the Capstone Survey of department and interdepartmental concentrations to determine how many culminating academic experiences are beneficial to students' undergraduate career. Dean Bergeron does not intend to reinstate the College Advisory Board for the time being. There may be a need for the Board next year. Dean Bergeron requested to meet with the FEC again in the near future to talk about two faculty governance issues and will be invited to do so. The CCC annual report will be presented at the April 3 faculty meeting.

There was some FEC discussion with regard to the Computing Advisory Board annual report and the College Advisory Board's current status. Should there be a Faculty Committee on Computers? There are three standing committees that are charged with reporting to the College Advisory Board: Commencement Speakers, Academic Standing, and the Faculty Committee on Resumed Undergraduate Education and Policy Admission Committee. Should they now report directly to the FEC? Should the Faculty Rules be changed at this point?

There was no new business or old business, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary