

Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Meeting

February 13, 2007
3:00-5:00 p.m.
Corporation Room, University Hall

Minutes

Present: Ann Dill, Chair; Ruth Colwill, Vice-chair; Bob Pelcovits, Past Chair; Albert Dahlberg, Svetlana Evdokimova, Nancy Jacobs, William Rakowski, and Geoffrey Russom.

Guests: Tony Cokes, Richard Fishman, Robert Hurt, Roger Mayer, Shelley Stephenson, Rajiv Vohra, Harold Ward, Kristi Wharton

The meeting began at 3:05 p.m. The 1/30/07 minutes were approved as submitted.

Professor Dill gave a Chair's report. This Friday, the FEC officers are meeting with faculty from the departments of English, Applied Math, and History to talk about issues regarding the Graduate School funding policy. The purpose of the meeting is to brainstorm to determine what can be done to address several issues that faculty members have raised.

Dean Vohra recently voiced concern regarding Brown's governance structure, there being an increased demand for committees without an increased supply of faculty to serve on them. He suggests that in its review of the governance structure this year, FEC consider whether there might be less faculty committees, or whether the number of faculty required for membership could be reduced. The FEC will address these questions soon.

The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) had their first meeting of the year yesterday. They did not elect a chair because they would like to merge with the Committee on Diversity in Hiring (CDH). Brenda Allen is scheduling a meeting between the two committees on behalf of the CSW. The FEC will discuss this at the March 13 meeting.

Professor Kristi Wharton, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) chair, will be coming later in the meeting to discuss the FAC's final draft of the proposed Enhanced Leave Policy. The FEC is pleased that some of their comments and suggestions were incorporated into the Policy, but do have some questions for Professor Wharton when she arrives.

Professor Harold Ward was invited to discuss a proposal to amend the Charge of the Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibilities in Investment Policies (ACCRIP). The ACCRIP has not been operating in accordance with its Charge because some of the duties charged to the Committee are beyond its authority. Because the number of proxy proposals raising social issues has increased dramatically in the past year, it became necessary for the ACCRIP to develop new procedures which should be included in the Charge. President Simmons requested that two staff members be added to the Committee's membership so it coincides with membership on other Presidential committees. Professor Ward noted the importance of continuity in faculty membership because the ACCRIP works with the Finance Committee. This is the first year the Committee has had staff assistance. There is a lot more the Committee would like to do but

cannot because they do not have access to the resources they would need. Professor Ward will prepare a motion for presentation at the March 6 faculty meeting.

Professors Tony Cokes, Richard Fishman, Roger Mayer and Assistant Provost Shelley Stephenson were invited to discuss a proposal for a Brown/RISD BA/BFA Dual Degree Program distributed with the agenda. It was approved by the College Curriculum Council (CCC) and the Academic Priorities Committee (APC). The proposal has been in the works for some 20 years. It never came into being because of the political climate of faculty and the difference between the two schools such as schedules. To alleviate this problem, they plan to have students register in one school or the other, not both. Professor Mayer described how the Program will work, an advisor intensive program involving two advisors for each student, one from Brown and one from RISD. Profits will go to both schools.

Discussion ensued with regard to financial aid, transcripts, grading consistency, and declaration of concentrations. Financial aid will be split 50/50 between the institutions. The plan is for each school to have a transcript and each to award a diploma. Shelley Stephenson noted that the details are still in the process of being worked out. Advising will come into play where concentrations are concerned. Not all combinations of concentrations will be feasible, and students will be made aware of this from the beginning. Shelley will prepare a motion for presentation at the March 6 faculty meeting.

Professor Hurt was invited to discuss the renaming of the “Alliance” for Molecular and Nanoscale Innovation to an “Institute”. The FEC recommended the Alliance be renamed because it was not a recognized entity in the Faculty Rules. Professor Hurt reviewed the Faculty Rules, consulted with Provost Kertzer and Vice President Clyde Briant, and did some research on nomenclature at other schools. A revised proposal was submitted to the APC for review and was approved. Professor Hurt thanked the FEC for their recommendation on behalf of the Planning Team. He will augment the written proposal for presentation at the March 6 faculty meeting. The motion to recommend the establishment of a Center for Nanoscience and Soft Matter will also be on the agenda.

Professor Kristi Wharton and Dean Rajiv Vohra were present to discuss the FAC’s final draft of the Enhanced Leave Policy. The FEC asked if the FAC had discussed the senior lecturer issue; they did. This population was not included in the FAC’s survey, so the policy was not analyzed with this group in mind. Senior lecturers are covered under scholarly leave as defined in the Handbook for Academic Administration, but are not covered under the Corporation Policy for Sabbatical Leave as defined in the Faculty Rules and Regulations. Taking this into consideration and the fact that the senior lecturer issue was raised after the fact, the Committee decided not to try to revise this proposal to include senior lecturers. However, the FAC is willing to take up this issue separately and is happy to gather information from other institutions. The FEC encourages the FAC to consider an alternate policy for senior lecturers. Different departments have different requirements for senior lecturers, so the FAC must be very careful on how they deal with it. This will require a lot of investigation.

The FEC noted some areas in the proposal that they feel need clarification such as the phrase “leave of any kind” which appears twice in the document. There are many types of leaves such as medical, parental, or family medical leaves, so it is recommended this be defined. Appendix III, Enhanced Leave Policy FAQ’s, is very helpful. However, Question 8: “I would like to take a sabbatical leave after six semesters but I was unable to obtain external funds to supplement my salary. What can I do?” Answer: “A recommendation has been made to the administration to make some internal funds available on a competitive basis.” Why is this not stated in the Policy?

It was the FAC's intention to put that in the recommendations, but it was inadvertently overlooked. Professor Wharton and Dean Vohra will make the changes and resubmit the final draft to Professor Dill. The proposal will be linked to the Faculty Governance web page and the Faculty notified of the posting by bulk email. The FEC expressed their gratitude to the FAC and Dean Vohra for incorporating some of their ideas into the proposal. A motion of Faculty endorsement of the Enhanced Leave Policy proposed to the Administration by the FAC will be made at the March 6 faculty meeting.

The meeting was called to Executive Session at 5:00 p.m. to discuss the Rosenberger Medal of Honor nominations. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau
Secretary