

**Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)  
Meeting**

**March 9, 2010**

**2:30-3:55 p.m.**

**Corporation Room, University Hall**

**Minutes**

Present: Chung-I Tan, Chair; James Dreier, Past Chair; Susan Allen, Lina Fruzzetti, Evelyn Hu-Dehart, Thomas Lewis

Guests: Katherine Bergeron, David Kertzer, Michael Pesta, Rajiv Vohra

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

Professor Tan gave a chair's report. The Provost hosted the President's monthly Executive Committee Meeting last Monday and spoke about what transpired during Corporation weekend in late February. VP Huidekoper touched upon the next phase of the Organizational Review Committee's recommendations. A list of areas where layoffs will occur is being finalized while appropriate language for notification of layoffs is being considered. President Simmons will review all of this before official action is taken. Some building renovations including a new swimming pool for the Athletic Center were discussed. The FEC officers met with the Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS) officers. The undergraduates are interested in the on-line syllabi and, in general, feel good about the new on-line course evaluation. Professor Tan would like to form an ad hoc committee to review the new on-line course evaluation which would include faculty, students and some administrators from the Dean of the College's office. The FEC officers met with the Provost and discussed the School of Engineering proposal and the upcoming faculty forum on the subject.

The meeting was called to executive session from 2:40-2:50 p.m.

Professor Allen reported on yesterday's MFEC meeting. They talked about the Faculty's endorsement for the establishment of the designation of Clinical Tenure in the Division of Biology and Medicine. This recommendation will go to the President and then Board of Fellows for approval in May. The MFEC plans to conduct a survey to investigate the current levels of teaching in the Medical School, and Professor Allen volunteered to help with the science of the survey.

Provost Kertzer and Dean Vohra were invited to give a preview of recommendations in the forthcoming report from the ad hoc Committee on Tenure. The ad hoc Committee consists of several Faculty in ranks at various levels throughout the University. Most of their decisions have been influenced by Brown's culture. Their goal was to identify weaknesses in the tenure process at Brown in order to build a stronger system for the process rather than changing standards. The ad hoc Committee considered the length of a junior faculty's contract and how Brown supports them and proposes a 4-year contract instead of a 3-year to give junior faculty more time. When TPAC offers feedback on tenure reviews, it is not always properly expressed by the department chair to the candidate, or simply misunderstood by the candidate. More feedback is recommended. At Brown, it is entirely left up to the department chair to recommend tenure while

other institutions bring in outside recommendations. The current minimum requirement for the number of recommendation letters in support of tenure review is five, the department chair consulting with the candidate about a potential list of names for the letters. The ad hoc Committee proposes increasing the minimum number of recommendation letters to 8-10 and that the department chair work with the Dean of the Faculty rather than with the candidate to come up with a list of names. They also plan to recommend changes to the composition of TPAC by increasing the number of faculty members from 12 to 14 for added breadth. TPAC could then be divided into two subcommittees, each half of the Committee reviewing half the cases allowing more time for reviews. Self-nominations from faculty interested in serving have not always produced the strongest group of faculty for this important committee. Therefore, they propose that the Nominations Committee select candidates for the TPAC ballot election in consultation with the Provost as is done with the APC and URC. Department chairs' reactions to the ad hoc Committee on Tenure's recommendations will be solicited at the next monthly department chairs meeting. Provost Kertzer feels they are a bit rushed at this point and, if necessary, could wait another year, but that would be unfortunate. He anticipates releasing the final draft of the Report just before or during spring break so that a faculty forum can be held on April 13. Final recommendations would be brought to the Faculty at the May 4 faculty meeting for a vote. The FEC will discuss this and get back to Provost Kertzer and Dean Vohra with feedback as soon as possible.

Dean Bergeron and Registrar Michael Pesta joined the FEC to discuss next year's academic calendar. Last year, the faculty voted to adjust the calendar to accommodate the early celebration of Rosh Hashanah. In looking at the calendar for 2010-11, an additional issue about the length of the fall semester came up. Currently, the fall semester has 64 teaching days versus 68 in the spring and faculty may want to make each semester consistent with the same number of days. Excel calendars distributed to the FEC showed the current and proposed calendars for the next few years with an increase in the number of days in the fall semester in the proposed calendars. The College Curriculum Council (CCC) is in favor of making both semesters equal with 68 days in each. There was some concern about the exam period going as late as the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December in the first semester. The FEC raised a question about the "optional" reading periods and whether they could be adjusted so that both semesters are equal. The CCC had not discussed this option. Dean Bergeron and Registrar Pesta would like to bring this suggestion about reading period to the CCC and come back for more discussion at the next FEC meeting.

Minutes of the February 23, 2010 meeting were approved.

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m. to a faculty forum on a School of Engineering.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A. Moreau  
Secretary