BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING 6 – 2016-2017

MEETING MINUTES

AGENDA

Thursday, May 18, 2017
12:30 PM – 1:45 PM

Heller-Schneider Classroom G2 (Ground Floor – Elevator level “G”)

OUTCOMES
♦ Election Results: New Senators, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees & Celebration of Outgoing Senators
♦ Election of Chair and Council for 2017-2018
♦ Understanding Charge of the new Faculty Governance Task Force & Update on Senate-related Work Groups

AGENDA

12:30 P.M. WELCOME

Congratulations & Farewells
• Senate & Faculty Reps Elections & Re-Elections and Farewells

Remarks from Chair & Council
  o Reflection on Meetings with President & Provost
    o Faculty Governance Task Force
    o Reflection Exercise
    o Update on Outstanding Resolution
    o Report on Executive Compensation Process & Outcome
    o Report on Board of Trustees Meeting

1:15 P.M. Senator’s Reports & Discussion Items
• Sexual Assault Policy Update – Sarah Mead & John Wardle
• Dignity at Work – Larry Simon (& Carol Osler)
• Free Expression – Tom Pochapsky and Rajesh Sampath

1:45 P.M. ADJOURN
Faculty meeting to follow at 2:00pm – Olin-Sang Auditorium (thru Mandel Center for the Humanities)

Attachments:

- Letter to the Faculty on Senior Administrators’ Compensation from Larry Kanarek & Susan P. Curnan (March 30, 2017)
- Pres. Liebowitz Memo on Faculty Governance Task Force (April 26, 2017)
- Pres. Liebowitz Memo on Self-Reflection (March 25, 2017)

* * *

PRESENT: Susan P. Curnan, Chair, Joseph Assan, Joel Christensen, Dan Bergstresser, Joseph Cunningham, Elizabeth Ferry, Eli Hirsch, Susan Holcombe, Sarah Mead, Paul Miller, Kate Moran, Carol Osler, Thomas Pochapsky, Raj Sampath, Laurence Simon, Faith Smith

ABSENT: Jennifer Cleary, Jane Ebert, Kathryn Graddy, Adrianne Krstansky, John Wardle, (Laurie Nsiah-Jefferson no longer on Senate)

12:30 P.M. WELCOME

Congratulations & Farewells
- Senate & Faculty Reps Elections & Re-Elections and Farewells
- The Chair welcomed all Senators, and Senators introduced themselves.
  - Newly elected Senators are Joseph Assan (Heller), Joel Christensen (Classical Studies/Humanities), Jennifer Cleary (At-Large), and Carol Osler (At-Large).
  - The Senators welcomed the first-ever Emeritus/Emerita Senator elected, Susan Holcombe (Heller).
  - The Chair welcomed returning Senators, Dan Bergstresser (IBS), Joseph Cunningham (Psychology/Social Science), Jane Ebert (IBS), Elizabeth Ferry (At-Large), Katy Graddy (Economics/Social Science), Adrianne Krstansky (Theater/Creative Arts), Sarah Mead (Music/Creative Arts), Paul Miller (Biology, Neuroscience/Science), Kate Moran (At-Large), Rajesh Sampath (At-Large), Laurence Simon (Heller), Faith Smith (African & Afro-American Studies & English/Humanities), and John Wardle (Physics/Science).
  - The Chair thanked retiring Senators, Eli Hirsch (Philosophy/Humanities), Laurie Nsiah-Jefferson (Heller), and former Senate Chair Thomas Pochapsky.
- Senators then nominated and elected the Senate Council and Senate Chair.
  - The call for 2017-2018 Senate Council nominations among the Faculty Senate resulted in the election of Laurence Simon, Sarah Mead and Kate Moran, followed by unanimous nomination and reelection of the current Chair to serve an unprecedented third term.
Remarks from Chair & Council and Senate Discussion: Faculty Governance; President’s Reflection; Resolution; Executive Compensation Process; Board of Trustees Meeting

Pending Resolution
• The Chair reported that President Liebowitz discussed the “Senate Resolution to Express Consensus on the Matter of Broken Trust and Lost Contribution to Faculty and Staff Retirement Funds” with Trustees at the April Board meeting and will share more about that at the May Faculty Meeting.

Reflection Exercise
• Senators discussed the Reflection Exercise circulated by President Liebowitz and weighed in on current action and various participation levels and awareness of the project in their departments/divisions. Comments included:
  o The reflection exercise is a way to start addressing University budget imbalances;
  o To address a personnel crisis that will be challenging certain departments;
  o Shed light on where their department fits within the broader university; There are questions about who exactly is completing the self-reflection and how broadly it will be shared;
  o Some Senators reported Department Chairs, Division Heads and others are participating in the self-reflection and still others had no idea it was happening;
  o Senators expressed concerns about the purpose of the self-reflection exercise and speculated on how the data may be used;
  o Overall, Senators stated that strategies and involvement in the reflection exercise are dependent upon the openness of chairs and departments/schools;
  o One Senator described a sense of cynicism over further cuts and to previous efforts by former administration leaders, which involved a lot of work with no apparent result.
  o The Chair reminded the Senators that President Liebowitz circulated the self-reflection exercise request in two phases – First, to a limited group, and then the Faculty Senate Council and Faculty Representatives distributed a second version to a broader group to ensure wider participation.
  o Senators asked for clarification about the purpose of the self-reflection work. Ultimately, the Senate sees this as an opportunity to participate in shaping the future and asked the Senate Council to invite the President to talk to the Senate about the self-reflection exercise in the fall.
  o In support of this invitation, Senate Council members described the enthusiastic and reassuring response of the President to concerns about the intention of the self-exercise during the special session with the Faculty Senate with President Liebowitz on April 4th and suggested that further reassurance and clarification may increase good will to participate among the University community.
Executive Compensation

• As per the attached memo from the chair of the Board of Trustees, Larry Kanarek, the Senate Chair provided an overview of the Executive Compensation process and outcome regarding President Liebowitz’s compensation.
• The Faculty engaged with the Board Compensation Committee included Dan Bergstresser and Wendy Cadge in addition to the Senate Chair.
• The Chair described Pres. Liebowitz’s compensation position among peer institutions and described the comprehensive process the Board of Trustees and Faculty Representatives engaged in. Discussion ensued. The Chair offered to discuss the process further and in more detail with anyone interested.
• Senator Osler provided an overview of the summer 2015 Executive Compensation modeling conducted by her as part of the University Budget Committee, under her leadership and the Senate Chair recognized the significant contribution of that work and affirmed that it was useful background for the revised modeling conducted this spring by the Board.

Free Expression

• While the meeting officially adjourned at 1:45 PM and the Chair departed to prepare for the final Faculty Meeting of the 2016-2017 academic year, Senator Sampath provided a preliminary debrief on the Presidential Task Force on Free Expression, to be presented and further discussed at the May Faculty Meeting immediately to follow.

• **Next Meeting**
  o Updates from Senators engaged in the Task Force on “Dignity at Work” and updating the Sexual Assault Policies will be presented at the next Senate meeting as will an update on the anticipated Faculty Governance Task Force.

Respectfully submitted by Lanni Isenberg.
To: All Faculty

From: Susan P. Curnan, President Faculty Senate

Larry Kanarek, Chair, Board of Trustees

RE: Letter to the Faculty on Senior Administrators’ Compensation

We are writing to tell you about a meaningful change in the way faculty and the Faculty Senate are involved in providing input to setting the compensation of Brandeis’ senior administrators, including the President. Historically, the faculty had no input or involvement in the Board’s compensation-setting process for senior administrators; rather, for the past few years, it would receive an after-the-fact presentation from the Chair of the Board looking back at what the President’s compensation was the prior year and how it compared with peers, along with aggregated compensation information about the senior administrative team.

Going forward, we’ve agreed to pilot a new approach. Three faculty representatives to the Board will now be involved in the compensation process itself. Specifically, the President of the Faculty Senate plus two other Faculty Representatives to the Board will participate in the work and deliberations of the 12-person Committee of the Board that approves compensation of senior administrators and recommends for approval to the full Board the compensation of the President.

This will allow those faculty members to offer perspectives on the key streams of compensation work:

- the appropriate university peer group to use in framing senior administrators’ compensation;
- the principles by which Presidential and senior administrative compensation is set;
- and the President’s performance.

With respect to the latter, the President of the University will meet with the full Senate in April to review annual goals, accomplishments and challenges and to share Presidential goals for the year ahead. Following this meeting, the President of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Representatives will hold a discussion with the Faculty Senate to gather the Senate’s perspective on the President’s goals and accomplishments and share it with the Board’s compensation committee for their consideration in forming the President’s evaluation. The Faculty Representatives will also be involved in the compensation committee’s discussions about the compensation of Brandeis’ senior administrators.
In addition, the President of the Faculty Senate will share information with the full Senate about the President’s compensation. For example, once the peer group is accepted by the Board Committee, the Senate President will share where the President’s FY17 compensation stood within the peer group (percentile). Also, the Senate President will share information if the increase exceeds certain parameters, the specific nature of which are still being determined by the Board’s compensation committee and the three Faculty Representatives to it. Of course, the compensation of individual senior administrators, including the President’s, is published on the 990 forms, on a somewhat lagged basis, and made available by the Chronicle of Higher Education, among other publications.

This approach signals a change in the role of the Faculty and the Faculty Senate in University governance and replaces the presentation the Chair of the Board has made to the faculty in recent years.

We want to encourage all faculty to reach out to their elected senators, the Senate President directly, and/or Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees, with any thoughts on this pilot process or any related faculty governance matters.
Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to encourage you to join our colleagues Susan Curnan, Wendy Cadge, Provost Lisa Lynch and me in an ongoing and important conversation about the faculty’s role in governance at Brandeis. This conversation began in January when the Faculty Senate hosted a retreat – open to all faculty – and attended by about forty faculty as well as the Provost and me. Organized by Susan Curnan, the faculty who gathered brainstormed about the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches to the faculty’s role in governance and began to articulate ideas for better integrating faculty in decision-making across the university.

Subsequent informal conversations – including a second meeting open to all faculty last month hosted by the Faculty Senate – identified gaps and points of ambiguity in current faculty governance. To bring more members of the faculty into this conversation and be sure that we have robust structures for including faculty in institutional governance, I have asked Susan Curnan and Wendy Cadge to chair a Task Force on Faculty Governance.

This Task Force – comprised of six to eight faculty nominated by their peers – will assess the state of governance at Brandeis, focusing both on how the faculty practices governances in those areas that are its primary responsibility and in terms of the faculty’s role in relationship to the administration and in some instances to the Board as they related to shared governance—a concept that will require a common understanding on the part of the Board and faculty. The Task Force will also compare Brandeis’ approach to that of peer institutions, pay particular attention to best practices, and draft a set of recommendations for faculty and shared governance at Brandeis. These recommendations will turn into proposals for amending the Faculty Handbook that will be presented at Faculty meetings as outlined in the processes for amending the Handbook. The specific outcomes of this process are open – the Task Force may recommend more committees and structures than we have now or fewer depending on what they learn along the way.
The Task Force will be comprised of one faculty representative from each of the Divisions (Science, Social Science, Humanities and Creative Arts) as well as one faculty representative from IBS, one from Heller, and one from Rabb. To assure a group that is as diverse as possible along all dimensions, we are asking the Division heads (John Burt, Sarah Lamb, John Wardle, Jonathan Unglaub) as well as representatives from Heller (Cindy Thomas and Darren Zinner), IBS (Katy Graddy) and Rabb (Karen Muncaster) to nominate two to three people that might serve. If you are interested in serving, please contact one of these individuals to be nominated by May 5th. We are committed to having at least one tenure-track faculty member on the committee and at least one-contract faculty member. The committee will be selected from the nominations by Susan Curnan and Wendy Cadge in consultation with Lisa Lynch and me.

We hope to announce the members of this Task Force in early May. A short survey will also be distributed in May to gather feedback from all faculty seeking opinions on the strengths and weaknesses in the current approach to faculty governance. Susan Curnan and Wendy Cadge will work with a consultant, Susan Resneck Pierce, who is President Emerita of the University of Puget Sound and author of a recent book pertinent to our work, Governance Reconsidered: How Boards, Presidents, Administrators and Faculty Can Help Their Colleges Thrive (Jossey-Bass, 2014), to analyze these data and gather information about peer institutions through the summer. The committee will do the bulk of its work in the fall and will present progress reports along the way. They will share their thinking through what they hope will be regular conversation with the faculty in the form of open meetings and presentations at regular faculty meetings. The information gathered about peer institutions will be made public as will a summary of findings from the survey at Brandeis. The Task Force will also be in conversation with the Board of Trustees primarily through two members of the Academy Committee, Meyer Koplow and Dan Jick.

I appreciate your attention to this process and encourage you to nominate faculty colleagues to the Task Force. If you have questions about any of this, please don’t hesitate to contact me, Lisa Lynch, Susan Curnan, or Wendy Cadge.

Best regards,

Ron
March 25, 2017

TO: Dean of Arts and Sciences + Dean of GSAS + A&S Division Heads
Dean of the International Business School + Senior Associate Dean + selective faculty
Dean of the Heller School of Social Policy and Management + Educational Steering Committee + Research Steering Committee
Vice President of the Rabb School of Continuing Education
Center and Institute Directors

FROM: Ron Liebowitz, Lisa Lynch, and Stew Uretsky

We have reached a critical juncture in our institutional history—a time to determine how we will build on the legacy of our first sixty-eight years and shape our shared future. We need to build a clear, compelling vision for the university, and we need to articulate how Brandeis achieves as a whole something far greater than the sum of its constituent schools, centers, institutes, and programs. We need to establish how we can best deliver on our mission, how we will increase our impact over the next generation, and how we will strengthen and steward our financial, technological, and human resources to ensure our flourishing for generations to come.

We already have important work underway on critical defining questions for the university, such as through the general education curricular review, our ongoing preparation for our re-accreditation review, and the annual department reports submitted to the deans. In addition, much brainstorming and discussion was part of the 2012-13 strategic planning process. These efforts and others are essential processes that we will incorporate into our greater thinking as we plan our future.

The next step in our university-wide planning process will be to ensure we are incorporating the best thinking within the various parts of the university by those who have the greatest knowledge of their respective programs. It is important to attain information at a scale that will capture the significance to Brandeis of the large as well as the smaller programs. Unlike a traditional strategic planning process, this work is an exercise in strategic prioritization. In order for us to consider what activities we want to grow and in which to invest, we need to take a dispassionate review of all our activities and consider their relative prioritization. With that goal, I am asking each of you to respond to the critical questions listed below over the next three months. We will use your work—in the form of a 15-page (give or take) paper—in what will be a university-wide set of discussions in the fall to help prioritize programs and activities for the entire university taking into account our financial, administrative, and human resources capacities.

**Vision.** What is your vision for your school/center/institute/program reaching a fundamentally greater level of achievement and impact over the next five years? What are the measures and qualitative markers “visible to the naked eye” that would demonstrate this vision has been achieved? How will achieving this vision advance Brandeis as a whole and further the university’s mission?

**Operating Constraints and Context.** What aspects of your school’s/center’s/institute’s/program’s current operating context are most relevant to your ability to make forward-looking plans and evolve in the near-term and beyond? For instance,
what specific challenges must be confronted/solved in the next few years, and what is the nature of each of those key management challenges (e.g., decisions required from others, staffing or funding needed, lack of data and information, or any other kind of challenge)? What are the most important “fork in the road” decisions that you must make in the next few years?

**External Context.** What are the major trends and developments in the external environment, outside of Brandeis, that you expect will most affect your school/center/institute/program over the next several years and beyond? What opportunities and risks do you expect these trends will create for your area especially and for Brandeis overall?

**Priorities.** What are presently your most important programs/activities—those that represent the “core” of what you do and areas where investment is presently most crucial? Please prioritize each of your programs or activities from the most important to those less so, and provide a brief explanation as to why you have prioritized something the way you have. What would be the anticipated outcome of expanding the highest priority item? What would be the impact of discontinuing the item with the least priority?

**Growth Opportunities.** Looking forward, what are your greatest opportunities to expand impact and, if relevant, to generate/increase revenue? Please consider what will it take for you to secure the resources required to take advantage of these opportunities (e.g., through freeing up resources currently directed to other objectives in your school/center/institute/ or program; through raising funds on your own; or raising funds with others’ help, etc.)? How might you be able to leverage Brandeis’ proximity to Boston, including greater collaborations with local universities and colleges as well as with other institutions, such as government, business, and the social sector, to help achieve goals related to new opportunities?

**Simplicity and Efficiency.** Following the recent detailed financial study completed with the help of Kermit Daniel of Incandescent, what academic or administrative activities in your area could or should be reduced or discontinued? What could you do in new ways with greater economy of effort and resources? Please identify where any of these activities might overlap with other parts of the University. For a summary of Kermit’s work, see the paper circulated in November 2016.

**Integration.** Where do you see the greatest opportunities to contribute more broadly to the university and realize “synergies” by collaborating with other parts of Brandeis? What are the greatest needs that other areas of the university could help you to address?

As you and those with whom you consult reflect on these questions, we strongly encourage you to think creatively from a “clean sheet,” without being constrained by the specific contours of exactly how we are currently delivering on our mission from a strategic and organizational standpoint. We are seeking the best forward-looking thinking from our school/center/institute/program leaders at this moment on how to advance and sustain the work
of you and your colleagues while addressing some long-term institution-wide challenges. It is also important that, as you shape your input to the planning process, you do so in a way that reflects the financial realities and constraints that we face as an institution. We will fundraise vigorously to continue to strengthen the university, but we must also make hard choices about the best use of limited resources as we go forward.

Lisa, Stew, and I will be available as you get started as well as when you are ready to finalize your work. We will clarify any of the questions posed above to help define the specifics of what they mean in your context, and to hear from you whether analytical or other kinds of support would be useful. We welcome discussion as your work progresses.

Of course, we understand that the questions we have posed are not ones that we can answer “once and for all,” and we will not answer them definitively in the next three months. Nevertheless, it is important as we prepare for university-wide discussions in the fall that we begin with understanding your perspectives on the issues and questions posed in this letter. Senior administrators (deans, vice presidents, and president) will work over the summer to synthesize the work requested here to prepare us for the university-wide discussions. The planning process that will follow those discussions will draw upon a range of opinions from our faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends of the university. It will also draw upon insights from the work done this past year by Mark Neustadt—work that involved many focus groups with major constituencies of the university.

Our plan is to be ready to engage the broader university community around the core conclusions from these “self-reflective” documents in the fall, even as we continue to deepen our analysis in certain areas that will require greater focus. The university-wide discussions will follow with the aim of having a plan in spring semester of 2018 that will serve as a critical document to guide our initiatives and investments and provide a coherent roadmap for the university. We also should recognize that this plan will of course continue to evolve as the external context shifts and as we learn through the proposals we consider and the actions we undertake.

We look forward to taking this critical first step together, and we welcome your questions and reflections on the path we have laid out for us here.