BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

Open Meeting of the Faculty Senate February 25, 2010

The Faculty Senate met from 3-5:00pm in the Admissions Conference Room

Present: Bishop, Dibble, Flesch, Garnick, Hill, Mann, Mapps, Meyer, Morrison, Nelson, Parmentier, Troen, von Mering

Absent: Burt, Gittell, Herzfeld, Hickey, Moody

Guest: Adam Jaffe, Dean of Arts and Sciences

Senate’s Response to the Brandeis 2020 Report
The faculty senate acknowledges and appreciates the thorough and sincere work of the 'Brandeis2020' committee. We thank the committee members for devoting their time to this difficult task. As part of the deliberative process, the Senate was asked to review the proposals at its regular meeting on Thursday, February 25. In light of the fact that a meaningful review of individual proposals would have to entail careful analysis of all the data the committee collected in the process of preparing the proposals, for which there is understandably not the time, we could only review the proposals as a combined whole. However, in order for the senate to adequately represent the faculty's perspective on the sum of the proposals we need to know the context in which these will be presented to the Board of Trustees. Both at the January 12 retreat and at the January 20 special faculty meeting Trustee Meyer Koplow requested that the faculty craft a plan to reduce academic commitments as part of a comprehensive plan to reduce the university's deficit over the long term. The senate must be given an opportunity to review that comprehensive plan before it is presented to the Board of Trustees. This must include the anticipated role of contributions from the professional schools, the Centers and Institutes, the Big Ideas Group, ARRC etc. The Senate expects the administration to propose a parallel plan that will achieve similar goals as the 'Brandeis2020' proposals with regard to both financial stability and commitment to Brandeis' vision of social justice. Given that there are many factors that are interconnected, i.e. the resulting ratio of undergraduate to graduate education, as well as the proper balance of increased contributions from Heller and IBS, among many others, the senate is concerned that the Provost would even consider making any decisions about the 'Brandeis2020' proposals without the other pieces of the puzzle in place. We ask that in addition to the $3.8 million in the 'Brandeis2020' proposals the Provost provide the senate with specific target figures for all other parts of the package so that we can review it before it will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the March Board meeting.
There was a suggestion made that the Senate Council could also request a meeting with Meyer Koplow, the Chair of the Budget Committee of the BoT.

**Handbook Changes**
The senate discussed the latest round of Faculty Handbook changes submitted by the Handbook Committee. A question was raised as to the change regarding the initial appointment term lengths, V.A.5 Appointments and Promotions outside the Tenure Structure. It was suggested that maximum appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor, Associate Research Professor, Associate Professor of the Practice (added), Professor, Research Professor, or Professor of the Practice outside the tenure structure should not be reduced from seven years to five years. Although only a very small number of contract faculty eventually receive 7-year-contracts, there was a concern that reducing the number of years to max. 5 would negatively affect the recruitment and retention of exceptional contract faculty.

There was also a concern raised regarding the section related to V.A.4 Tenure and Promotion, as this section refers to a “departmental report.” It was suggested that the language here and throughout the handbook should be changed to be inclusive of Heller School and IBS--both schools do not have departments. It was suggested that the change could be made to say the “summary recommendation report is prepared by the department/Heller/IBS.”

**Report by the Workload Committee**
Adam Jaffe, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, joined the meeting at 4:30pm to discuss the suggestions made by the Faculty Workload Committee. This committee recommended that all tenured faculty be required to prepare a report every five years.

Dean Jaffe reported that this proposal was discussed at the last chair’s meeting and the general consensus among the chairs present was that this additional report would be unnecessary and that the activities report, possibly with a slight adjustment, could serve a post-tenure review process just as well, without the need for an additional report or committee. The chairs also agreed that a review of tenured faculty, and subsequent adjustments to workload, was in the purview of the dean and did not need an additional report.

The dean reiterated that the committee felt the report would give authority to any actions deemed necessary by the dean, as this would be a faculty supported initiative. Some members of the Senate agreed that having this report could have benefits in the review of a tenured faculty member, since it would produce uniform documentation for all tenured faculty. However, there was much agreement that the current system could be adjusted to allow for such reviews. It was decided that the dean would go back to the workload committee with the suggestion of adjusting the current activities report, by adding questions that could accomplish the goals that the workload committee laid out for the new report. This could then be evaluated and adjustments made or a new report added, if
The Senate asked that if any questions were to be added to this year’s activity report, that they be emailed to the Senate for review prior to publication.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm