BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

Meeting of the Faculty Senate March 25, 2010

The Faculty Senate met from 3-5:00pm in Heller G53

Present: Bishop, Dibble, Flesch, Garnick, Herzfeld, Hickey, Hill, Mann, Mapps, von Mering

Absent: Burt, Gittell, Meyer, Moody, Morrison, Nelson, Parmentier, Troen

Guests: Susan Lanser and Leslie Griffith, Representatives to the Board of Trustees
        Allyala Nandakumar, Heller School
        Danielle Wolfson, Student Director for Academic Affairs

Report on Board of Trustees Meeting
Leslie Griffith and Susan Lanser gave a report to the Faculty Senate on the meeting of the Board of Trustees that occurred March 23rd and 24th, 2010.

In response to the proposal of the Brandeis 2020 committee, the Academic Affairs Committee of the BoT stated that they were impressed by the effort carried out by the faculty, especially given the time constraints. The question was raised as to the number of students actually affected by the elimination of the suggested programs. Dean Adam Jaffe reported on those numbers.

The BoT at large had questions that concerned the elimination of certain undergraduate programs, such as Hebrew. It was explained that many of the majors could still be completed under different programs, such as the Hebrew major under NEJS, and students that could not complete a desired major under a different concentration could still fulfill that area of study through an independent studies major.

The budget was passed by the Board of Trustees.

The representatives also gave a brief report on the status of the Presidential Search. They confirmed that the BoT is pleased with the progress being made by the search committee and that they are currently talking with several potential candidates. The suggestion was made that one of the faculty representatives on the search committee should be invited to serve as a member on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the search.

Review of new Institute for Global Health and Development
Allyala Nandakumar visited to discuss the creation of the Institute for Global Health and Development within the Heller School.
Nandakumar explained that the question the Heller School has posed in the development of this new institute is one of how to translate the research that is ongoing in the field of technology and healthcare in such a way as to reach, and advance, the care received in disadvantaged countries on a large scale. The committee focused the mission statement for this institute with the aim of providing the best research to policy makers, enabling them to implement programs based on these findings. He also explained that the creation of this institute was following through on a promise made when the Schneider Institute was established with the intention of, eventually, focusing on global care. Nandakumar reiterated that tremendous input and effort went into defining the mission of the institute and in ensuring that the program would be financially viable and sustainable.

It was expressed by other faculty in the school that Heller is already concerned with global issues through many of their programs and degrees. Over half of student body is from outside of US. These students work with faculty who do research in other countries through grants that promote global health and development. The goal of this institute is to find a home for what already exists at Heller. The current plan is to focus on key geographies and research areas where the school already has strong involvement. The target is to achieve a growth of half a million dollars per year, minimum, for the next five years. So far, the school has raised one million dollars in committed grant funding. In six months, the committee will go back to Dean Lynch with a fund raising strategy.

There was an acknowledgement from the Faculty Senate that, according to the faculty handbook, the proposed creation of this institute should have begun in consultation with the Faculty Senate Council, in order that an appropriate deliberative process could have been established. This has been acknowledged by Dean Lynch as well. However, upon reviewing the materials and the process undertaken by this committee of the Heller School, it was agreed by the Council that an appropriate process had indeed occurred. Some concerns were expressed by members of the Senate that the new institute would not be integrated into the rest of the university, particularly in the area of undergraduate education, and that this could be an area that should be investigated further with the aim of identifying synergies outside of the Heller School. It was stressed that the affiliated faculty from Arts and Sciences within the Heller School were a part of the process and the creation of the proposal.

The Senate agreed that the plan for the institute was well thought out and in-line with the mission of the University. They felt that the committee should be congratulated on the work undertaken, the fundraising efforts and results, as well as the specific process implemented in the establishment of the institute proposal. It was agreed that, with the additions of the initial consultation with the Senate Council, this process could serve as a model for future planned centers and institutes. It was suggested that this proposal go to the Provost for approval and that a presentation be made at the next faculty meeting.

It was suggested that the Handbook Committee be charged with reexamining the procedure for approving centers and institutes to more clearly define the process and specifically the involvement of the Faculty Senate.
**Pass/Fail Plus Proposal (Presentation by Danielle Wolfson, Student Director for Academic Affairs)**

Danielle Wolfson began the discussion of the Pass/Fail Plus proposal by explaining some modifications. It was suggested at the UCC meeting that this plan should not apply to Foreign Language, WI and UWS requirements. Wolfson planned to make those changes before submitting the proposal to the UCC for final approval.

Wolfson explained that her proposal is aimed at allowing students to take courses that might seem daunting, but interesting, to fulfill their General Education Requirements. The proposal states that a student must receive a C+ or higher in order to receive credit in one of the General Education areas, even if the student chooses to cover the grade on his/her transcript. A student may receive a passing grade on the transcript if the grade is lower than a C+, but would still have to take another class to fulfill that requirement.

The Senate raised the question to Wolfson as to why the proposal asks that only one course be competed under the Pass/Fail Plus option. She explained that, usually, there is one class out of the GE requirements that is of concern to an individual student. This would allow the student to take a more challenging course in this area without fear of failing. Many in the Senate supported this idea, especially as it would encourage students to attempt more challenging course work and most felt that it should not be limited to only one course in the general education requirements. In addition, they felt this plan would alleviate the need for several sections of the larger lecture courses and allow some of the small seminar classes to fully enroll.

Judy Herzfeld made a motion that the senate should express its support for this plan and that the Pass/Fail Plus program should allow all GE requirements to be taken pass/fail, with the exception of the UWS. This was seconded by William Flesch and approved by consensus of the Senate.

**Junior Faculty Initiative and Updates**

Sabine von Mering gave a report to the Senate on her recent activities, as well as those of the Senate Council.

She has asked Provost Marty Krauss for a comprehensive response to the Brandeis 2020, as requested by the Senate at the February 25th meeting. Von Mering confirmed that the Provost is in the midst of generating that report.

Von Mering reported that the Senate Council has held meetings with all three Deans, Jaffe, Lynch and Magid, separately. This will continue next year.

The Handbook Committee is continuing their work. It was suggested that broader initiative be undertaken next year.

The HR Policy Committee has started work under chair Jody Gittell. It is possible that they may have a draft by the end of the year.

The development committee is working and will present a report at faculty meeting.
It was suggested that a reception be organized for junior faculty members. If this is to occur there will need to be a subcommittee, comprised of only junior faculty, established to organize this. It was decided, for this purpose, that junior faculty would be defined as those having been at Brandeis less than six years.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.