The second meeting of the Faculty Senate was held at 3:10 p.m., 26 September 2007, in the Board of Trustees Conference Room. Senators present: Marc Brettler (Chair), Seth Fraden, Ira Gessel, Eric Hill, Harry Mairson, Robert Moody, Leonard Muellner, Richard Parmentier, David Rakowski, Govind Sreenivasan, Ilan Troen, Malcolm Watson. Senators absent: William Flesch, Jody Gittell, David Jacobson, Catherine Mann.

Report from the Chair

Firearms Proposal: The Chair reported that Peter French, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, will attend the Faculty Meeting on 11 October, to report on the proposal to arm Brandeis University Public Safety Officers. Mr. French will take questions from the faculty at that time. Edward Callahan, Director of Public Safety, will also attend the meeting.

Education Program Proposal: The Chair said that Professor Marya Levenson, head of the Education Program, has asked that the Faculty Senate consider a proposal for creating a new major in education studies. The Chair reported that the Senate Council discussed the matter, which is now sitting before the Social Sciences Council. The Senate Council, he said, believes it is not appropriate to involve the Senate in the discussion until the proper bodies, the School Councils and the University Curriculum Committee, have made their determination. The Senate concurred.

Reappointment of Provost and Dean of Arts and Sciences: Professor Brettler said that the Provost has informed the Council that the process, procedures, and timing for the reappointment of the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences are in place, and that the Senate should expect to receive notification by early November.

Council Meeting with Provost and Deans: The Senate Council met with the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences, Adam Jaffe, Dean of the Heller School, Stuart Altman, and the Dean of the International School of Business, Bruce Magid. Discussion focused on the ways in which various units of University can cooperate and may learn from each other. Another meeting of this group will take place later this semester, and some suggested handbook changes may result from these interchanges.

Senate Report at Faculty Meetings: Senators agreed that the Chair should report on Senate business at Faculty Meetings.

Appointment of Tenured and/or Tenure Track Faculty to Arts and Sciences Programs: Prior to the meeting, the Chair distributed to Senators a memo from the Dean of Arts and Sciences, which outlines guidelines for the appointment of Tenure and Tenure Track faculty to Arts and Sciences programs. Currently, the Education Program has requested a Tenure Track Assistant Professor position. In his memo to the Senate Council, Dean Jaffe outlines principles to guide appointments of this kind. Although the Faculty Handbook does not require the Senate’s approval for such appointments, the Dean asks, in his memo, that the Senate discuss the desirability of moving in this direction.

The Senate discussed this matter at length, and then took the following straw polls on the proposed
guidelines:

1. Is it ever a good idea to appoint a tenure/tenure track faculty member to a program: 11 yes, 1 no.
2. Is this current document sufficient to determine when such exceptions take place? The Senate felt there are ambiguities in the policy guidelines, and that exceptions can become the norm. However, with modifications, the Senate said it would be willing to endorse the document: 12 yes, 0 no.

The Senate also began to discuss what special amendments would improve the policy.

Dean Adam Jaffe was invited to attend the meeting to continue the discussion. Senators expressed their concern that the criteria in the document involve significant judgments and interpretations, which could be abused by future deans. Therefore, they felt that some oversight mechanism should be incorporated; e.g., approval by the Senate, by the School Councils, or by the School Council closest to the program.

When asked what he would consider reasonable oversight of the policy, the Dean said that he does not see the need for faculty oversight; that a clearly drafted policy should be sufficient. He added that he would agree to the Senate’s suggestion that the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities should be notified in such appointments, as it is notified in cases of tenure/tenure track appointments without a national search (i.e., Target of Opportunity hires).

The Chair asked the Dean if, in terms of oversight by faculty, 1) the Target of Opportunity procedure is acceptable (i.e., the Dean and the Provost agree that all conditions described in the Faculty Handbook have been met before authorizing such a search, and that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee has been notified; and 2) that approval of the policy is subject to review by the Senate after three years. The Dean said he would have no objection. (In subsequent discussion, the Senate felt that a one-year review would be more appropriate.)

The sense of the Senate is that the Dean’s proposal is a reasonable one in exceptional circumstances, and voted 11-1 in favor of the proposal on the conditions that the Dean notify the Faculty Committee on Rights and Responsibilities in any case where such an appointment is to be made, in the same manner as is done by the Provost in the case of Appointments to the Tenure Structure Without a National Search, and that the policy be reviewed by the Senate after one year.

Attached is Dean Jaffe’s memorandum.

Brandeis University
Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences
MS 120
Extension: 63451 Fax: 63457

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate Council

From: Adam B. Jaffe, Dean of Arts and Sciences

Re: Appointment of TT/tenured faculty to A&S Programs without a Departmental Home
I have approved a search for a new faculty member in the Education Program, to help staff the rapidly growing Master of Arts in Teaching (“MAT”) program. The Program currently has two full-time faculty outside the tenure structure, but we are more likely to get a strong candidate, and build a better program, if we can make this new appointment a TT Assistant Professor appointment. The two full-time faculty members endorse this decision.

The Faculty Handbook talks about the tenure process in terms of “Departments,” but officially defines the term “Department” for this purpose as “Department or other Academic Unit.” Last fall, I consulted the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for an interpretation of this structure relative to the question of whether TT or tenured appointments could be made directly to an Interdepartmental Program. The Committee’s opinion was that the Handbook does, indeed, permit such appointments. Nonetheless, since our past practice has been to appoint tenured and tenure-track positions in Departments, I would like the Senate to discuss the desirability of moving in this direction. I suggest that we should retain a strong presumption that TT/tenured appointments should be housed in a Department, but tenure track appointments could be made in programs when all the following conditions hold:

1. An appointment needs to be made to achieve the curricular goals of a Program, there is no Department that would be an appropriate home for the appointee for scholarly and/or curricular reasons, and making the appointment outside the tenure structure would weaken the Program or the appointment.
2. The Program in question is one that already exists and is one that corresponds to a well-established field of academic study, with generally understood standards for tenure within that field.
3. The Program in question is one that already exists and has a core of faculty hired within the program.
4. There are on the faculty 3-4 tenured members qualified to evaluate the tenure case. These members should be identified and willing to serve before a tenure decision is made.

I believe that these conditions are satisfied in the case of Education, and for that reason favor the tenure-track appointment. I seek the views of the Senate on whether or not it is, indeed, appropriate to make such appointments, and, if so, whether the conditions that I have suggested provide an appropriate framework for such decisions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.