Meeting of the Faculty Senate October 22, 2009.

The Faculty Senate met from 3:00-5:00pm in the Board of Trustees Room, Irving.

Present: Bishop, Burt, Dibble, Garnick, Gittell, Herzfeld, Hickey, Hill, Mann, Meyer, Moody, Morrison, Nelson, Parmentier, Troen, von Mering

Absent: Flesch, Mapps

Guests: President Jehuda Reinharz

Response to Harper’s Article
An article entitled “Voodoo Academics: Brandeis University’s Hard Lesson in the Real Economy” was written for Harper’s magazine by reporter Christopher Beha. The article discussed Brandeis' intention to sell art from the Rose Art Museum to close the university's budget deficit, and the financial investments and construction projects of the university. This article was circulated on the faculty listserv.

Reinharz stressed that many of the statistics quoted in the article were incorrect, and that the magazine had been contacted about their inaccuracies. He plans to write a letter to the editors at Harper’s in response to the article in an attempt to rectify the misstatements. In addition, there is a plan to send both the article and the President’s response to the Columbia School of Journalism for investigation. This, however, is a lengthy process and will not result in an immediate response. Reinharz also plans to write a letter to the Board of Trustees and the Brandeis faculty clarifying the issues raised in this article and correcting the inaccuracies.

Fiscal 2011 Budget
President Reinharz discussed the outlook for Fiscal Year 2011. He referred to the projections made at the last faculty meeting, and stressed that the projection of last year, to reduce the annual deficit to two million dollars by 2014, would not be possible to attain at this time. The largest factor in the university’s inability to close the financial deficit is based on the lower level of fundraising. While fundraising is still continuing, and the donor base is growing, those donors are not contributing the same amounts as in previous years. Reinharz predicted that fundraising will be more difficult this year than it was last year. He said that the current focus is on donations towards scholarships. The current student tuition discount rate is around 36%, and Reinharz predicted that percentage might have to increase with the next class that had to be recruited. He stressed that 72% of Brandeis students receive some type of financial aid.

A discussion ensued regarding the “need blind” system of admissions, and whether or not Brandeis would continue this practice. Reinharz stressed the importance of continuing
this kind of recruitment to maintain the consistent high caliber of students attending Brandeis.

**Update on Rose Lawsuit**

Reinharz updated the Senate on the status of the Rose lawsuit. Though the motion was dismissed, several of the plaintiffs’ demands were also rejected.

1) The plaintiffs had requested an injunction against the sale of the art work from the Rose. This was denied.

2) The plaintiffs wanted to “represent the public” in these matters. This was rejected as the Attorney General serves as the public representative. The plaintiffs were allowed to represent their own art housed at the museum.

3) The plaintiffs have created a 501(c)(3) and requested that all contents of the Rose be transferred to this fund, giving them control of the assets. This was denied.

The final decision to be made in this case centers around the plaintiffs’ role in overseeing the affairs of the museum. It is expected that this will be revisited in June 2010, and the decision will be made as to whether or not the plaintiffs’ individual standing as overseer of the Rose means more than serving as advisors in matters related to the museum’s operation.

The question was posed as to whether or not the recommendation by the Future of the Rose Committee to further integrate the museum into the campus would be in conflict with the Rose’s status as a public museum. Reinharz stressed that the two ideas were not in conflict with each other and that, further, the administration is following the recommendations from the committee to hire a director of the museum, who would then participate in the search and hiring of an education director and curator.

**Creation of “Vision Committee”**

President Reinharz discussed his intention to charge the Provost with the task of forming a “Vision Committee.” This committee would be charged with developing ideas for generating additional income for the university, while still working within the existing academic framework. The committee will be announced at the next faculty meeting. This would most likely be a ten-person committee made up of both faculty and administrators.

**Presidential Search**

The Senate asked President Reinharz for his thoughts on the Presidential Search, and what qualities would be necessary in his successor. Reinharz said that one of the disadvantages we have going into this process is that the pool of applicants interested in Brandeis will be smaller, because of the nature of Brandeis as a “hybrid” institution. But that this can also be an advantage. Reinharz expressed that the job of the President of any university is going get harder in the coming years as American higher education is changing rapidly.

Reinharz said that he will not have an active role in the search, but that he feels confident in the trustees and faculty representatives, and stressed that he would like to have as
many representatives from both groups on the search committee as possible. In terms of qualities necessary in a candidate, Reinharz said it would be ideal for a candidate to be a scholar with a Ph.D., though this should not be a requirement as long as the candidate were in line with the mission and purpose of Brandeis. Former President Sam Thier, for example, had held an M.D. and not a Ph.D.

The question was raised as to whether or not Reinharz felt it would be important for a candidate to be religiously or culturally Jewish. Reinharz agreed that it would be helpful, but again, not necessary. As with the issue of hiring a scholar, he felt that as long as a candidate was in line with the goals and intentions of the university, religious or cultural affiliation would not be a requirement for the position.

President Reinharz left the Faculty Senate Meeting at 4:00pm.

**Update on Board of Trustees Creation of a Presidential Search Committee**
Malcolm Sherman, the Chair of the Board of Trustees, has agreed to raise the number of faculty representation on the search committee from two to three. He is unsure as to whether or not the announcement of the complete committee can be made by next week, as he is waiting to hear back from many of the Board members as to whether or not they feel that they would be able to serve. A search firm has not been chosen yet, as this will be a task taken on by the committee. The overall size of the committee has not been determined, but the decision has been made that there will not be student representation on the search committee. Sherman will be meeting with the student union next week to discuss student involvement in the search process. Emeriti faculty have been approaching Sherman about representation on the search committee as well, but at this point it seems that they have agreed to defer a place on the search committee in favor of current faculty members. They will, however, have opportunities to give input.

**CARS Implementation Process**
The DCC (Dean’s Curriculum Committee) has reviewed the CARS report from last year and determined that it is their role to oversee the implementation of the recommendations in all cases except:
1) recommendations for centers and institutes and
2) workload issues.
They have returned both of these areas to the Provost’s office. They have proposed to the Provost’s office, in the case of faculty workload, that a committee be formed that includes faculty and administrators with representation from both CARS and the DCC to oversee the recommendations in this area. This committee would take on defining procedures for such things as course banking and course relief for faculty carrying administrative workloads. The Provost will appoint two members of this committee and the Senate will appoint two members, with Dean Jaffe chairing.

The Senate reviewed a charge for the committee provided by Provost Marty Krauss. Some suggestions of changes were made to the language of the charge. The role of the Senate, if any, was discussed as it related to implementing the recommendations that will
come out of this committee and whether or not the charge should come directly from the Senate.

According to the Faculty Handbook, workload issues must be submitted to the Faculty Senate for review. (From the Faculty Handbook: Letter C: Rights and Responsibilities, Section 2. Responsibilities, Letter g. Work schedule)

i. Proposals for changes in university policy with respect to the work load of faculty must be submitted to the Faculty Senate, the School Councils, and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for prior review, and may be submitted to the Faculty Meeting for review.

The Senate agreed that it is the responsibility of the Senate to review the recommendations that come out of this committee, and if desired, the recommendations could also be brought before the faculty at large. Therefore, it was not necessary for the Senate to charge the committee directly, but there will be recommendations made to the Provost for changes to the charge.

Process of Establishing the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Presidential Search Committee

The discussion then moved to the construction of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Presidential Search Committee. Sabine von Mering stated that it would be necessary to reopen the nominations to the faculty for this committee, rather than assuming that the faculty members nominated to the Search Committee would be the same faculty nominated to this second committee. It was agreed that this committee could not be formed, however, until the final decision is made on which faculty will be serving on the search committee. The purpose in re-nominating is that this committee will serve a very different purpose than the search committee and should have a broader base with wider faculty representation, therefore, the same candidates might not be as appropriate, or willing, to serve on this committee. It was requested that Malcolm Sherman be asked to put in writing the role of this Faculty Advisory Committee in the search process.

It was suggested that the email asking for nominations encourage volunteering to serve on this committee as well as nominating fellow faculty members. Sabine von Mering also stated that she is interested in meeting with junior faculty members to hear their concerns and to encourage their participation in this process.

The current idea is to have this committee be a minimum of eight faculty members, but the final determination of the number will depend largely on the participation of this committee in the search process. This committee will report directly to the Faculty Senate. Many members of the Senate stressed that there needed to be a defined mechanism by which the work of this advisory committee would be reported to the Presidential Search Committee and vice versa. Regular communication with the Senate would also be needed for this committee to be effective.

Malcolm Sherman has agreed to attend the November 19th meeting of the Faculty Senate along with the Chair of the Presidential Search Committee. More discussions can be had at that time regarding the composition and charge of the Faculty Advisory Committee.
It was agreed that an agenda for that meeting should be developed soon.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.