

**Report of the Rose Committee**  
**Nancy Scott, Fine Arts; Jerry Samet, Philosophy; Eric Hill, Theater Arts**  
**Feb 16 2009**

**CHARGE**

Our charge, as we understood it, and announced it to the groups we met with:

- To better understand the costs and benefits of keeping the Rose Museum open vs. the costs and benefits of closing it.
- To explore viable alternatives to closing the Rose.
- We took ourselves to be an emergency, fact-finding body.
- We assumed from the start that we would not have the time or resources to make a concrete close/don't close recommendation about the Rose Museum. Instead, we tried to listen and to sketch out the key issues involved in closing or not closing the Rose. We also tried to assess the damage that has already been done to the museum and the university.
- We considered what further damage might be done.

**MEETINGS WE HELD**

We spoke to:

- Michael Rush, Rose Director
- Peter French, VP-Finance
- Marty Krauss, Provost
- Fine Arts Dept faculty and students
- Studio Arts Dept faculty and students
- Faculty and students in Cultural Production (MA) and Masters of Arts in Teaching

We had hoped to also schedule appointments with the following (but ran out of time)

- Jehuda Reinharz
- Malcolm Sherman, Chairman of the Board of Trustees
- Jonathan Lee, Chair of the Board of Overseers of the Rose
- Peter Conrad, Faculty Budget Committee

More time to talk, think, and digest would of course have been useful, but we feel that we have been able to gather important information that can support subsequent deliberations and decision-making.

**DISCUSSION WITH PETER FRENCH**

We used the time to get a clearer view of how Brandeis got into its current financial difficulties and how the sale of the Rose Museum's contents could help solve them. The following financial points are an oversimplification, but it might be useful to the University community to have a clear point of perspective to help us think seriously about our problems:

- Currently, our budget requires that we get \$40m a year from our endowment - roughly 5% of the \$712m that we had before the current financial crisis
- The endowment is now roughly \$550m
- The current losses in the endowment mean that the \$40m will have to come out of the university's 'rainy day' fund part of the endowment, what Peter French refers to as the 'quasi-endowment'.
- Even if the market reverts to 'normal' in the near term, we will very likely have roughly a \$430m endowment (roughly 5% = \$20+m)
- So, with no changes in the way we operate, we will have a likely \$20m shortfall every year. If the market rebounds very quickly, the endowment will grow and throw off more; but we can't plan on that.
- The reserve fund will cover this shortfall for 2 years (yrs 1-2).
- If we succeed in the changes the CARS subcommittees are working on, we will save a net of \$6m per year, and there will be some 'double benefits' if we phase in the mandatory summer semester (or some alternative) while we have students on the old system (yrs 3-4).
- If we settle into a steady state (yr 5 and out), we will still be \$14m per year short.

There is more to the finances - an expected drop in annual gifts, a debt of \$256m, a \$25m structural deficit, etc - but these numbers are probably a decent starting place.

#### WHAT IF WE COULD SPEND MORE OF THE ENDOWMENT?

Although there is some debate as to whether the administration could challenge the MA law that prevents us from spending more out of our endowment, it is still a firmly held belief by Peter French that this is inviting disaster. Even if we *could* spend more of the principal, we would be digging ourselves a deeper and deeper hole - a diminished endowment means a diminished return and a bigger yearly deficit.

#### WHAT WOULD WE DO WITH PROCEEDS OF ROSE SALES?

According to Peter French, if we had \$150m coming in over a 5 year period, we should use it to: (i) bridge the budget gaps, (ii) serve as a backstop in case the risky initiatives we are poised to take (CARS) do *not* work out as planned, and (iii) build up the reserve fund ('quasi-endowment').

#### ALTERNATIVES TO CLOSING THE ROSE.

There are still legal uncertainties that surround the sale of paintings, even if the museum is closed, so there is a possibility that closing the Rose is not any sort of solution to our problems. We wanted to find out if the Administration or the Board of Trustees had developed an alternative PLAN B. It turns out they had not; if the Rose closing didn't work, it was "back to the drawing board". We

have not been able to even sketch out financial alternatives, but we understand the University Budget Committee has taken on that task.

French reported to us that he was quoted out of context by Judith Dobrzynski (The Daily Beast & Forbes - online). She put the alternative as: “Faced with the prospect of closing 40 percent of the university’s buildings, reducing staff by an additional 30 percent, or firing 200 of its 360 faculty members.” But French assures us that this was never an alternative plan - it was just a translation of dollar figures into budget lines.

#### HOW WE GOT INTO THIS FINANCIAL TROUBLE.

As French sees it: we gambled over the past decade and a half. We grew the faculty in number and quality; we built better buildings, gave more financial aid - and so on - in order to compete in a very competitive niche. It worked for a time, but we leveraged ourselves, and now, in a serious recession, we are especially hard hit. Is this sort of leveraging: (i) the courageous and exciting choice for an ambitious start-up in a space dominated by much older players, or (ii) reckless financial mismanagement? Both opinions are in the air, but we are not in a position to say. And in the end, we don’t have the luxury of making this our main focus.

### **DISCUSSION WITH MICHAEL RUSH**

Michael Rush has been widely spoken of as a brilliant director, and he has many admirers in the groups we’ve interviewed. He acknowledged the overall crisis, but he made it explicit that he saw it his duty to defend the institution that he leads. In this respect, he stands apart from all the other ‘stakeholders’ we spoke to, in that the overall interests of the University - unless they include the Rose - are not *his* direct interest or responsibility. Nevertheless, he not only spoke eloquently about the excellence and prestige of the Rose and its position in the local and broader museum world, he was also passionate about the role of the Rose in Brandeis’ history and founding and the vision of its original Jewish donors to integrate culture and academics and the striving for excellence

#### THE UNIVERSITY AND THE ART WORLD.

Rush presented his views of the consequences we would suffer if we were to close the Rose—or even sell one painting for the purposes of budget relief. The American Association of Museum Directors (AAMD) policy on the sale of paintings from a public museum is this: ‘De-accessioning’, selling paintings to buy other paintings, is allowed; ‘selling’ paintings for any other purpose is *not allowed*. We are not members of the AAMD (we were on the verge of being approved as a member museum), but it is the most prestigious professional organization in the museum world apart from AAM (Association of American Museums). Both of these organizations set credentialing guidelines, and a high bar for ‘best practices’ in museums nationwide.

Rush's view was that even selling one painting would devastate the Rose: no one would ever again donate paintings or money to the Rose, no one would cover our shows, no one would lend or borrow art from us, students wouldn't be drawn, visitors would stay away, etc. In short, such a step would be fatal to continuing as a public museum. This AAMD rule has been put forward as an explanation of the administration's decision to simply authorize the closing of the museum (if you're not a museum, professional museum standards don't apply).

We wonder if the expected response of the AAMD and the larger museum world has been given too big a role in the University's deliberations about the closing, and in whatever sketchy plans are in place for the future of Rose. The following points may be worth considering.

- The AAMD 'ethic' is understandable as a way to protect art and artists but plainly does not stand up to serious scrutiny. There are always going to be emergency conditions that rule-makers and rules did not really prepare for. Brandeis is reacting to a catastrophic global financial emergency. We may be first up, but it is not unlikely that other institutions will be squeezed, and it is not unlikely that other museums will face the 'bad or worse' choice that we do. The AAMD might be approached, by the University or the Rose Board, about developing an emergency waiver policy. If a solution along these lines is workable, the Rose might continue *as a museum* (diminished, but with continuity and growth potential).
- Museums and institutions have come up with creative ways to use their art to raise cash, including: (i) long-term loans, (ii) selling half-shares of paintings, (iii) sell-lease programs. Has the administration investigated such options and found them all insufficient to help us get through the current crisis?
- An important question about which we remain uncertain: will the fallout of the sale of paintings be *as disastrous* as some have suggested? It has been suggested by some that the experience of other 'offenders' shows that, in time, the stigma will fade. It stands to reason that this is even more likely if other institutions facing financial emergencies are forced to follow in our footsteps.
- The upshot of these points is that it remains possible that the Rose could continue as the Rose, even if it were to sell paintings in violation of AAMD rules. Whether this is an optimal solution we leave to others to determine. Our point is that this possibility should not be closed off prematurely.
- Rush, with a grant and financial support from Board of Overseers members, Ann Tanenbaum and Jonathan Novak, has overseen the publication of the first comprehensive catalogue of the museum's collection, selecting 285 artists from the Rose's extensive holdings. These represent together a narrative of the collection's strengths and of the very story of modernist 20<sup>th</sup> century art to our contemporary times, from Cézanne, Picasso and Chagall to Rauschenberg and Johns, Warhol and Lichtenstein, these latter being the works purchased in 1962 by Sam

Hunter with \$50,000 from the Gevirtz-Mnuchin family foundation. The book, edited by Michael Rush, is well on its way to publication in Fall 2009 by Harry N. Abrams, Inc. in New York; the essays are written by Brandeis faculty and alumni, and distinguished critics, all of whom freely volunteered their time.

#### RUSH AND THE FUTURE OF THE ROSE.

If the Rose was to be closed and a new entity put in its place, it seems unlikely that Rush would be prepared to play a significant role going forward. Rush has modified his original remarks to the Faculty Meeting about the Rose being dead, etc., but when we asked him under what circumstances he could continue as Director of the Rose, his reply was that the decision to close would need to be reversed, *and* he would need to be given an 'iron-clad legal guarantee' that the University would never again try to sell the art for any purpose except to buy more art. There is more to be learned through more careful and extended discussions with the relevant parties.

### **DISCUSSION WITH PROVOST MARTY KRAUSS**

We confirmed in our last meeting with the Provost that the administration had retained a new public relations firm, Rasky Baerlein. The Provost was also clear that, despite backing away from closing the Rose, the intention of the university administration was still to liquidate artwork if that was what was necessary to protect the university financially. Under what kind of direction the Rose would continue remains unclear. The Provost indicated that an attorney has been retained to work with the University General Counsel as a means of presenting the Massachusetts Attorney General with a case for determining a legally feasible way to sell art while keeping the museum open.

We also learned in our last meeting with the Provost that a committee is now studying all forms of assets owned by the University and their liquidity. This committee is examining assets that could serve as an alternative to the wholesale, litigation-prone selling of the Rose collection. A series of cuts in a variety of areas might be the most rational approach if the assets are carefully examined. These areas include real estate and buildings, archives, personnel, the Endowment, and the contents of the Rose museums vaults.

The Provost also welcomed the faculty initiative in the area of fund raising and alumni cultivation. She feels that Nancy Winship is also welcoming ideas being proposed by faculty who want to take a more proactive role in diversifying the university's developmental efforts. The Provost recognized the need for diversification in development including reaching out to constituencies in Asia and Southeast Asia.

The Provost said that all efforts were being made to search out external funds in what we all recognize as a difficult economy. We are searching for anyone who is out there who could help Brandeis in this crisis, she told us.

## **DISCUSSIONS WITH FACULTY/STUDENTS**

We had very probing discussions with groups of faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students. We learned that closing the Rose will very significantly affect the Academy. Damage to our public reputation is apparent everywhere. Students described themselves as “youthful and ambitious” like our University—in the three meetings with faculty and students, the students spoke about the point of ethics and integrity. There has been a strong emotion among them that this act of converting art treasures to cold cash is simply underhanded. A better and more open process would have certainly mitigated this perception.

### FINE ARTS .

The Fine Arts department not only uses the Rose collection in courses, but has, in a sense, shaped the department around the Rose. This includes two important junior faculty members who work in contemporary art and architecture, Profs Grigor and Kalb, and Prof Wong, recently tenured, who also heads the East Asian Studies major, and thus has links both to Asian contemporary art and the Social Sciences. Part of what drew these faculty members to Brandeis was the prestige of the Rose, and students we spoke to in FA also spoke of the Rose as drawing them to Brandeis. Students stressed over and over the importance of the hands-on opportunities to be with the works of art and to participate in the many facets of a museum’s operation and functioning. There was also an unspoken basking in the glow of the Rose, the thrill of having something so excellent and prestigious as part of their education. This association with greatness is a benefit that will be lost if the Rose is significantly diminished—if its greatest works are sold off.

Many of the students attending our three informational meetings described museum internships, or the expectation of a future internship at the Rose as gateway to careers in museum work (MoMA, P.S. 1, the Whitney, and the Brooklyn Museum, as well as the Frick Art Museum, and Metropolitan Museum of Art were cited); other students spoke of the pleasure of studying and writing about an original work of art for a class curriculum, or working over a period of two to four years at the Rose. An entering freshman, who described herself as having been accepted to University of Chicago to study economics, turned to Brandeis instead to study art history and participate in the educational programs of the Rose, because she had been already fortunate to work in two internship capacities prior to arriving at Brandeis.

Students may intern at the Rose in the junior or senior year; some work at the Rose for all four years, whether as a guard, reception desk guide or office

worker; some are also docents. One recent senior (now in a PhD program) held numerous tours of every level of visiting group, from senior citizens to children, over a long semester between Education directors. It should be noted that the Starr and later the Warner funded internships at the Rose are excellent hands-on, experiential learning semesters for some of our most talented Fine Arts majors. The Starr curatorial internship, funded in the late 1990s by Jill Starr, has had a full decade of students. Five of the Starr interns are currently enrolled in Ph.D. programs of history or art history (Nicole Eaton, Danielle Gold, Isabelle Havet, Megan Rook-Koepsel, Karen Chernick).

Education about our situation, and efforts to re-establish the necessary trust between students and university governance seems now at a critical point.

Faculty in Fine Arts expressed opinions ranging from ways in which the 'change' of the Rose which might accommodate FA programs to strongly held positions that the museum be left as it is. A second area of concern, if the Rose is 'changed,' is that some museum staff should be retained to manage the collection, even if in its dormant phase—between its public and the auction block. A future curator of the permanent collection might be the key appointment to oversee the collection. Then, thematic or historically-minded shows from the vault could be put on view. The purposeful development of sub-sections of the work could be made into traveling exhibits, and the Rose collection could be sent on tour with catalogues so as to garner income.

- One idea expressed by faculty was that the Rose should be celebrated. Treat it like a treasure.
- Another emphasized the Importance of the Rose's reputation and the students who are drawn to Brandeis because of the Rose and what it stands for.

### STUDIO ARTS

On the practical level, our current students wonder what the BA degree will be worth, and the meeting with the art history students particularly brought forward repeated expressions of such concerns, echoed also the next day when meeting with Studio seniors and faculty. Among students just beginning at Brandeis are those uneasy that the entire University might close before their four years are complete. Students interested in the arts expressed disappointment that the very reason they were attracted to Brandeis, the Rose, will soon be gone. The obvious discouragement to prospective students, who have been informed in the press in various ways that Brandeis administrators do not consider the students' point of view (Boston Globe op-ed, Jan 31, 2009, and New York Times, letters to the Editor, Feb. 7, 2009), cannot be helpful during the process of matriculating the class of 2013.

For Studio artists, the bracing encounter with new art (in a subsequent meeting, the Cultural Production students cited this as the only way to engage fully in a museum), and exhibits of recent artistic production were cited. From the New

York Times letters, one of our recent graduates, Eliza Jacobs '05, questions if the University ever truly had a strong commitment to the arts. We heard this complaint from students in both the Art History and Studio Arts areas of Fine Arts, for whom concerns about poor studio conditions in particular (one student cited a roof leaking onto her painting last year) have been a long-running area of dissatisfaction.

The students were also engaged by the dialogue with works of art selected for a current exhibit ("Masters of Reality") curated by their own art professor, Joe Wardwell. Thus, the Rose gave them a fresh look at 'Old Masters' of modernist abstraction, such as the current Hans Hofmann 1950 exhibit, or contemporary works otherwise rarely seen in New England venues.

### CULTURAL PRODUCTION, EDUCATION, MEDIA STUDIES

The Cultural Production Masters' degree students stressed the variety of ways in which they studied museums ethnographically, or as sites of intellectual exchange in the many symposia that have occurred in the space of the Rose. Ellen Smith produced an extensive document with ideas on creating a 'speed lane' between the Rose and the Volen Center. She imagined a Center for Visual Literacy, and also noted that the 'mission of social justice' presented different faces to internal faculty and to the larger art world.

Other dynamic new programs discussed in the Cultural Production meeting were beginning a Media Studies program, continuing to teach museum studies curriculum (3 potential courses from 3 different departments were represented). Great potential for interdisciplinary curricula were emphasized by Prof Dirck Roosevelt from Education, and in the above remarks of Ellen Smith. Dirck emphasized that the Rose had been open to group meetings arranged for students as young as eight years, and for a group of Central American women and children from the Waltham schools, thus facilitating cultural exchange.

Prof. Tom King spoke about the importance of the academy's support of specialized learning, and the Rose as unique place for such environments; he also represented Mary Campbell's views, who teaches Creative writing in conjunction with work at the Rose. Other such new collaborations are imagined in the future, using the Humanities Center.

Summary of faculty response: It is astonishing that when one compares the strengths of the Rose Art Museum in modern and contemporary art with other New England museums, one sees a gathering affirmation that we do have an extraordinary treasure. Ironically this 'execrable process' - a comment from the CP meeting - has demonstrated the wisdom of our founders, i.e. that Sachar's vision for a Brandeis with special emphasis on the creative arts was an important one and continues to inform liberal arts education today. [See Dec 2008 report from Harvard on the 'new centrality' of the arts in their liberal arts curriculum.]

One might pause to imagine our collection in a future for students of the year 2059, or thereabouts. The Fogg Art Museum, founded in 1895, mounted the first exhibit anywhere of a certain French contemporary artist in 1911: Edgar Degas. The museum director at Harvard, Edwin Forbes, began to question the 'broader cultural and intellectual life' to which the university art museum contributed. He would soon return to exhibits of Renaissance art, but at the time observed: "This year we made an innovation and have recently held an exhibition of works by Degas. The advantages of exhibiting modern works of art are various. The students like it. The artists of today speak in a language that students readily understand. Art is not dead."

With some tenacity in these very hard times, Brandeis artists or faculty could write similarly of its many contemporary masters in the collection not so many years in the future.

### IF THE ROSE CLOSES: SECOND BEST ALTERNATIVES

The students all wanted us to understand the over-riding importance of the Rose to them, to their educations, and to the future careers. The faculty eloquently made the case for the unique and invaluable role that the Rose has been playing in courses, innovative initiatives and community outreach, and the reputation of Brandeis in the wider world. But these constituencies have a deeper and broader commitment to Brandeis as a University, and in this sense, our discussions with them ranged farther than our discussions with Rush. Specifically, we were forthright in pressing the following question on every group: if the decision to close the Rose is *not* overturned, what would be the *second-best solution*? Some ideas we posed for them to consider:

- Would we still be able to launch interested students into the art world? What if Brandeis could secure reserved spots for curatorial internships for our arts students at the MFA, ICA, and the Gardner?
- Could Fine Arts and Studio Arts, Museum Studies, Cultural Production, Education, and other programs that incorporate the Rose into their curricula, adapt to a diminished Rose (or to a successor that might be more responsive to curricular goals)?
- Could Brandeis make travel to Boston museums more convenient for students who benefit so much for the convenience of the Rose?
- To what extent are the educational benefits of the Rose dependent on particular works or the prestige of the museum?
- What would you want a successor to the Rose to look like?

A few, very few, faculty members were ready to address these second best issues directly, and a few students responded positively to the idea that the University might try to mitigate their loss should the museum close. But for the most there was great reluctance to consider these possibilities, matching our discomfort in pressing these questions). Perhaps it is too difficult for these stakeholders to think themselves into the aftermath of the loss of the Rose. If the decision to close is *overturned*, we can expect a new appreciation of the Rose and new energy available to work out ways to use it and benefit from its

presence. But what if the Rose does *not* continue in its present form? We sense that there is a lot of creative energy available to envision a successor or alternative. Some faculty we spoke to seem to be ready to begin that task immediately; others were less so. But our discussions with the 'inner circle' of stakeholders gives us confidence that their commitment to a healthy Brandeis is deep, and that even if the Rose does close, that their energy can help shape what comes next. Perhaps it goes without saying: they must be brought into the planning process as early as possible, and we would recommend that other 'inner circle' stakeholders - like Rose Board members - also be given opportunities to be involved in these deliberations

### **PR FALLOUT**

This is relevant not just to the on-campus discussion of the issues. The dire predictions about enrollment lost, donors and alumni alienated, and so on, also presumes that the interest and anguish of those of us involved in the controversy over the Rose is reflected in the Brandeis community at large. But we don't really know that this is the case. We have anecdotal evidence from alumni who write us, from a student who intends to transfer, from an art donor who complains in the press, and so on. But anyone who knows anything about human judgment knows that we ought not to be generalizing on the basis of such spotty data. This certainly qualifies as a PR disaster, but most PR disasters fade as someone else's PR disaster rises to the top.

Certain articles such as "The Brandeis Bombshell" in the Wall Street Journal of Feb. 3, 2009 devoted scrupulous reporting and investigation to many angles affecting our dilemma—the legal entanglements, the aesthetic loss, the irreparable harm to the related academic programs in art and art history, and comparable litigious chaos engendered and ripe for study in recent cases, such as Fisk University and Randolph College.

### **SOME GENERAL THOUGHTS**

We've referred to the groups we met with as the 'inner circle' of stakeholders, the terms used in Faculty Meeting resolution-motion. They are the most easily identified groups who are directly affected in their teaching, learning, making, and research by the proposed closing of the Rose. In another sense of the term, we are all stakeholders. In this second sense, we have not consulted with the bulk of the stakeholders but one can speculate that this second group contains a great many people who do *not* value their stake in the Rose as highly as those in the groups we consulted. It is a plain fact that there are large constituencies who have never been to the Rose, willingly, who do not bask in its glow in any way, and for whom selling the Rose is a 'no-brainer'. We probably do not want to know how big this group is, or to let these decisions be made by a show of hands. But we should not act or speak as if this group does not exist. Perhaps 20% of the Rose holdings are worth 80% of the money; it is just as likely that 20% of the

faculty and students create 80% of the buzz, email traffic, and so on. So we have to reiterate that we have not taken the pulse of the faculty on these issues, and certainly not the students, alumni, and larger community.

We highlight the unfortunate dilemma before us if the Rose is to remain closed as a public museum. Perhaps a balanced, more difficult and more careful set of considerations should be undertaken to retain the core collection—that is, could the art be loaned out in a series of focused high-profile exhibitions? Might local, or East Coast art institutions exhibit a portion of the collection, for an exhibit fee, a normal practice for prepared traveling exhibits? The sharing of our art treasures with the larger community and an increased effort to extend educational resources to the Waltham and greater Boston schools might structure new opportunities for our own students, and stress the excellence of our holdings in new ways.

More work and research is needed to accomplish any of these objectives, to be sure—there is no easy solution here. Museum management training will be much needed for registrar records and in packing, crating and shipping works. A collections curator, working in close conjunction with faculty and based on the newly published research in the forthcoming collection catalogue, perhaps also someone who might teach, would be needed. This might be a position for someone who could potentially oversee other ways of raising funds—whether from various new ventures or from traveling the collection.

The care of a collection requires good staff, and it is unimaginable that the University would leave the collection locked up in the Rose Art Museum as of June 2009, without proper oversight. The hoped-for sales over time will never be realized if the paintings are destroyed by neglect in the interim. Some thought must be given to retaining staff to protect these valuable works.

If the current plan of closing the Rose moves forward, with future sell-offs intended in coming years, the recurrent bad publicity must be anticipated. Ahead there would very likely be bad press to be awaited each time another group of works goes on the auction block, a steady deterioration of reputation, a reminder of the first breach of public trust.

As the students have observed, due to their strong feelings of a tarnished institutional integrity -- this was the 'easy' way to raise cash, closing the entire museum seemed an 'occasion that presented itself, something that had been thought of for a long time.' The hasty decision behind the closed doors of our senior administration makes one wonder how such considerations could have been so seriously misjudged.

We have found confirmation for what we intuitively accepted from the start: Much of the firestorm we are going through is due to procedural missteps by the Administration and/or the Board of Trustees. The Administration (i) failed to

consult the faculty and students in a timely fashion, and - as important, if not more important - (ii) failed to present the community with PLAN A and PLAN B to solve the problem. It was easier for many to oppose the closing of the Rose and not have to face the fact that the price for keeping it open might well be losing something *else* invaluable - faculty members, graduate education, students in financial need, etc.

The Faculty has a responsibility to advocate, whatever happens in terms of 'changing' the Rose or selling assets, to assure our students at the earliest possible moment that actions taken to save Brandeis are necessary, will promote our core mission, while upholding our core values. If not handled properly, there will be utter loss of trust and students transferring out. Remarks from the students ranged:

- This is about integrity and ethics - why I came here.
- Students don't understand how bad the economy is.
- Student: "This was decision that had been desired for a long time and this was an occasion that presented itself."

Many we spoke to - especially students - just did not believe that we do indeed face a choice between *bad* and *worse*. They, like many faculty members on the listserv, conceptualized the problem as pitting the defenders of culture vs. the bean counters, or art vs. business, or the aesthetic vs. the expedient. It did not suffice to contrast closing the Rose with 'disaster'. Many think that selling the Rose is *itself* a disaster, and they question the Administration's priorities in embracing this disaster in order to avert another.

### **Recommendations**

The committee recommends that the university administration consider carefully the public relations and recruitment consequences of any decisions surrounding the Rose and the future status of the priceless collection it contains. We further recommend that the administration consult in advance with students, faculty and staff prior to taking any action.

The committee recommends that the university administration explore all possible avenues of escape from the decision to close the Rose. We further recommend that the university administration and the committee studying the university's assets search for any assets or combination of assets that might forestall or eliminate the need for the sale of any artwork.

We recommend that if the university finds no alternatives to selling artwork for liquid assets that it understands the consequences of doing so in a drastically deflated market. We further recommend that the university administration formulate careful Plans B, C and D if indeed the legal obstacles to selling the artwork prove too difficult to overcome. Is Plan B for Brandeis University to become Brandeis College and lose its graduate programs in Liberal Arts and

Sciences? Is Plan C to continue cutting faculty along some lines yet to be determined until the financial gap coming three to four years out is filled? What further alternative plans could emerge over time?

We recommend that the university administration consider the damage that may have already been done to the pedagogical areas most closely connected to the Rose. In any future scenario involving the restructuring of the Rose, careful, prior consultation with students, faculty, and staff by the administration should take place, especially with the areas most closely affected.

Nancy Scott, Fine Arts

Jerry Samet, Philosophy

Eric Hill, Theater Arts