

**BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE**

Minutes of the Second Meeting

29 September 2005

The second meeting of the Faculty Senate was held at 3:00 p.m., 29 September 2005, in the Board of Trustees Conference Room. Senators present: Marc Brettler, Stephen Cecchetti, Bulbul Chakraborty, Jon Chilingirian, William Flesch, Richard Gaskins, Ira Gessel, Jane Hale, Jytte Klausen, Harry Mairson (Chair), Robert Moody, Laura Quinney, Leonard Muellner, Richard Parmentier, Aida Yuen Wong. Senator absent: Margie Lachman.

Report from the Chair

The Chair reported to the Senate on the Dean's informal advisory committee, and on the Provost's *ad hoc* committee on the length of the tenure clock.

Dean's advisory committee: At the start of the academic year, Dean of Arts and Sciences Adam Jaffe proposed the creation of an informal faculty committee to advise him on matters of academic policy. The Dean brought the issue to the Senate Council because he wanted his committee to have the Senate's approval. Discussions with last year's Senate Council were inconclusive, and he revived the discussion this autumn.

In discussion with the Dean, the Council expressed three goals: to emphasize that the committee was not a second version of last year's Faculty Review Committee; that the Senate have significant representation on this committee (one which excludes Senate Council members); and that the Dean's informal committee include constituencies which could have been affected by last year's proposed cuts.

The result (subsequently announced by the Dean on 30 September) is an informal advisory committee which includes Marc Brettler (NEJS), Bulbul Chakraborty (Physics), and Margie Lachman (Psychology) from the Senate; Eric Chasalow (Music), Tom King (English and American Literature), and Dan Perlman (Biology and Environmental Studies) from the faculty at large.

Provost's ad hoc committee: Provost Marty Krauss requested a nomination from the Senate to her *ad hoc* committee on the appropriateness of Brandeis's tenure clock. After discussion, the Senate Council asked Marion Smiley (Philosophy) if she would be willing to serve on the committee, and then forwarded her nomination to the Provost. Because Professor Smiley is from the School of Humanities, the Chair also asked Humanities members of the Senate to concur before this nomination was forwarded.

Senate Subcommittee on Handbook Revision: Professor Richard Gaskins, Chair of the Committee (including also Senators Bulbul Chakraborty, Laura Quinney, and Richard Parmentier), reported that proposals on changes to the Handbook will be presented at Faculty Meetings during the academic year. These proposals will be compiled by the

Senate Subcommittee on Handbook Revision. The subcommittee is not a policy making body; rather, it provides a mechanism for vetting and presenting issues to the faculty that have been discussed by other study groups. Some changes will simply involve clarification of old language. Others require some urgency, as expressed by faculty committees, including the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

The initial proposals will concern two new titles for contract faculty: Senior Lecturer and Associate Professor of the Practice. This item will be on the agenda of the 10 November Faculty Meeting. More complex proposals (including additional proposals dealing with contract faculty) will appear during the academic year. Some proposed changes may need to be examined by special study groups. When asked if he envisioned the Senate making recommendations on all proposals as a matter of procedure, Professor Gaskins responded that the Senate retained the ability to do so in any particular instance.

Budget Committee Report: The Senate then had a discussion of the University integrated plan, particularly the planning of new science buildings as the major component of the Science Initiative. Last year's curricular debate had tremendous potential impact on the University's intellectual profile, but only a marginal one on its finances. The Science Initiative, when realized, will have a profound impact on both. The Senate discussion was led by Professor Steven Cecchetti (Economics/IBS), a Senate member and Chair of the University Budget and Finance Committee.

Professor Cecchetti reported on the finances underlying the Science Initiative. His report was based on information from the 21 September meeting of the University Budget Committee. This major initiative has important budget implications for the entire University for many years to come. Starting with construction, the plan is for a two-phase building project with a total estimated capital construction (and demolition) cost of \$154 million. This is to be financed by \$74 million in gifts and \$80 million in newly issued debt.

Any new building requires maintenance. To ensure that there are funds for future renovation and building, the University budgets funds equal to the estimated depreciation of the building over the life of building. Current projections are that the new science building will increase the operating budget by \$11 million by 2012 (this is net of projected savings from demolished facilities). The plan is to finance the increase from three sources. First, \$2 million of this is from projected increased indirect cost recovery. (There are some complexities in how these are computed. Briefly, interest payments of \$80 million in debt and incremental depreciation will increase reimbursement for our research costs through a higher indirect cost recovery rate.) Of the remaining \$9 million, \$5 million is to come from raising \$100 million in new budget-relieving endowment (assuming the standard 5% endowment payout rate), and the remaining \$4 million is to come from projections of increased net revenue in the Integrated Plan by FY 2012 (e.g., incremental net tuition). Overall, as currently configured the building initiative will use \$174 million of the newly announced capital campaign extension, plus roughly a quarter of the projected revenue surplus in 2012.

Professor Cecchetti emphasized the need to ensure that the project was of an appropriate size, and to examine the risks that the project would pose for the rest of the University. He anticipates exploring these questions in the context of University Budget Committee meetings during this academic year, and will report further in the coming months.

Contract Faculty: The penultimate discussion at the meeting involved consideration of contract faculty, and how they ought to coexist with tenured faculty under Faculty Handbook guidelines. Of particular relevance is a recommendation of the Contract Faculty Committee (see http://www.brandeis.edu/departments/provost/Contract_faculty_rpt.pdf) that the University consider the possible conversion of faculty positions off the tenure track to tenured and tenure-track positions. Because this recommendation has possible implications for the appointment and promotion process, there was a discussion of the document titled *Policy on Tenured and Tenure-Track Appointments Without National Searches* (see http://www.brandeis.edu/departments/provost/Appts_no_ntl_search.pdf). The following resolution was affirmed:

1. The Senate requests that the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities report on whether it has previously reviewed the document *Policy on Tenured and Tenure-Track Appointments Without National Searches*, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook condition: *Such guidelines are subject to review by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.* [V.A.4]
2. If the *Policy* has not been reviewed by the Committee, the Senate requests the Committee to do so, and to determine specifically whether the use of the *Policy* is consistent with the Faculty Handbook as a mechanism for converting contract faculty to tenured or tenure-track faculty.
3. The sense of the Senate, upon examination of the *Policy* and relevant parts of the Faculty Handbook, is that the *Policy* does not *prima facie* justify the conversion of contract faculty to tenured or tenure-track faculty, because its intent is to explain hiring from outside the University. The following Faculty Handbook statement is not countermanded by the *Policy*: *The tenure policy of the university applies only to faculty members who have been appointed in the tenure structure as defined in this Handbook.* [V.A.4.a.ii]
4. The Senate requests the Senate Council to meet with the Provost in order to understand her view of the applicability of the *Policy* in such circumstances.

In view of issues which have already come up this year, and their subsequent consideration by the Senate, the meeting concluded with a discussion of the idea of creating a Senate working group to focus on University policy regarding tenure matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.